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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this qualitative case study was to examine how two faculty integrate equity, diversity, inclusion, and social justice (EDISJ) within their work with doctoral education at an AAU institution within two different disciplines. Due to the understanding that doctoral students imitate and emulate behaviors and values of close advisers, mentors, and experienced faculty, examining what faculty do within the work with doctoral education regarding EDISJ remains an important aspect to understanding how social inequalities may be perpetuated or disrupted within and beyond the academy. Two sites selected were initially categorized into the “core and integral value” and “peripheral value” for EDISJ by examining mission statements, course catalogs, committees, and faculty profiles of the department and PhD program.

Institutional logics and disciplinary logics served as analytical frameworks to understand how institutional and disciplinary factors influence faculty integration of EDISJ. Several scholars broadly define institutional logics as generalized rules that dictate the degree of appropriateness of behavior through legitimizing particular forms of identities, interests, values, and practices. Becher (1984) described academic cultures as a shared way of thinking and a collective way of behaving while Posselt (2016) defined these active communities as seeking ongoing relevancy and rewarding standards through their own set of disciplinary logics.

A total of three interviews per participant were coordinated which lasted from 39 minutes to 83 minutes over nine weeks. Participants were asked to participate in a form of reflective journaling to share any insights or perspectives after each of the three interviews. Documents such as news releases, handbooks, publicly-available guidelines for teaching, research, service, and tenure, and professional associations websites were gathered to corroborate and augment evidence from other data sources. To strengthen trustworthiness, multiple forms of data were
collected, participants completed member checking, incontestable descriptions were provided,
and the researcher utilized peer debrief.

This case study illustrated how faculty are continually interacting with socialization
processes at the borderlands of disciplinary communities organizing within higher education
institutions. Overall, the influence of the disciplinary force, in these cases, set the boundaries for
the personality, character, habits of mind and heart, and general scholarly dispositions of their
disciplinary community in which conflicts of multiple logics exist (Golde et al., 2006). Jay’s case
illustrated the power of professional associations around disciplinary pursuits in a competitive
discipline and its direct influence on a research-intensive focused approach with students. Alicia
and her advisees research is quite novel in their field of study although not producing large grant
funds that previously fractured parts of her field shifted to decades ago. Unfortunately, despite a
larger saliency of EDISJ in her field, as compared to Jay’s, the course distribution is structured in
a way to place a heavy burden on one faculty member (Alicia) to handle the teaching load for
diversity courses.

Opportunities for integration of EDISJ are possible throughout all of doctoral education
although not equally attainable. For both Alicia and Jay, their cases confirm the importance of
distinguishing collective and individual decision-making processes. For example, Posselt’s
(2016) scholarship on graduate admissions committees should be considered categorically
different than Noy & Ray’s (2012) study on the impacts on the adviser-student relationship. The
descriptive case summaries, the implications of the study, and future research directions offer
recommendations for how faculty members can continue to integrate EDISJ as a value-set, as a
form of action, and as part of one’s identity as they shape and are shaped by the influences of
their institutional and disciplinary logics.
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, I provide an introduction to my study. I then provide an overview of the purpose of my study and conclude with discussion of the significance of the study.

Many scholars in higher education have written about the purposes of doctoral education (Bok, 2013; Cassuto, 2015; Conrad, Haworth, & Millar, 1993; Gardner, 2008; Gardner & Mendoza, 2010; Golde & Dore, 2001; Golde et al., 2006; Lovitts, 2001; Posselt, 2016). Since its early history, a connection between graduate education and society has been well-documented (Cassuto, 2016). Doctoral degree recipients have had a general responsibility to improve society. First, they contribute their expertise in the production of knowledge and technologies; second, they have developed professionally as “t-shaped” public intellectuals—those with both an expertise in a particular academic field and broad knowledge across a range of interwoven topics (Gardner & Mendoza, 2010; Golde et al., 2006). In context of an individual with a Ph.D. in engineering for example, the stem of the “T” would indicate depth and expertise of knowledge in a particular field or discipline (e.g. the engineering design process and the mastery of computer coding, physics, and mathematics) and the top of the “T” would indicate breadth of knowledge (e.g. pairing engineering knowledge with business, management, and communication preparation).

Society needs highly educated people from doctoral programs to fill a wide variety of positions both inside and outside of academe (Bok, 2013; Lovitts, 2001). Golde et al. (2006), through the Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate, captured and synthesized these conversation towards viewing doctoral education as a means to develop stewards of the discipline—“someone who can imaginatively generate new knowledge, critically conserve valuable and useful ideas, and responsibly transform those understandings through writing, teaching, and application” (p.73). These stewards are asked to embrace the personality, character, habits of mind and heart,
and general scholarly dispositions of their disciplinary community. Understanding and bettering this call for stewards is vital; for example, this call can help yield positive and generational impacts onto individuals and societies by evaluating and reimagining the ways knowledge is created and transformed, how it is taught, who it is taught to, and what perspectives and worldviews make up sustainable disciplinary communities.

Doctoral degree recipients will often times be in positions of power and exert such power over social, political, and economic spheres by means of their advanced credentials in the labor market, learned abilities and knowledges, and acceptance into selective pipelines due to their terminal degrees and gained prestige (Posselt & Grodsky, 2017). These newly minted PhDs take over vital roles ranging from corporate executives, policy and legal analysts, and compliance and oversight board members, to school superintendents, higher education faculty, and advisory councils of nonprofit and charitable organizations. These positions offer opportunities to shape access to and distribution of government funding, determine the purposes of education through the influence of standards and mandated curriculums, offer places and programs for sanctuary and safety, and more—arguably many important decision-making processes that impact individuals and groups differentially across racialized, classed, gendered, and other identity-based experiences. Thus, those with PhDs continue to shape society’s and higher education’s personality, character, habits of mind and heart, and general dispositions by means of enacting power and privilege in their societal positions. Therefore, their actions in such positions and their enactment of power and privileges impact how systemic inequalities and discrimination are maintained, evolved, disrupted, or eradicated.

In some ways, how people enact their power or contribute to social reproduction is reflective of what they learned during doctoral education. Doctoral education programs are
viewed as selective and prestigious educational spaces (Cassuto, 2016; Lovitts, 2001; Posselt, 2016) where a few are welcomed due to resource limitations and sense to one’s ability to succeed during and after their program. This perpetuates the selection bias into who has access to these positions of power and privilege. Due to the presence of homophily and commitments towards meritocracy (Posselt, 2016; Poselty & Grodsky, 2017), disparities persist in who are welcomed across identity groups. Once in the program, students experience and weigh the norms, values, and expectations of their behavior towards success, and impactful scholarship; often these standards are in effort to maintain recognition and prestige to match elite programs’ reputations. Students live in this education space that has been controlled prior to admission largely by faculty—from financial support, to core curriculum and electives, and the requirements for degree completion.

Embedded in these programmatic elements are faculty standards that students must abide by enough to the point to persist and graduate or attrite out of the program; this provides endless moments for students to be shaped by their faculty. Knowing that doctoral students imitate and emulate behaviors and values of close advisers, mentors, and experienced faculty (Lovitts, 2001; Mendoza, 2007; Patton, 2009; Sallee, 2011), understanding what faculty do within the work with doctoral education regarding equity, diversity, inclusion, and social justice remains an important aspect to understanding how social inequalities may be perpetuated or disrupted within the academy and beyond. This study inquires into how two faculty integrate equity, diversity, inclusion, and social justice within their work with doctoral education.

**Purpose**

The purpose of this dissertation is to examine how two faculty integrate equity, diversity, inclusion, and social justice within their work with doctoral education within two different
disciplines. I will utilize case study methodology to describe how faculty integrate equity, diversity, inclusion, and social justice into their work in doctoral education. Following the research by Posselt (2016) who utilized both high and low consensus disciplines to describe differences in disciplinary logics within graduate admissions decisions, I will study two faculty in different disciplinary contexts for this inquiry—one discipline/field of study which conveys a core and integral value for equity, diversity, inclusion, and social justice and one discipline/field which conveys a peripheral or supplemental value for equity, diversity, inclusion and social justice. Posselt’s study utilized methods of interviews and observation to understand faculty within the admission process. Additionally, Becher (1984) provided further framing by their study of faculty life in consideration of epistemological beliefs, navigation of political realities, and professional practices through the use of interviews with current faculty. Both studies offer framing in how to contextualize faculty’s work in doctoral education. Tierney & Rhoads (1994) studied faculty socialization and characterized academic cultures as the interplay between five sociological forces: (a) national, (b) professional, (c) disciplinary, (d) individual, and (e) institutional. Each of these three studies lay foundation for the need to examine how faculty integrate equity, diversity, inclusion, and social justice. This dissertation builds on the latter two works by explicitly foregrounding equity, diversity, inclusion, and social justice into the worldviews and work life of faculty in a doctoral education context and moves beyond the robust analysis into the admissions decision-making process of faculty within elite doctoral programs to other areas of faculty work.

This study will give attention to the institutional and disciplinary logics (Friedland & Alford, 1991; Rao, Monin, and Durand, 2003; Townley, 1997) utilized by faculty within their integration of equity, diversity, inclusion, and social justice within doctoral education. Scholars
broadly define logics as generalized rules that dictate the degree of appropriateness of behavior through legitimizing particular forms of identities, interests, values, and practices (Friedland & Alford, 1991; Rao et al., 2003; Townley, 1997).

It is my assumption that integration may not always be a formal lesson in a classroom or an explicit conversation in an advising meeting about how someone should act. Logics influence all aspects of organizational livelihood and thus implicitly and explicitly guide expectations on the appropriateness of action; at the same time, faculty themselves may have a wide array of expertise, mindfulness, and desire to shape their work with equity, diversity, inclusion, and social justice as a foregrounded or backgrounded influence. Knowing that individuals are complicated and wrestle with competing individual and institutional values and expectations, I believe it is important to be aware of the various elements of a faculty’s life (administrative, teaching, research, service, and extension responsibilities) but not to consider them so categorically as to remove the opportunity to see the nuances in their integration and enactment.

**Research Questions**

Specifically, this study is guided by one overarching question: How do two faculty integrate equity, diversity, inclusion, and social justice within their work with doctoral education? This primary question is supported by three subquestions to guide the inquiry:

1. What do these faculty envision as their role in developing such an orientation within doctoral students?
2. How have these faculty learned how and where equity, diversity, inclusion and/or social justice can take place within doctoral education?
3. In what ways are institutional logics and disciplinary logics informing these faculty’s behaviors related to equity, diversity, inclusion, and social justice in doctoral education?

**Significance of the Study**

As previously mentioned, knowing that doctoral students observe and imitate behaviors and values of close advisers, mentors, and experienced faculty (Lovitts, 2001), understanding what faculty do within doctoral education regarding equity, diversity, inclusion, and social justice remains an important aspect to understanding how social inequalities may be perpetuated or disrupted within the academy and beyond. This study can add perspective and knowledge into the growing literature domain around doctoral education—particularly in understanding faculty work within doctoral education. Furthermore, this study can support and illuminate findings regarding inequitable trends in doctoral program enrollment patterns across race and ethnicity (Bok, 2013; Perna, 2004), gendered gaps in doctoral program enrollment (Aud, Fox, & KewalRamani, 2010), and programs’ use of diversity and equity within admissions practices (Posselt, 2016). Lastly, this study can continue the call which critiques the “private practice” (Barnes, Williams, & Stassen, 2012, p. 327) perspective that doctoral advising is often understood as an independent, solitary, and isolated training between only a master and apprentice.

Additionally, further inquiry, such as this, can reach across camps of research on: (a) doctoral student experiences (Baker, Pifer, & Flemion, 2013; Bieber & Worley, 2006; Golde, 2005; Wilson & Meyer, 2011; Winkle-Wagner & McCoy, 2016), (b) doctoral program socialization (Austin, 2002; Gardner, 2008, 2010; Mena, Diefes-Dux, & Capobianco, 2013; Mendoza, 2007; Sallee, 2011; Szelényi, 2013), and (c) faculty career preparation (Austin, 2002;
Bieber & Worley, 2006; Golde, 2005; Golde et al., 2006; Winkle-Wagner & McCoy, 2016), (d) advising (Barnes et al., 2012; Noy & Ray, 2012; Patton, 2009), and (e) faculty decision-making (Posselt, 2015).

Connecting these camps of research provides this research a more holistic perspective onto the practices, structures, and nuances of doctoral education. Understanding how faculty integrate equity, diversity, inclusion, or social justice into doctoral education requires this greater holistic approach to attend to the subtle, distinct, overt, and subversive ways this is attempted. As these are contested concepts within society (Davis & Harrison, 2013), faculty assuredly are challenged with striking balance with their internal morals, values, knowledges, experiences, and dispositions, with the external demands and needs of their students, colleagues, and institutional expectations. Better describing how faculty integrate these concepts, may assist in critiquing and evolving dominant narratives of their academic and disciplinary communities to better address societal inequalities.
CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

In this chapter, I provide an overview and synthesis of the literature relevant to this study—namely, scholarship related to the current environment of graduate education relative to equity, diversity, inclusion, and social justice, graduate school socialization, and faculty work and experiences. I begin by providing operationalized definitions of equity, diversity, inclusion, and social justice for the purposes of this inquiry. I utilize working definitions of other scholars while infusing my perspectives as the researcher within the definitions for greater clarity and transparency. Following, I provide a depiction of the current environment in graduate education. While describing the current environment, I also take time to detail the calls for improvement across admissions, advising, and programmatic milestones.

I then focus on a more detailed outline of logics as the theoretical framework for this study. I outline the commonly agreed upon understandings around institutional logics—both in what they are and what they do. I then describe the ways in which logics are maintained, sustained, disrupted, and changed. Finally, I describe the way scholars have understood academic communities as enactors of their own logics. I argue these disciplinary logics influence faculty in what they do within doctoral education.

Definition of Terms

Several theoretical perspectives around race have informed my understanding of equity, diversity, inclusion, and social justice to a more nuanced level. Although these scholars range within contexts of racial experiences and structures, I find larger perspectives drawn from their words to be transferable to a larger conversation beyond race exclusively. In earnest, critical race theory and racial formation theories are overwhelmingly my foundational perspectives for determining representational definitions that account for all elements involved. The words of Omi and Winant (2015) ring through my head—race is strategic, race does ideological and
political work. The brilliant writing of Derrick Bell (1992) in *Space Traders*, Dudziak’s (1998) challenging of the history of the Cold War’s involvement in *Brown v. Board of Education*, and even Wilson’s (2012) historical accounting of race within institutional evolutions in The *Declining Significance of Race* have shaped my thinking in such a way where their thoughts have converged into my thoughts. Therefore, in regards to race and any other social identity or other aspects of one’s life as part of society, I see it nearly impossible to not understand the sociohistorical roots of oppression to define these terms of equity, diversity, inclusion, and social justice. As such, I solicited operating definitions from current scholars and layered on my understanding of systems, context, and culture as needed as well as acknowledge the constructed and the felt consequences of oppression through material distribution (Bonilla-Silva, 2014).

Together these definitions offer guidance into better understanding complex and contested ideas both in how they may have implicitly shaped the foundation of this inquiry and also in how they may be utilized in data collection and analysis. Furthermore, the definitions offer insight into the researcher’s point of view and some depth into how these concepts can be operationalized within participants’ environments. Each definition supports a worldview where multiple social institutions impact individuals and identity groups differently; the definitions together strive to acknowledge contexts—both historical and cultural that may shape individual interpretations and experiences.

**Equity**

Davis and Harrison (2013) defined equity as the just and respectful treatment of people within consideration to historical disadvantages and systems of oppression within background, history, and unique needs; the driving force for equity is getting people what they need. Zine (2001) stated equity goes deeper than equality and beyond a sense of individual or group rights;
equity strives to develop sociological and practical equivalents to what justice and respect mean within the world of identity politics and practices. For the purposes of this study, I will add that equity is a standpoint where individuals also have a ubiquity of relevant material resources, human rights in order to seek pursuits that best develops themselves while minimizing harm onto others.

**Diversity**

Diversity is defined as those numerous elements of difference between groups of people that play significant roles in social institutions, including race and ethnicity, gender, socioeconomic class, sexual orientation, and other identity groups (Smith, 2009). Banks (2012) defined diversity through the perceived differences in race, national origin, language, gender, sexuality, religion, and class. For greater clarity in the study, diversity’s definition acknowledges how time changes our recognition of differences in the physical, social, and historical domains of who we are, and what we value, believe in, and practice.

**Inclusion**

Gibson and Haynes (2009) defined inclusion as commitments towards equality and diversity where all people are systemically valued with opportunities for societal engagements without detriment of their identities and experiences. Davis and Harrison (2013) defined inclusion as integration into normative and mainstream practices, services, and institutions to ensure individual rights and opportunity.

**Social Justice**

Davis and Harrison (2013) outlined social justice as defined by what people do or believe with analysis of how people use power. They defined social justice in terms of bridging the gap between what our society aspires to and what we actually do at the boarders of power and
privilege. Social justice as an action focuses on equal participation in decision making and equitable distribution of resources. Adams, Bell, and Griffin (2007) stated social justice connotes both a process and a goal. Their vision of social justice promotes (a) equitable distribution of resources, (b) safety and security, (c) self-determination and agency, and (d) a sense of self and responsibility to society. For this study, social justice also critiques and analyzes current realities with sociohistorical roots of oppression.

**Equity, Diversity, Inclusion, and Social Justice in Graduate Education**

For future stewards of the discipline, they need to look no further than the current academic environment for examples on how to interact with equity, diversity, inclusion, and social justice within their practice—for better or worse. Damrosch (2006) noted that some faculty advisers would believe in an ideal world personal differences—such as age, race, ethnicity, nationality, and gender—would go away in the clear light of the intellect within doctoral education. Even upon consideration of differences, most higher education discussions of diversity, in particular, focus heavily on structural diversity which focuses on number counts that tend to overshadow the actual experience of students and faculty (Bender, 2006). Posselt (2015) found even when diversity was introduced into the latter stages of graduate admissions decision-making, faculty were hesitant and reluctant in speaking openly about race, gender, or socioeconomic status. In spite of reports of increased percentages of underrepresented racial and ethnic enrollees and women in male-dominated fields (Perna, 2004; Posselt, 2016), widespread issues around discrimination (Felder, 2010; Gardner, 2010), isolation (Lovitts, 2001), and two-track advising (e.g. research intensive versus teaching intensive or non-academic career guidance) still occur (Cassuto, 2016). Enrollment and graduation rates of doctoral students from
racially minoritized populations have seen little growth in comparison across all demographics in the last few decades (Aud et al., 2010; Bok, 2013; Perna, 2004; Posselt, 2016).

Unfortunately, responses to improve the environment on how we operationalize equity, diversity, inclusion or social justice are not always productive. Even advocates for change in doctoral education can put the burden on underrepresented groups and their faculty to create supportive environments (Gardner & Mendoza, 2010). These types of advocacy usually burden faculty of color and female faculty who are asked to do more than their white and male counterparts—both in the advising and supporting of students within and outside of the department as well as being tapped for additional service to the institution (Noy & Ray, 2012; Patton, 2009). Advocating for inclusion can come from a risk management perspective where the goal is to minimize legal conflict rather than critiquing normative behaviors and values; it can also emerge as a financial maneuvering tactic where admissions processes are adapted to allow more students entry creating a greater inflow of money into the institution (Cassuto, 2016).

Attempts to understand equity or inequity can be difficult when comparing enrollment rates, population sizes, and pipeline processes across demographics and over time (Posselt, 2016). In most cases, underrepresented students are expected to place themselves within the academic pipeline as faculty may be otherwise unsure on how to recruit them (Chan, 2006). Some faculty see the increase emphasis of human rights and changing roles of women in society as tertiary to any change in the essence or purpose of the PhD degree (Kwiram, 2006). Others do not focus on the underrepresented audience they research or make strong enough attempts to put into practice their research within the audience and stakeholders it could benefit (Elkana, 2006).
Calls for Action

Simultaneously occurring alongside the current habits and actions in mainstream doctoral education, calls for change have been articulated across multiple stages of doctoral education—particularly within: (1) admissions, (2) advising, and (3) programmatic milestones. Faculty have been asked to reconsider the pools of applicants to include more variety of students’ ages, abilities, and institutional pipelines, and find relevancy in reconsidering program structures to allow students to start families and have children (Gardner, 2010; Stacy, 2006). Posselt (2016) stated departments need to hold a mirror up to their committees, their program, and to themselves, to see who and what is being reflected back in order to reinterpret the norms that academic identities look for in doctoral admissions—and all of higher education. While an equitable, inclusive, or just admission practice helps, it is not the end but the start of opportunities for integration.

As advisers are considered the most important support in doctoral education, doctoral students could experience a radically different environment. Having a purposeful process for determining primary (and secondary) advisers rather than random selection would allow for better matches academically, personally, and professionally (Lovitts, 2001). Advisers with closely aligned interests, concerns in personal matters (not just academic requirements), and commitments to the students’ research, ideas, and professional development had students who persisted to degree completion at greater rates (Gardner & Mendoza, 2010; Golde & Dore, 2001). Faculty serve students well by providing positive assistance through dilemmas of personhood, beliefs, and conflicts (Gardner & Mendoza, 2010; Lovitts, 2001); however, faculty need to be aware and open to those differences (Cassuto, 2016; Golde & Dore, 2001). Students report chilly climates of gender discrimination, differential treatment within frequency of
interaction, type of relationship, and differences in and out of academic setting interactions (Gardner & Mendoza, 2010; Sallee, 2011; Turner & Thompson, 1993). By recognizing student differences within doctoral experiences, students can experience less isolation, less victim blaming (Lovitts, 2001), and receive assistance in developing cognitive maps of the institutional and disciplinary expectations (Cassuto, 2016; Lovitts, 2001). These cognitive maps are mental models that help people make sense of their experiences and provide them with a general understanding of their environment (Lovitts, 2001). Students that have faculty advisers who value their dissertation advising responsibilities as much as their pre-candidacy advising get the added attention and support needed for further success (Lovitts, 2001; Noy & Ray, 2012).

Developing patterns of open communication between admission into the program and the start of the dissertation process can have students express more of their preferred career goals, life plans, and sense of belonging (Cassuto, 2016).

Finally, calls for action address the programmatic elements of doctoral programs. Golde (2005) outlined that admissions decisions, financial support, the requirements for degree completion, and the curriculum are all determined and controlled by the department or program faculty. Doctoral programs are often more decentralized resulting in much of the decision-making process led by faculty regarding milestones, achievements, and proficiency (Gardner, 2010; Lovitts, 2001). Faculty are the actors who admit students into these prestigious and selective programs (Posselt, 2016), and are the ones who have the most influence in helping them stay or leave (Cassuto, 2016; Lovitts, 2001). Program requirements like coursework, comprehensive exams, and dissertations tend to be overspecialized, outdated, and nontransferable outside of intensive research experiences (Bok, 2013; Cassuto, 2016). Scaffolding milestones and having purposeful and realistic requirements through student-
centered processes lowers time-to-degree expectations (Bok, 2013; Cassuto, 2016). Reduction in timeline extends students’ opportunity to implement their skills and knowledge in greater and more beneficial career capacities while also reducing student-accumulated debt (Bok, 2013; Lovitts, 2001). Further emphasis into the outlining the purpose and structure of a graduate program can reduce unneeded ambiguity in terms of expected directions and expectations for students (Gardner, 2007).

Additional calls for programmatic changes have been made for greater coordination between administrators and faculty to increase their understanding of what underrepresented students seek in graduate programs (Bar, Wanat, and Gonzalez, 2007; Bersola, Stolzenberg, Love, & Fosnacht, 2014). For faculty to question and ultimately change normative standards and structure of programs, different stages of life can be represented in doctoral programs outside of the students largely benefitting who are single, in their mid-twenties, and male (Stacy, 2006). Even including those with career experience in industry, policy, or business who are in the middle of their careers can achieve growth in student diversity (Stacy, 2006). By faculty aligning programs to find “potential” within a broader understanding of students today, it allows those from varying paths in life to receive an education that would be of benefit to them and to society.

**Potential Outcomes**

These calls for action can impact doctoral programs on the day-to-day, but they also can support loftier aims and outcomes of doctoral programs. Higher diversity is viewed as having higher scholarly excellence, creativity and problem solving, innovation in research and preparing professionals for multicultural communities, and greater diversity of ideas, image and institutional reputation (Golde et al., 2006). When implemented systemically across the institution, gains may be had towards an institution embodying inclusive excellence—when
“colleges and universities integrate diversity, equity, and educational quality efforts into their missions and institutional operations” (Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2013, p. 1). These efforts require a deep understanding or awareness of a sense of agency in order to address concerns of equity and injustice (Pasque, Carducci, Kuntz, & Gildersleeve, 2012). A more robust and advantageous outcome of having highly educated persons in positions of power experience an education integrated with equity, diversity, inclusion and social justice content is the chance that systemic barriers can be changed due to a reinterpretation of these communal values (Brown & Strega, 2005). These types of institutional calls for action to address inequalities can be supported by faculty within the programmatic and socialization processes of doctoral education.

Departments and doctoral programs promote their own schools of thought at the onset of orientation programs (Gardner & Mendoza, 2010). This allows departments to create future stewards who similarly reflect the values of the department. This reality of faculty leading the socialization of students from time of application to graduation shows the importance that any incorporation may have on whether these future stewards challenge or perpetuate existing inequalities in academia and beyond. Labaree (2004) described how a community of scholars forms by including some and excluding others to create shared definitions, values, and standards. These standards are then taught and rewarded to future scholars and members of these communities as means of finding success and survivability (Gopaul, 2011). These shared ideals center narratives and subtleties around key concepts like merit, hard work, productivity and fairness (Pasque et al., 2009). Values, like someone’s merit and quality, are contested issues debated upon, established by the more prestigious and elite doctoral programs, and replicated across many striving institutions (Cassuto, 2016; Gardner, 2010; Labaree, 2004; Posselt, 2016).
When enacted, these values—like merit, quality, and rigor—help shape higher education and society. For example, forms of segregation, wealth gap disparities, environmental racism, discrimination practices in hiring, and criminal justice failures can be viewed as good fortune for some or the failure of others—or they can be viewed through societal systems and structures of historical oppression and marginalization. Thus, exists a real possibility to shift individual interactions with each other towards understanding power, inequality, and the historical events of exclusion (Learner, 2009). Faculty can utilize their role as educators to have future scholars develop for themselves a sense of these narratives as well as juxtapose student thinking with the dominant narratives of their academic and disciplinary communities.

Those who control much of the decision-making processes in graduate programs (tenured faculty and tenure-track faculty) can also show how a redistribution of power may yield positive impacts for doctoral students. Adjunct faculty and lecturers usually do not receive as much say in programmatic decisions; meanwhile, an increase of adjunct faculty positions is likely to be in the future career pathways of newly minted PhDs—and disproportionately across disciplinary expertise, race, and gender (Bok, 2013; Cassuto, 2016; Golde & Dore, 2001; Lovitts, 2001). Faculty can provide a sense of transparency when handling difficult decisions around scholarship, fellowships, training programs (e.g. Preparing Future Faculty), and how they advise students into particular career pathways. Additionally, increasing the opportunity to serve on committees and supporting student subcultures can be ways faculty distribute decision making or other power-related activities (Lovitts, 2001). It could develop agency in students to fully participate in their graduate education.

In addition to developing students’ dispositions, faculty can also teach skills that future students need. Many of the skills and knowledge faculty desire to be gained by doctoral students
rarely mention equity, diversity, inclusion, or social justice explicitly—although those attributes vary across institution, discipline, and department. For example, the typical goals for future scholars include pursuing cross-disciplinary work (Austin, 2002; Elkana, 2006), becoming an independent scholar (Gardner, 2008; Golde & Dore, 2001), collaborating across departments (Chan, 2006; Golde & Dore, 2001), thinking critically (Elkana, 2006), communicating with various audiences (Cassuto, 2016; Elkana, 2006), teaching more effectively (Austin, 2002; Golde & Dore, 2001; Richardson, 2006), and espousing a wealth of worldly knowledge, perspectives, research methods, and evaluating skills (Elkana, 2006; Golde et al., 2006). These skills certainly have close connections to how equity, diversity, inclusion, and social justice can be enacted; however, the connection is not always made. For example, teaching with a connection towards equity or inclusion can occur through acknowledging the lived experiences of marginalized and majoritized students to address the hidden curriculum of normative values and beliefs.

Developing multiple perspective towards modes of inquiry or evaluation can offer new ways and awareness towards problematizing, exploring, and offering solutions for working with power relations between researchers and communities (Brown & Strega, 2005). For these reasons and more, faculty affiliated with doctoral programs have a complicated set of opportunities across programmatic, advisory, and educational spaces to incorporate equity, diversity, inclusion, and social justice related concepts, perspectives, and actions into their practices.

**Graduate Student and Faculty Socialization**

**Socialization Defined**

Socialization in graduate education is considered the first general stage of faculty socialization (Austin, 2002; Golde & Dore, 2001; Tierney & Rhoads, 1994). Development of
graduate students as potential members of the faculty is shaped by many factors that take place in a nonlinear, complex way (Austin, 2002). Socialization is considered a two-way process which an individual learns to adopt the values, skills, attitudes, norms, and knowledge needed for membership in a given group (Austin, 2002; Gardner & Mendoza, 2010; Rutz, 2008; Tierney & Rhoads, 1994; Van Maanen, 1976). Graduate school provides a setting in which graduate students have access to experts, finished and high-quality products and scholarly processes, and more advanced apprentice experiences (Bok, 2013; Gardner & Mendoza, 2010; Tierney & Rhoads, 1994). Doctoral education gives students an opportunity to learn a broad base of knowledge defined by the seminal work of the discipline, allows them to acquire contemporary practices, and specialize in at least one area (Golde & Walker, 2006). Graduate school is a complex setting; it provides intense socialization and resocialization experiences (Lovitts, 2001). Students interact with “at least five distinct, but synergistic cultures” (Gardner, 2007, p. 737) that contribute to this complex setting: the overall culture of graduate education, the institutional culture, the disciplinary culture, the department culture, and one’s own individual culture (Gardner, 2007). Regardless of career path chosen by each student, in a well-structured doctoral program all students should be well socialized into professional habits, norms, and practices characteristic of that field. The underlying goal is to socialize them to the norms, values, ethics, thought processes, and modes of verbal and written discourse of their chosen disciplines and sometimes even to a new vision of themselves—in order to fill the role of an academic professional (Lovitts, 2001; Tierney & Rhoads, 1994). This socialization involves garnering a sense of identity and personal commitment, a way of being in the world, and a matter of taking on a culture frame that defines a great part of one’s life (Gardner & Mendoza, 2010; Rutz, 2008).
Scholars studying doctoral student socialization broadly agree on three or four stages representing doctoral education depending on their leaning towards viewing socialization through the learning experiences that occur (e.g. students moving from a novice to the internalization of professional values) or the salient stages of doctoral education (e.g. from admission to dissertation); this is not to say that one perspective doesn’t acknowledge the other—only that the stages are organized differently yet describe similar processes. Nevertheless, cutting across these stages Golde and Dore (2001) described six elements that impact each of the stages described below: (a) advising and advisor selection, (b) financial support, (c) annual reviews, (d) coursework and examinations, (e) teaching assistantships and grading, and (f) time to degree and graduation criteria. Each of these areas position graduate students in places to receive feedback about their performance and thinking, their ability to gain new knowledge and perspectives, opportunity to practice fundamental skills of faculty life, access to expert scholars and teachers, and assessment of their progress through the program.

Weidman, Twale, and Stein (2001) outlined four stages of socialization: (a) an anticipatory stage during recruitment where an individual becomes aware of expectations, (b) a formal stage where early instruction and participation is experienced through normative situations and observations, (c) an informal stage where an individual learns of expectations and information through unstructured interactions and through a developed network, and (d) a personal stage where roles and structures become internalized by an individual. Tinto (1993) described the three stages as: (a) transition or adjustment, (b) attaining candidacy or development of competence, and (c) completing the research project. Gardner (2008) bounded the first stage temporally as admissions through the beginning year of coursework, the second stage as coursework up until the comprehensive examination, and the third stage is the culmination of
coursework through the dissertation research. In the first stage, students are more concerned with developing academic competencies through their coursework (Cassuto, 2016; Mendoza, 2007) and adjust to the independent culture of graduate education (Gardner, 2008). In the second stage, students finalize their coursework through their attainment of candidacy (Cassuto, 2016; Gardner, 2008). In the third stage, students synthesize their learning and personal growth into the abilities of a new and independent scholar (Gardner, 2008).

**Characterizing Doctoral Education Socialization**

Fundamentally, the doctorate is a research degree, so doctoral student socialization tends to include a heavy dose of research-related activities (Austin, 2002; Gardner & Mendoza, 2010). In terms of the areas graduate students may find themselves in, participation in research and research-related activities varies considerably by academic discipline/field of study (Gardner & Mendoza, 2010). For example, graduate students in the sciences more often participate in research teams, whereas students in the social sciences have more isolated or individual research assignments (Austin, 2002). Often viewed in an apprenticeship model, students are exposed to and participates in the academic traditions of research activities as they learn the rules and activities towards becoming an expert (Kwiram, 2006; Mena, Diefes-Dux, & Capobianco, 2013). This apprenticeship into the “art of discovery” (Kwiram, 2006, p. 141) develops a student towards appropriate habits of mind and associated skills spelled out by departments and institutions. This idea of apprenticeship suggests a replication model by which the production of researchers is the goal through a restricting of identity and power to ensure success (Bender, 2006) for the teacher or “master” (Bender, 2006, p. 305). Such intensive relationships can go extremely well across all forms of teaching, mentorship, and advising, but can also lead to an exploitive experience for students (Cronon, 2006).
The typical experience for a full-time student is that they enter a graduate program with a set of skills and predispositions about what is required to earn a degree and pursue a successful career after graduation, they go through socialization experiences occurring primarily within the normative context of the graduate program (especially those dimensions related to developing research capacity), and complete the degree with the skills necessary for doing research that is valued in the academic arena (Rutz, 2008; Weidman, 2006). Students can replace their old values with something approaching their departmental model when aligning themselves towards institutional norms (Golde, 2005; Lovitts, 2001). Some choose to change, some conform, and some leave—it’s on a continuum of integration. Once they choose to connect to the department, the collective conscience of their department increases their self-regulation—in behavior and mindset (Golde, 2005; Lovitts, 2001; Tierney & Rhoads, 1994). Advanced students preparing for the job market described both internal and external pressures to be groomed into the research mindset to prepare them to fit appropriately into the disciplinary milieu (Gardner, 2007).

Faculty expertise and research agendas, required institutional and departmental coursework, student demographics and enrollment size, and types of funding opportunities available all shape how scholarly pursuits and disciplinary expectations are enacted in a graduate program (Gardner, 2010; Lovitts, 2001; Posselt, 2016). Therefore, the doctoral education environment is characterized to be quite ambiguous and difficult for students to comprehend fully (Gardner, 2007; Lovitts, 2001). Even before starting their first semester, selectivity based on research experience is used a significant factor in determining who is worthy of acceptance into a doctoral program—reinforcing inequalities in educational access (Posselt, 2016). As students move through the stages of doctoral education, they experience a less structured educational experience and more self-guided opportunities towards completion as they become
independent scholars (Gardner, 2007, 2008). Issues of balancing multiple responsibilities are prevalent for students learning how to integrate into the academic culture—which is compounded by seeing currently faculty struggle with the same balancing act (Gardner, 2007). Socialization into the academic arena and as an emerging scholar is often through observations of faculty interactions and departmental dynamic (Gardner, 2007) although not everyone feels equally included in nonacademic settings (Sallee, 2011). Female doctoral students, even after controlling for background and personal circumstances, discipline, and factors of adviser behavior report lower satisfaction with their adviser (Zhao, Golde, & McCormick, 2007). Racially minoritized students can struggle to find faculty with similar experiences and backgrounds (Gardner, 2007) and thus may have inequitable socialization experiences due to the lack of an active mentoring or peer network (Winkle-Wagner, & McCoy, 2016). If students cannot become integrated into the dominant and valued modes of interaction within a department or discipline, they consider dropping out (Golde, 2005; Gildersleeve, Croom, Vasquez, 2011). Racially minoritized student experiences speak to intellectual isolation, benign neglect, and a lack of respect that may begin and be compounded by advisor/student relations (Gildersleeve et al., 2011; Noy & Ray, 2012).

Golde (2005) found that a quality match between adviser and students positively shapes students’ experiences and development of important habits and practices. This type of positivity would include keeping attune to ongoing training and progress checks, inserting a personal touch to support beyond academic concerns, demonstrating mentorship within career development, and minimizing exploitive aspects of student labor (Zhao et al., 2007). As students need support or structure to their education endeavors, the physical presence as responsiveness of a faculty adviser can greatly support the success of students (Gardner, 2007; Zhao et al., 2007). Mendoza
(2007) also determined that a quality adviser and advisee relationship may be more important than relationships with peers when it comes to meeting larger disciplinary cultural expectations and standards while peers are important for tacit information for graduate school survival. Nevertheless, both relationships are key in the socialization process as students become academically and socially integrated (Gardner, 2007; Lovitts, 2001).

**Continued Socialization as Faculty**

Once hired as a faculty, individuals experience a second stage of socialization with the conceptualized understanding of faculty socialization. Bieber and Worley (2006) identified concerning thought patterns of doctoral students to believe that students do not fully understand what it means to be faculty until they start in the position. Although students have been observing behaviors for years, many may not know why more seasoned professionals do what they do (Labaree, 2004). Few graduate students respond receiving any guidance about the array of tasks that faculty members must accomplish (Austin, 2002). As Bieber and Worley (2006) found, if students did not see the experience, they could not fully consider it as part of the faculty landscape of committees, shared governance, and autonomy. Therefore, this second stage of faculty socialization—known as the organizational stage—are described as the early years of intellectual isolation, lack of collegial support, and heavy workloads as new faculty learn predominantly by trial and error habits (Gardner, 2010; Tierney & Rhoads, 1994). Faculty adapt as they find ways to cope with the stress of academic life and become more seasoned in the requirements of the position. Socialization is seen as ongoing through experiences with various departmental processes, traditions, relationships, and rules that govern the culture— influencing both new and seasoned faculty (Becher & Trowler, 2001; Lovitts, 2001; Tierney & Rhoads, 1994). Faculty experience daily the discipline and department socialization practices. In terms of
research and socialization, significant normative influences are also exerted by disciplines/fields of study, both within the graduate institution and external to it through professional associations and academic journals (Austin, 2002; Becher & Trowler, 2001; Lovitts, 2001; Tierney & Rhoads, 1994). Moving through the second stage of faculty socialization is seen as continuous as the process of promotion and tenure impacts seasoned faculty while institutional priorities change and create a need for ongoing learning and relearning (Tierney & Rhoads, 1994).

**Theoretical Framework**

Understanding socialization, in this context, can help position doctoral education as ongoing and overlapping series of processes meant to acclimate and instruct students into the ways of the academic community. Outlining student socialization as the initial stage of faculty socialization from their graduate program into their full-time employment can frame the aspects of one’s behaviors and mindsets that are undergoing potential change and long-term transformation. While understanding socialization can provide a framework for what aspect of a student or faculty may have been advanced or instructed, incorporating institutional logics and disciplinary logics as theoretical frames can further the explanation what guides and constrains the socialization process. Utilizing logics as a theoretical frame can help identify the rules of the game by which an individual learns to adopt the values, skills, attitudes, norms, and knowledge needed for membership in the academic community—in addition to what perspectives or expectations are being asserted for membership.

**Institutional Logics**

Scholars broadly define logics as generalized rules that dictate the degree of appropriateness of behavior through legitimizing particular forms of identities, interests, values, and practices (Friedland & Alford, 1991; Rao et al., 2003; Townley, 1997). Logics are
enacted to serve a number of functions at varying levels. Friedland and Alford (1991) argue that individuals, organizations, and society constitute three levels where logics specify opportunity and constraint for individual action. Higher education offers a context on which to understand these levels through institutional logics. Institutional logics create, define, provide, inform, determine, and legitimize organizational actions and decisions. These institutional logics are operating influences within both the material and symbolic manners of organizations. Of upmost importance, organizations seek stability, predictability, and legitimacy, and are interest driven as they seek to survive (Oliver, 1991); therefore, they seek organization persistence through habits and conventions, and have a willingness to conform to external criteria (Oliver, 1991). Thornton and Ocasio (1999) proposed three mechanisms by which institutional logics shape organizations: (1) legitimizing sources of power, (2) controlling and rewarding behavior, and (3) determining appropriate answers and solutions for controlling organizational activities.

First, the meaning, appropriateness, and legitimacy of various sources of power are shaped by the rules of the prevailing institutional logics (Thornton & Ocasio, 1999). These rules of the game regulate which issues, strategic initiatives, or problems become important in the political struggle among members in organizations (DiMaggio, 1988; Thornton & Ocasio, 1999). The rules determine how power is gained, maintained, and lost. Institutional logics provide the rules that legitimate what factors form the basis of leadership power and authority in organizations (Thornton & Ocasio, 1999). These logics are therefore the belief systems and organizing principles that furnish guidelines for group and individual actions, and how authority is exercised within institutions (Friedland & Alford, 1991). Institutional logics are helpful in keeping institutions durable through constraining action of its members to stabilize governing structures and the identities of actors (DiMaggio, 1988). More specifically, they encode the
criteria of legitimacy by which role identities, strategic behaviors, organizational forms, and relationships between organizations are constructed and sustained (Suddaby & Greenwood, 2005).

Second, institutional logics determine what issues to attend by controlling and rewarding behavior (Thornton & Ocasio, 1999). Pressures towards conformity onto individuals depends on why the pressures are exerted, who is exerting them, what the pressures are, how they are being exerted, and where they occur (Oliver, 1991). For example, institutional logics are used as formal and inform rules for obtaining social status and recognition, or receiving penalties (Thornton & Ocasio, 1999). Logics create a system of incentives that rewards actors for conformity to a given logic and penalizes actors for violations of behavior (Rao et al., 2003). This system of incentives reinforces which interests are determined and pursued, instilling value, and giving intrinsic worth (Friedland & Alford, 1991).

Third, the assumptions, values, beliefs, and rules that comprise institutional logics determine what answers and solutions are available and appropriate in controlling activity in organizations (Thornton & Ocasio, 1999). Such logics constrain and enable the potential actions of actors (Friedland & Alford, 1991; Suddaby & Greenwood, 2005). Constraining and enabling action is done by constituting how to interpret organizational reality, what constitutes appropriate behavior, and how to succeed (Jackal, 1988). Additionally, this is completed by guiding how to make sense and interpreting the ambiguous and complex worlds in which individuals live (Friedland & Alford, 1991; Suddaby & Greenwood, 2005). These guidelines become reinforced through institutionalized practices over time and positions historical experiences as precedent for future action (Townley, 1997). It is these historical experiences that
become normative models that perpetuate ideals of the legitimacy of the status quo (Friedland & Alford, 1991; Townley, 1997).

Logics can change and are not conceptualized as forever enduring. Rao et al. (2003) described that logics can be formed, dissolved, or replaced creating changes in both governing structures and individual action. Overall, previous scholars shared similar perspectives in how changes in logic occur. Changes occur at moments of discontinuity (Suddaby & Greenwood, 2005), during times of conflict that impact the legitimacy of the prevailing logic (Townley, 1997), when insurgent logics arise from institutional ambiguities and contradictions (Suddaby & Greenwood, 2005), and to the extent logics rely on ambiguous language and embody contradictions (Rao et al., 2003). DiMaggio (1988) suggested insurgent logics endure in the peripheries of organizational fields when they are less privileged by the operating status quo. Then, they emerge at times of conflict. Dissonance and conflict are expected to some degree as institutional environments are not fully monolithic spaces (Townley, 1997). Therefore, there exists a possibility that at all time the prevailing logic is under dispute and disagreement.

Conflict arises from multiple levels. Individually, non-compliance exists by desiring autonomy over decision-making, making internal demands, and delaying existing logic-based practices (Townley, 1997). Rao et al. (2003) described two types of movements that form from continued non-compliance from individuals: instrumental and identity. Instrumental movements seek to redress injustice, challenge economic and political structures, and strive for policy impact in the form of new laws or governance structures (Rao et al., 2003). Identity movements arise in opposition to the dominant cultural codes which are expressed through cultural materials such as names, narratives, symbols, and rituals (Rao et al., 2003). Identity movements critique the existing logic and roles expected as constraints on autonomy, and they offer a new logic and role
identity emphasizing expanded autonomy (Rao et al., 2003). Resistance may be achieved by actors’ ability to assert ownership over the ways concepts such as authority, legitimacy, and sovereignty should operate (Townley, 1997). In addition to movements providing conflict, Friedland and Alford (1991) depicted major institutions of society as providing often contradictory logics that form the bases of conflict. Due to their ubiquitous presence across multiple spaces and times in society, institutions like religion, education, and markets are bound to produce contradictory actions and expectations (Rao et al., 2003; Townley, 1997).

**Disciplinary Logics**

Academic cultures also perpetuate their own set of logics. Since the development of the modern university in the late 1800s, the postsecondary environment has instilled a sense of rationality and control onto its faculty and stakeholders (Metzger, 1987). Becher (1984) described academic cultures as a shared way of thinking and a collective way of behaving. Posselt (2016) defined these active communities as seeking ongoing relevancy and rewarding standards through their own logics. Therefore, these disciplinary logics from academic cultures are utilized by faculty to legitimize standards of quality and practices enacted from their methodological and epistemological inquiry foundations (Posselt, 2016)—in very similar ways that institutional logics are utilized to maintain the survivability of institutions.

Scholars have defined culture as both the groups of persons living in the same environment linked by common habits, values, beliefs, assumptions, and ways of life as well as culture meaning cultivation, growth, and production of breeding (Becher, 1984; Tierney & Rhoads, 1994; Twale & De Luca, 2008). Influencing academic cultures are five sociological forces: national, professional, disciplinary, individual, and institutional (Tierney & Rhoads, 1994). For example, society places value onto disciplinary communities differentially according
to the public’s preferred interests (Becher, 1984); after World War II, STEM disciplines were valued for economic and militaristic competitions against the Soviet Union leading to global prominence in research and discovery (Bok, 2013). These forces impact attitudes, personal characteristics, and epistemological understandings (Tierney & Rhoads, 1994; Twale & De Luca, 2008). Disciplinary logics can be understood in a parallel manner to Thornton and Osacio’s (1999) three mechanisms by which logics shape institutions outlined earlier: (a) legitimizing sources of power, (b) controlling and rewarding behavior, and (c) determining appropriate responses in organizations.

**Disciplinary logics legitimizing sources of power**

Becher (1984) argued academic cultures owe their very existence to a common form of pursuits and epistemological considerations; it’s these common pursuits that give the discipline a sense of power. Learning these pursuits begins in undergraduate or graduate education through socialization processes to maximize the long-term accomplishments and legitimacy of the institution once they become faculty members (Tierney & Rhoads, 1994). Legitimizing higher education as a source of power comes from the fact that supply of faculty positions and future faculty are largely produced by the same entity—the institution itself (Lovitts, 2001; Tierney & Rhoads, 1994). In this difficult hiring climate, new faculty are simply excited to be hired and consider themselves the lucky ones (Cassuto, 2016; Tierney & Rhoads, 1994); when struggles occur, they may blame themselves in similar ways graduate students do when issues arise (Lovitts, 2001; Twale & De Luca, 2008). Institutions hire faculty with the assumption that they will espouse the same values as the institution if they find applicants with high productivity in their doctoral programs; in this light, they can allow the members themselves to uphold the traditions and norms of the institution with little work on the institution to enforce through means other than tenure and promotion (Tierney & Rhoads, 1994). This maintains legitimacy of
institutional power (Becher & Trowler, 2001; Tierney & Rhoads, 1994). Power is lost at moments of overlap and conflict at the intersections of faculty culture—for example between one’s disciplinary identity and institutional expectations (the fight between their cosmopolitan identity and local identity) (Becher & Trowler, 2001; Tierney & Rhoads, 1994; Twale & De Luca, 2008). Hiring practices help maintain a semblance of uniformity (Tierney & Rhoads, 1994) and offer faculty an opportunity to exert power through the recruitment process (Twale & De Luca, 2008).

Once in a faculty position, new faculty are frequently tested informally and formally about their abilities, motives, and values before being granted inclusionary rights about organizational secrets, access to insider-outsider rhetoric, and realistic moral conduct expected of its members (Tierney & Rhoads, 1994). Becher & Trowler (2001) argued that essentially every part of a faculty’s behavior is graded by their peers. This preserves power for those who are willing to abide by the norms and ways of the institution or department (Becher & Trowler, 2001). Senior faculty serve as the actors to set standards by enacting them after they’ve already received tenure and promotion. This puts them in control of the pathways acting as gatekeepers (Becher & Trowler, 2001; Tierney & Rhoads, 1994). Finally, the fractalization of disciplines into subspecialties further burdens the power and legitimacy of academic culture logics (Becher & Trowler, 2001; Metzger, 1987; Tierney & Rhoads, 1994); as more academic groupings move away from a singular academic pursuit into subspecialties, further conflicts will arise (Becher & Trowler, 2001).

**Disciplinary logics controlling and rewarding faculty behavior**

Secondly, faculty behavior can be controlled and rewarded in many ways. Socialization in itself helps reward and punish behavior by instilling a sense of what is important for new faculty and important for the institution (Becher & Trowler, 2001; Tierney & Rhoads, 1994).
Behaviors that become legitimized through approval or indifference by the institution become more self-regulated and normative by faculty (Twale & De Luca, 2008). High standards of behavior are assumed to be instilled through extensive schooling and reinforced by professional associations (Becher & Trowler, 2001; Tierney & Rhoads, 1994). High research productivity is what is assumed by hiring quality graduate students. Productivity is valued and thus rewarded (Becher & Trowler, 2001; Tierney & Rhoads, 1994). The primary message to succeed as a faculty member—achieving tenure—is acknowledged across the institution (Tierney & Rhoads, 1994). The importance of teaching, service, and research is known, but ambiguity prevails within the specifics of the tenure and promotion process (Tierney & Rhoads, 1994; Twale & De Luca, 2008). For example, publication and research output is important and controlled by professional and government organizations who have a say in what is quality, valuable, and legitimate; therefore, faculty have to adapt to publication standards of each journal with consideration of its institutional value (Becher & Trowler, 2001; Tierney & Rhoads, 1994). However, understanding the balance between quality and quantity of publication is left obscured (Becher & Trowler, 2001). With few tenure-track positions available, institutions can reward the behaviors that help them stay in power by hiring those who ascribe to their beliefs (Tierney & Rhoads, 1994). Newer faculty listen to older faculty about how to act in meetings, the importance of publications, and how to navigate the system instilling a sense of appropriate behavior (Tierney & Rhoads, 1994).

**Defining appropriate faculty activity**

Lastly, a wide array of assumptions, values, beliefs, and rules comprise logics which determine the type of behaviors which are available and appropriate for faculty. Becher and Trowler (2001) examined norms and practices to support these claims that disciplines shape academic behavior of all kinds. Geertz (1982) described, similarly, disciplinary cultures’ reach into the lives and worldviews of faculty. Some faculty see their discipline as apolitical and value-
free, while others may see their discipline being influenced from scholar’s positionality and self-expression (Becher, 1984). Yet even through the tensions between an apolitical or identity-based view of faculty work, the bounds of what faculty are asked to do have broadly remained consistent for decades. Since the end of World War II, faculty have known the general bounds of their work: teaching, research, administration, and institutional service (Metzger, 1987; Tierney & Rhoads, 1994). Despite differences in disciplinary norms, faculty still act through these arenas.

Additionally, institutions, department chairs, deans, and senior academic administrators continue to shape the realities of others by offering their own vision of the institution’s purpose and desired behaviors. Organizational culture shapes faculty’s behavior through policies, rules, and decision-making committees in addition to the informal and formal processes that influence meaning making (Becher & Trowler, 2001; Tierney & Rhoads, 1994). Socialization helps shape understandings and responses to task demands helping those in the institution continue their membership (Tierney & Rhoads, 1994). Successful socialization can be utilized to maintain power of the existing culture through ritualized processes that define the institution (Tierney & Rhoads, 1994). The promotion and tenure acts as a ritual which prepares faculty for initiation over multiple years. It acts as both a formal but also ambiguous process keeping new faculty stuck between cultural values and empirical performance standards (Becher & Trowler, 2001). Senior faculty act as oral historians to reinforce historical precedent to keep behaviors in alignment (Tierney & Rhoads, 1994). This is due to their experience and knowledge of the culture; they can give meaning to the symbolic events of the institution. New realities can enter from older faculty experiencing new perspectives (e.g. holding an interim administrative position or while on sabbatical), or when conflict arises when a new president or senior administrator
joins (Tierney & Rhoads, 1994). Therefore, when faculty are asked to respond to anticipated or unanticipated events (e.g. departmental budget cuts, productivity expectations, or development of new private-public relationships), many of the solutions have been previously recommended or modeled to preserve institutional legitimacy.

The cause for concern for equity, diversity, and inclusion occurs when the normative script of what is expected does not allow for individuals to fulfill their self-efficacy (Gildersleeve et al., 2011) creating a form of self-censorship. Additional questions of worthiness or fit occur when their values and research agendas or self-interests do not fit the expectations or values of the institution (Gildersleeve et al., 2011; Lovitts, 2001). Furthermore, higher education has been slow to integrate forms of critical inquiry and ways of knowing which remain marginalized or overgeneralized within the scholarly community (Pasque et al., 2012). Therefore, when faculty are asked to respond to stakeholders or institutional needs, faculty have been implicitly or explicitly aware of the appropriate and rewarded behaviors to remain in alignment with the institutional values and expectations.
CHAPTER 3. METHODOLOGY

In this section, I present guiding epistemological assumptions, a statement of positionality, an overview of case study as a methodology, participant and site selection, data collection, and data analysis.

Epistemological Assumptions

This study is broadly informed by a critical constructivism epistemology. A critical constructivist approach in research operates: (a) from an understanding that what we know about the world is socially constructed, (b) believing all people and their knowledge are temporally situated, and (c) in consideration of political, economic, cultural, and other institutional worlds (Kincheloe, 2008). Synthesizing two epistemological approaches, first, constructivism posits that “knowledge is constructed rather than discovered” (Stake, 1995, p. 100). It is an epistemological perspective that describes the nature of reality as containing multiple realities with context binding what is truth and knowledge (Merriam, & Tisdell, 2016). A constructivist perspective asserts our understanding of a real world or worlds is based on our own perspectives and points of view (Maxwell, & Mittapalli, 2010; Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2010).

Second, a critical epistemology acknowledges the multiple realities situated with political, social, cultural institution perpetuating power and privilege (Merriam, & Tisdell, 2016). McLaren (2003) asserts we, as individuals and societies, live unfree and amongst contradictions and imbalances of power and privilege. Attempting to understand the interwoven aspects of self and society require critical thinkers to tease out histories and relations of the system (McLaren, 2003). The role individuals and institutions play are important to view society and its stratification as constructed by the products of social thought and relations (Bonilla-Silva, 2014); furthermore, both the stratifications and systemic inequalities are used to maintain power for dominant groups and to perpetuate ideologies that can restrict inclusion, participation, and
potential of various groups. These consequences of systemic privilege, power, and oppression exist both in the distribution of material goods but also the mechanisms on how those materials are distributed via elements such as: (a) housing, education, and marriage; (b) gerrymandering, and representation within elected officials; (c) incarceration rates and police brutality; and, (d) income and wage differences, occupational mobility and segmentation, and wealth disparities (Bonilla-Silva, 2014).

Statement of Positionality

My involvement and participation within the educational system has been the most profound and significant experience that has informed my understanding of equity, diversity, inclusion, and social justice. Since childhood, I have existed as an actor within the formal structure of schooling. The development of my worldview has been through the lens of a student and as an employee of a university. I have been enveloped with people of similar talents, abilities, social mobility, and hopes all within the bounds of an educational structure and environment. Although I am grateful for the amount of education and years of time I have been asked to think and reflect on these terms in classes and conversations, there is something limiting to having developed an understanding and personal connection to equity, diversity, inclusion, and social justice through schooling. I know what inequality is because I read and talked about it; I went on field trips to see it. I had speakers come for an hour to talk about their work and why we should support their efforts. I rarely have had a need to move through any personal inequalities to survive and feel a sense of value or belonging.

I have many other privileges transferred to me without any work of my own. I identify with being White (and am seen as a member of that race) that has been the most hegemonic within Western society and has reaped the societal unconscious of being the most revered,
valued, and successful due to its oppressive actions to remain dominant. I have had economic stability over the course of my life. I don’t have any serious mental health or physical health problems. My biological sex, identifying as biologically male, is valued as the dominant and preferred sex across many cultures and histories. I am a cisgender man—which is an acceptable gender identity to the majority and my identification as heterosexual is widely accepted and religiously valued. This places me within a unique part of society and this positionality will need to be considered before, during, and after any data collection or analysis occurs. I know my worldview has been shaped by these identities and that I need to be mindful of that as I approach the perspectives, knowledges, and assertions constructed throughout this inquiry.

Since my admission into graduate school, my understanding of equity, diversity, inclusion, and social justice has been both academically fueled and morally grounded as I learn more about the systems and structures that guide my world. It was the academic environment that (re)educated me to the harmful conditions impressed upon many and put words to those privileges and systems that go unexamined and persevere to maintain the status quo. I have an insider perspective to a broad spectrum of graduate education—and doctoral education in particular—as I have spent the last four years enrolled full-time, participated on graduate student and graduate education committees and organizations, and relied on on-campus assistantships for funding education across multiple university colleges and departments. There are many aspects of faculty life I only know about from academic writing or a passing comment in class so there will be a need to be aware of my position in spaces where faculty are the majority, or where my participants themselves are unwilling to describe experiences due to my positionality—either as a doctoral student with no formal experience as a faculty or my position in a room as a person espousing many privileged societal positions.
Peer debrief served as a significant factor to mitigate my sensitivities to this work. Due to my close proximity to the data and the participants, it was important to share examples of thoughts through the analysis process to provide space for biases or assumptions to emerge. In particular, as my scholarly emphasis has been in graduate education, even the most indirect background story emerged as a code that related to faculty integration of EDISJ within doctoral education due to my openness of both personal, professional, past, and current experiences. A greater focus was placed on finding the most important or significant aspects to share through the descriptive and analytical case summaries to provide a clear focus to the interpretation as compared to every subcode receiving its own space within the broader narrative of doctoral education. Additional work focused on the role and responsibilities of faculty, as my peer debrief colleague had their own experiences and understandings into faculty life.

**Case Study as Methodology**

Yazan (2015) scrutinized three common methodologists of case study—Yin, Merriam, and Stake—for divergent, convergent, and complementary perspectives; at the time, Yin’s positivist epistemological approach contrasted with the constructivist approaches of both Merriam and Stake. Since the release of the article in 2015, Yin has published the sixth edition of *Case Study Research and Applications: Design and Methods* (2017) and has responded and adapted to the critiques of grounding case study work only from a positivist lens to now allow multiple epistemological assumptions to operate within their outlined, case study methods. Yin (2017) directly acknowledged the applicability of different epistemological orientations:

> This all-encompassing mode of inquiry also can embrace different epistemological orientations—for example, embracing a relativist or interpretivist orientation, compared with a realist orientation...you may pursue a constructivist approach in designing and
conducting your case study—attempting to capture the perspectives of different participants and focusing on how their different meanings illuminate your topic of study.

(p. 16).

Although not completely removing positivistic recommendations from this latest edition, Yin’s (2017) strength remains on how to conduct and structure a rigorous case study design open to multiple epistemological assumptions while Stake (1995) describes more in depth what a case study is and considerations an inquirer should make to recognize and minimize bias. I utilize suggestions and recommendations from both to design the bulk of this case study. As both texts together still omit some concrete recommendations for practice or rationalizations through their reasoning that I find important for this case study inquiry, I utilize specific aspects of Merriam and Tisdell’s (2016) *Qualitative Research: A Guide to Design and Implementation* and Creswell’s (2013) *Qualitative Inquiry & Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches* as tertiary, supplemental perspectives—mostly in the structuring of non-quantitative or computer-based approaches to data analysis.

A case study provides a framework to investigate a contemporary phenomenon in-depth and within its real-world context when the boundaries of phenomenon and context may not be clearly defined (Stake, 1995; Yin, 2017). The case study approach is preferred when examining contemporary events, but when the relevant behaviors cannot or should not be manipulated (Yin, 2017). This process and structure allows investigators to focus on a “case” and retain a holistic and real-world perspective (Yin, 2017). Case studies are apt to study the particularities and complexities of a case coming closer to understand its existence within important circumstances (Stake, 1995). Case studies utilize techniques incorporating document analysis, direct observation, and interviews in order to collect a full array of evidence (Yin, 2017).
Utilizing case study orientations from Stake (1995), this study is framed as an intrinsic case study—one where we need to learn about a particular case of interest, but not for the feeling that we need more knowledge to solve or better understand something else outside of the case. I believe a holistic multiple-case design is the optimal design to guide the study. A holistic case study is best for when units of analysis are at the same level (Yin, 2017). A multiple-case design is needed when the same study contains more than a single case. In addition, a multiple-case design provides an opportunity for comparison across cases to strengthen or reject a theoretical or conceptual grounding (Yin, 2017). Although describing faculty’s expectations for developing future students attuned to equity, diversity, inclusion, and social justice, their previous experience with these concepts, and how logics inform their use of them may seem like subunits of analysis, I see them as integral to understanding how faculty integrate equity, diversity, inclusion, and social justice. As I am interested in multiple disciplines/fields of study, then each will be treated as a separate context in which to view an individual case. Additionally, while two different disciplinary contexts are needed, I believe a need exists to bound the case within a single institution to be able to acknowledge how a larger system, such as the institution as a whole, may have practices or policies that impact faculty similarly or differently.

The unit of analysis surrounded two individual faculty members in order to relate back to the way I defined my initial research questions. Bounding the cases, to persist its relevance and also to provide evidence, will considered areas in which their knowledge, attitudes, and behavior directly or indirectly impact doctoral education—including doctoral courses taught, supervision of doctoral students, advising meetings, departmental or institutional service related to doctoral education and structures (e.g. financial support, program requirements, admissions, committees), mentorship of non-advisee doctoral students, and their own reflection and perspectives about
doctoral education. The case was bound by two faculty at a single institution; one faculty resided in a discipline/field which conveys a core and integral value for equity, diversity, inclusion, and social justice, and one faculty resided in a discipline/field which conveys a peripheral or supplemental value for equity, diversity, inclusion and social justice. The rationale for two faculty from two different disciplines/fields and employed at the same institution comes from the ability for one investigator to properly be aware of the various elements of a faculty’s life while simultaneously preserving the opportunity to recognize the complexities and nuances in their work. Utilizing logics as a theoretical framework offers the ability to analyze how logics potentially influence the acknowledgement or elimination of discriminatory, exclusive, and oppressive patterns of thought and action.

**Selection of Site**

Due to doctoral education being a key aspect of this case study, the higher education institution selected needed to be a large state or regional university, flagship institution, or research-type university. This first offers the presence of doctoral programs and also the likelihood of a variety of doctoral programs across discipline and fields. These types of institutions also offer a few faculty at each of the multiple stages of the professoriate—with full-time and residency-based doctoral students and in-person courses. These institutions also can house large departments which offers a greater opportunity for participant identification and mutual interest in the study.

Oakes University (a pseudonym) served as a quality site for this case study. Oakes University enrolls over 34,000 total students with over 4,000 enrolling as graduate students. About 350 doctoral degrees and 1,000 master’s degrees are awarded annually. Oakes University belongs to the Association of American Universities (AAU), an invitation-only organization of
the 62 top public and private research institutions in the U.S. and Canada. In order to maintain their membership, Oakes University is assessed on a routine basis to exemplify: federal and industrial research support, membership in national academies, faculty awards, fellowships, citations, PhDs granted, postdoctoral appointees, and its undergraduate education (AAU Membership Policy, 2018). As a Research I University, Oakes University has over 100 total graduate programs, and over 50 graduate minors and certificates.

To fulfill the goal of examining contrasting disciplines/fields of study, I identified characteristics for initially categorizing departments into the “core and integral value” and “peripheral value” for equity, diversity, inclusion, and social justice. First, I examined at their mission statement of the department and then of the PhD program. Secondly, I looked through their course catalog for course titles and descriptions to find related language. Thirdly, I looked through faculty profiles, whether or not the individuals would be part of the inclusion criteria for the study, generally to see if I would categorize any research agendas as explicitly mentioned related vocabulary to equity, diversity, inclusion, and social justice. Lastly, I also looked for references to committees or other initiatives listed online that would suggest activity around these topics. From this search, I identified two primary and two backup departments to contact for participant recruitment.

Participants

I purposively sampled participants for this study. Participants needed to have direct access to doctoral students—through teaching, advising, service, or supervision capacities. The study was initially framed around the belief that ideally participants were tenured faculty due to the legitimacy they receive as well as a sense of autonomy towards their professional agendas. In comparison, pre-tenured faculty may not always have the agency to behave dissentingly from
institutional or evaluative norms. These pre-tenured faculty were still sent recruitment e-mails with the ability to be excluded from consideration as non-optimal, but still quality cases pre-study. As part of the larger approach for inclusion to this research question, new faculty were considered a unique opportunity to see early attempts at incorporating equity, diversity, inclusion, and social justice into faculty work. Ultimately, with consideration to the limited time and opportunity to study a case, participants need to be selected to give the best opportunity for learning (Stake, 1995)—thus tenured faculty will be preferred.

Of peripheral consideration within the planning for the study were those with dual appointments as administrators or interim directors. These appointments offer situations which add complexity towards understanding faculty integration of equity, diversity, inclusion, or social justice; I assumed during participant recruitment these appointments were more uncommon than common and therefore did not represent the normative faculty responsibilities. Thus they were excluded from the study. Adjunct and emeritus faculty were removed from consideration as well. Whether or not participants currently produced scholarship in the areas of equity, diversity, inclusion, and social justice within the academic community was not of concern; however, it was considered a characteristic of a participant that would be crucial to consider if present within data collection.

In order to initiate recruitment efforts, an e-mail to each chair was sent requesting permission to contact faculty from their department. Upon receiving permission, an e-mail request was sent to faculty who meet the desired characteristics. If multiple faculty were interested, the first person to respond was selected while additional faculty interested were told they were in waiting if I needed to reconsider pre-study decisions for the number of participants. Across the entire recruitment process, I contacted four department chairs for permission, and
they all offered permission to contact faculty in their department. I initially contacted one department in the social sciences and one department in STEM. Two faculty who showed interest from the first social science department recruited did not respond to interview scheduling requests, so a different social science department was contacted. The second social science department had one person respond (Alicia, a pseudonym) with interest who completed the entire study. The first STEM department had no faculty respond so a different STEM department was contacted. The second STEM department had one person (Jay, a pseudonym) respond with interest who completed the entire study. In total, 54 faculty received invitations to participate in the study.

**Department of STEM**

Jay works in the Department of STEM (a pseudonym). The department has over 20 tenure-eligible staff, with several non-tenure track and lecturers. As of 2017, the department enrolled over 150 doctoral students with about 25 to 35 new students enrolling every year. About half of the doctoral students are international and half are domestic students. The mission statement for their PhD in STEM is to equip students with skills, knowledge, and abilities to create new knowledge for today’s problems. All doctoral students take two required courses related to conducting research.

**Department of Social Science**

Alicia works in the Department of Social Science (a pseudonym). The department has over ten tenure-eligible faculty and several lecturers. In terms of a graduate student population, they enroll over ten new PhD students a year and have a total graduate enrollment over 100 graduate students. The goal of the Social Science PhD program is to advance knowledge to
address industry-based topics that impact global perspectives, the environment, and culture. The core classes that are offered are centered around research methods and academic writing.

**Data Collection**

**Interviews**

Case study interviews are structured to follow the investigators own line of inquiry towards gathering evidence for the research questions while maintaining a fluid or conversational manner that serves the interwoven aspects of integration of equity, diversity, inclusion, and social justice (Yin, 2017). Interviews are the main road to understanding multiple realities and used to obtain the descriptions and interpretations of others (Stake, 1995). Interviewees can also provide secondhand observations that the research would not have been able to see for themselves (Stake, 1995). In addition to interviews serving as a means to produce narrative descriptions, they will also serve to substantiate certain assertions or to provide additional insight into observations and assumptions.

An initial list of *etic issues* (Stake, 1995, pp. 20) were determined to help structure interviews (Stake, 1995) such as their definitions of equity, diversity, inclusion, and social justice and the participant’s hopes for their PhD advisees. During each interview, some *emic issues* (Stake, 1995, pp. 20) were discussed as they evolved from participant interest in the conversation. The first interview served as an entry point into faculty’s integration of equity, diversity, inclusion, and social justice into doctoral education. Etic issues for the first interview were: (a) introduce and describe themselves, (b) describe their faculty position, (c) their responsibilities around doctoral education, (d) describe the purpose of doctoral education, and (e) define equity, diversity, inclusion, and social justice. The second interview was structured around: (a) introduction to their department and the institution, (b) descriptions about their
discipline broadly, and in context to equity, diversity, inclusion, and social justice. Etic issues for the third interview were: (a) how have they learned about equity, diversity, inclusion, and social justice from graduate education, and during their faculty career, (b) how they envision their responsibility in including equity, diversity, inclusion, and social justice into doctoral education, and (c) how their institution, department, and/or academic community shapes their thinking and actions.

A total of three interviews were coordinated to focus on one or two topics while allowing for fluid conversation to occur based on the interviewee’s determination. Interview protocol was developed to offer a conversation lastly ideally between 60 to 90 minutes in duration. Jay’s interviews duration ranged from 39 minutes to 80 minutes with each interview taking place on Oakes University’s campus but not physically in the Department of STEM. Jay’s interviews took place over nine weeks. Alicia’s interview duration ranged from 50 minutes to 83 minutes with one interview taking place on Oakes University’s campus and the second and third interviews took place via Zoom due to Alicia’s scheduling needs. Alicia’s interviews took place over eight weeks.

Interviews were audio recorded to provide a more accurate rendition of the interview and can help supplement in-person notetaking. Before the interview, I recorded the environment features of the space, my personal reflections about the day at-large, and my attitude as I approached the interview. After the interview, I prepared a reflection of the interview with key ideas, initial reactions, and topics of interest for their journaling. Audio recordings were transcribed through a professional transcription service. The transcripts, upon completion, were read for accuracy against the audio recording with corrections made for any errors.
Journaling

Participants were asked to participate in a form of reflective journaling. This reflection was an opportunity for participants to share any insights or perspectives after each of the three interviews. Baber (2008) posited that “journals provide an indication of the inner thought process of the individual in their personal language, uncovering events with lasting impact, stimulating further questions from the researcher” (p. 56). In addition to interviews serving as a means to produce narrative descriptions, they will also serve to substantiate certain assertions or to provide additional insight into observations and assumptions.

Jay completed all journals verbally by sharing their reflection within an audio recording and upload them into a secure, online portal between the researcher and participant. Initially, Jay thought the journal questions were something to just be read but not responded to, so he completed his all three journals after the third interview was completed due to some conference travel complications as well. Alicia wrote all journals within a Word document and submitted them into a secure, online portal after each interview. Journaling expectations provided some broad reflection directions to clarify their perspectives and experiences related to the topics discussed through the interviews. Participants were instructed that any amount of time was appropriate, but it was recommended that 15 to 45 minutes were spent on each journal. Participants did not have to report how much actual time they spent on their journals. Jay’s audio journals were transcribed through a professional transcription service which produced significant more words to analyze than Alicia’s written journals. Jay’s transcripts were read for accuracy with the submitted audio recording.
Documentation

Gathering data by studying documents follows the purposes of the interviews and direction observations; “the most important use of documents is to corroborate and augment evidence from other sources” (Yin, 2017, p. 107). Utilizing documents requires researchers to be mindful of the bias or error in the record keeping utilized to create the documents. Documents can also serve a substitute for records of activity that the researcher could not observe directly (Stake, 1995). The list of documents of interest included: news releases, syllabi, handbooks, publicly available guidelines for teaching, research, service, and tenure, learning outcomes from institutional, disciplinary, and departmental contexts, websites across the institution, department, faculty profiles, and professional associations, and participants’ personally-run, academic websites. I collected and utilized 37 documents to corroborate Jay’s case and 25 documents to corroborate Alicia’s case.

Data Analysis

The goal of the case study researcher is to pull apart instances and put it back together in more meaningful analysis and synthesis (Stake, 1995). Interpretation begins in the early stages of inquiry—even during the development of a research plan as assumptions and perspectives influence researcher thinking. Assertions are made from a mix of personal experience, previous scholarship, and deep understanding of the case (Stake, 1995). Analysis should not be considered separate from everlasting efforts to make sense of things (Stake, 1995). While the interpretations of the researcher are likely to be emphasized more than the interpretations of the people studied, preserving the multiple realities—and even contradictory viewpoints—within the study are possible through rigorous analysis processes (Stake, 1995; Yin, 2017). This is one way to ensure that an examination of plausible rival explanations is considered (Yin, 2017). With an intrinsic
case study such as this, the primary task is to come to understand the case—to tease out relationships, to probe issues, and to collect categorical data (Stake, 1995). To preserve the focus of the study on the case as a holistic event, direct interpretation of data is preferred over categorical aggregation (Stake, 1995).

Therefore, the larger goal of data analysis was to search for meaning from patterns of consistency within context (Stake, 1995). Each case was initially analyzed separately—called the within-case analysis (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). Aligning with Creswell’s (2013) and Merriam and Tisdell’s (2016) recommendations for types of qualitative coding, interview transcripts from each case were iteratively coded. Initially, the researcher open coded each set of transcripts to generate a set of initial codes about any word, phrase, sentence, or passage with broadest of connections to the research question (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). This captured moments in the transcripts that described equity, diversity, inclusion, or social justice implicitly or explicitly, mentions of doctoral student interactions or aspects of doctoral education, and descriptive details about the participant in general or related to their work—among other open codes. Examples of codes included: D (diversity), DSA (doctoral student advising), DSR (doctoral student research), PP (PhD program detail), FI (faculty interaction), and OU (Oakes University), among others. A classification system was recorded from one transcript to the next to capture all codes. Upon the development of a new code, any previous coding was adapted to the new classification system of codes.

These initial codes were reorganized, and further detailed and elaborated around descriptive background details to frame each case, and the three subquestions. In particular, codes were reorganized under these four areas broadly; what codes provide general incontestable descriptions in which to frame and start the case for the reader, what codes help answer
participants’ role or responsibility in developing an EDISJ orientation with students, what codes help understand where and how they have learned where EDISJ belongs in doctoral education, and what codes assist in capturing moments where the participant interacted with their disciplinary knowledge community, or their university systems and actors. Therefore, as different areas of the transcripts may have been coded with the same code, they may have been organized within two different subquestions. For example, DSA (doctoral student advising) as an open code resulted in a DSA-SQ1 (doctoral student advising related to developing an EDISJ) and a DSA-SQ2 (doctoral student advising related to how and where EDISJ can belong in doctoral education) based on this organizing of codes into larger groupings.

A final round of coding took place with emphasis on specific aspects and perspectives of institutional and disciplinary logics for how these rules of the game influenced participant’s behaviors and mindset. In this round of coding, any existing coded passage was additionally labeled as one of three codes for institutional logics: IL-P (Institutional logics around power), IL-B (institutional logics around rewarding behavior), and IL-R (institutional logics around interpreting reality). The same existing coded passages were labeled with one of three codes for disciplinary logics: DL-P (disciplinary logics around epistemological and knowledge pursuits), DL-B (disciplinary logics around rewarding behavior through tenure), and DL-R (disciplinary logics around interpreting the role, realities, and bounds of faculty responsibilities and expectations). In doing so, codes that initially helped answer one of the first two subquestions became more valuable and central to answering how institutional logics or disciplinary logics inform behavior. For example, a DSA-SQ2 coded passage changed to an IL-R when acknowledging within the participant’s transcript an explicit role of the university to structure EDISJ opportunities for students.
Subsequently, a comparison across the two cases was conducted looking for divergent and convergent codes utilizing a form of pattern matching (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016; Yin, 2017) where two sets of codes are analyzed to illicit how’s and why’s of the overall case study. One of the main goals of the cross-cross analysis was to attempt to build a general explanation that fits both cases (Yin, 2017). As both cases followed parallel writing structures (opening vignette, incontestable descriptions, SQ1, SQ2, SQ3, within-case analysis, and closing vignette), I identified and coded moments of convergent or divergent thinking, behavior, or experience around a similar topic, like course offerings in the department or the roles of professional associations in determining rewards. I utilized similar classifications of codes to write the case summaries and therefore was able to analyze in depth the how’s and why’s of the overall case study. Upon recognizing the same topic appearing at times across multiple or all of the sections of the descriptive and analytical within-case summaries, I went back to the literature to find a way to reorganize to prevent this duplication. This led to utilizing Tierney & Rhoads (1994) characterization of academic cultures as the interplay between five sociological forces (national, professional, disciplinary, individual, and institutional) as the theoretically-driven coding system for organizing these convergent or divergent patterns within the cases.

**Trustworthiness**

Merriam and Tisdell (2016) identified that the trustworthiness of a qualitative research endeavor is tied to the rigorous thinking regarding the methodological and analytical choices within the design of the study. First, multiple forms of data were collected as a form of triangulation to strengthen the understanding of the case (Merriam and Tisdell, 2016). Collecting multiple forms of data across different contexts assists the researcher in identifying corroborating or augmented details to explain multiple or alternative explanations. In particular, interviews
were conducted, and journal entries were written over multiple months to capture participant’s emergent and reflective perspectives about the issues of the case study. Publicly available documents highlighted multiple years of faculty experience for each participant and served as additional context and insights into experiences that occurred before the study.

Before the interview, descriptions of the environmental features of the space, personal reflections about the day at-large, and personal attitudes regarding the data collection process were recorded in memos. After the interview, initial reflections about the conversation, topics of interest to focus on in future interviews, and preliminary journal questions were recorded. These memos were read in full before the coding of the data as a means to capture the salient aspects of each conversation and offer a secondary perspective into the data. This is defined by Merriam and Tisdell (2016) as ensuring consistency and dependability in the investigator’s position by authenticating how a researcher developed their claims.

Stake (1995) and Merriam and Tisdell (2016) recommended member checking to review the researcher’s interpretations and case summaries as another consideration for increasing credibility or trustworthiness. Member checking allows the participants to identify how the researcher’s interpretations is congruent with their experiences or suggest some “fine-tuning to better capture their perspectives” (Merriam & Tisdell, p. 246). This process took place two months after the final interviews as means to provide an additional time context. The participants were asked to review their descriptive case summary for accuracy and palatability when no further data was collected with them (Stake, 1995). In particular, they were asked to review the case summary for areas where participant identification would still be a concern, and they reviewed the summary for where attempts to reduce deductive disclosure from the data led to an inaccurate interpretation of the participant’s experiences.
Stake (1995) recommended providing a substantial body of incontestable descriptions for the reader to be able to compare their interpretations with the researcher’s. This would include examples that almost anyone who had the opportunity to observe it would have noticed and recorded (e.g., such as where someone sat in the room or how long someone was in a particular location). Data collection processes first started with participant’s describing themselves, their typical schedule or responsibilities as a faculty member, their definitions of equity, diversity, inclusion, and social justice, their educational experiences from undergraduate to doctoral programs, and an overview of purpose and characterization of doctoral education. These descriptions with limited interpretative perspective from the researcher offers participants’ own words to assist readers in understanding the contexts of the participants.

Peer examination or debriefing is a strategy to ensure consistent between what is determined as findings of the study are appropriately found within the data itself (Creswell, 2013; Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). A researcher’s colleague with expertise in case study methodology, institutional theory, and disciplinary cultures reviewed the descriptive and analytical aspects of both case summaries. The researcher informed this colleague about the data coding protocol, the disciplinary backgrounds of the participants, and methodologists guiding the study’s design. Through peer debrief, some interpretations were identified as needing further context, description, or evidence while also considering attempts to limit deductive disclosure of the participants. This colleague also highlighted interpretations that were novel or significant from their perspective which later informed the cross-case comparison and implications of the study.
CHAPTER 4. A CASE AND ANALYSIS OF A SOCIAL SCIENCE FACULTY MEMBER

In this section, I present a case summary for Alicia, a pre-tenured, social science faculty member at Oakes University. I offer a within-case analysis of Alicia’s integration of equity, diversity, inclusion, and social justice (EDISJ) within their work in doctoral education. Each case summary begins with an opening vignette to offer an immediate, vicarious experience into the participants. Then, I present a body of narrative description to further define the case and the participants’ contexts. Lastly, I offer descriptive detail, quotations, and assertions to examine in-depth the three subquestions of this study: (a) what do these faculty envision as their role in developing such an orientation within doctoral students, (b) how have these faculty learned how and where equity, diversity, inclusion and/or social justice can take place within doctoral education, and (c) in what ways are institutional logics and disciplinary logics informing these faculty’s behaviors related to equity, diversity, inclusion, and social justice in doctoral education? The participant’s name, department, institution, and discipline have been given pseudonyms to limit any opportunity for deductive disclosure.

Introductory Vignette

You want to know what I think? It’s really exhausting to be the one percent that stands up and says something, and I’m a White, cis-gender, heterosexual-appearing person and I feel exhausted by this, which is a very privileged thing to say. You know, exhausted. Sitting there listening to my old department chair, I was shaking because to have to stand up and say something in front of all these people who are my colleagues is ridiculous, because in my opinion, they should educate themselves. Although, the education isn’t always enough. In order to really get social justice related stuff, people need to have personal experiences that really make them angry. That will motivate them, you know
what I mean? I don’t know how people can get that personal experience, maybe they
don’t have to do it my way, but doing one workshop isn’t going to change anybody, doing
one year of a program, that’s not going to change anybody. They’re not going to know
and continually understand. They have to have it as an everyday experience to really be
angry. It took me a long time to really understand what social justice meant. And then
once I got it, I was just like, “I’m done with this” and I don’t care so much about
standing up to people. So much that I’ll stand up to my old chair and just say like this is
stupid and you are totally wrong. You really have to feel passionately to say that or say
that directly to people. You have to be really knowledgeable and be able to say it and be
able to defend yourself with statistics or peer-reviewed research, which is not easy to do.
You really have to be informed and not a lot of people put in the time because it’s not
part of their research. Not everybody cares either to put in the time, and they may want to
research a particular topic, and maybe that could be social justice stuff but they just
don’t want to do it most often.

Incontestable Descriptions

Alicia is a tenure-track professor in the Department of Social Science at Oakes
University. She grew up in the United States and, although she had “a lot of privilege,” social
class was “not necessarily one” type of privilege she had. Alicia knew she had a hobby with a
limited economic pathway through a four-year college, but regardless “nobody was asking [her]
about college or anything like that.” She had to learn on her own how someone with her interests
could find the best fit in terms of a bachelor’s degree. She chose a more realistic degree related
to her interests due to financial constraints. Nevertheless, “horrible” financial loans burdened
Alicia throughout her educational career which developed a sense of financial awareness she
shares with her graduate students and her doctoral advisees. Although once in college, Alicia expressed a lack of expectations by sharing, “I had no hopes to do something. I had no direction. No goals, no aims. Maybe move to New York City. There was no goal-making. I had none of that. Nobody was asking me that.” She “hated” her collegiate experience, transferred elsewhere, but came back to her first college to finish because it was the quickest option. One of the professors who she had connected with during her undergraduate education told her about graduate school “because I didn’t even know what graduate school was.” After getting accepted to graduate school and working for a bit to afford some of it, Alicia got an assistantship after her first semester which helped pay for some of graduate school. Afterwards, Alicia moved for her PhD to study the intersections of culture, history, and people. In year one of the PhD, she had “no idea what I was doing,” but by year two had found her fit and direction. Alicia knows from personal experience that some careers for PhD students aren’t options because “finances are a reality.”

One of the first things we talked about during our interviews was for Alicia to define EDISJ. Alicia said equity is “equal distribution” even though “nothing is equally distributed” like rights and privileges. A second characteristic of equity is that it is “largely unachievable but something worth striving for.” Alicia defined diversity as “a variety of stuff”, then said “that’s so unacademic” but “when things are diverse, there’s lot of different kinds.” I followed up with how she would contextualize this definition in context of people. Diversity became more specific then with “different positions or identities like race, class, gender, sexuality, ability, religion, body size, ethnicity which is separate from race.” Inclusion was defined as, “broadly just people being included without having a barrier to their inclusion—making space.” Lastly, Alicia connected social justice back to the definition of equity. Social justice was defined as “equitable
distribution of privilege, power, and resources and so when there’s injustice there’s not equal
distribution of access.”

I asked Alicia why she wanted to be a faculty member. She told me that “I always like reading and writing” and “hated” the industry she otherwise would work in— “it was horrible, and I still think it’s horrible.” Alicia had previous faculty experience at an institution that had a “value system based on social justice.” She described it being in every layer of the institution and it was “just a normal thing, for everybody. I knew about their mission and values, which is why I ultimately was attracted to and took the job.” Since coming to Oakes University, Alicia noticed, “it’s really not like that at all, it’s the opposite of the experience I had at my first job. There isn’t a huge focus on social justice.”

Currently, about 1/4 of their job is research focused, about 1/2 is teaching, and 1/4 is service. Alicia does her best to protect her time as a faculty member to both strive for work-life balance and focus on her goal of tenure. She has a research team of doctoral students that focus on advancing areas around her own research agenda which focuses on the intersections of marginalized identities and culture and history; there’s one doctoral student that works as a research assistant on literature reviews as other aspects of research generation. She utilizes e-mail to keep communication effective and she does not “go over [on service]” because that does not get someone tenure. One key piece of service is assisting with diversity-related events at the department and institutional level. Alicia questioned the amount of service she was assigned by telling me:

You have to say “yes” sometimes. And as a woman, I of course say yes, and as a woman I also am prone to doing more service. Not that I don’t want to, but I also know the values that are placed on me getting to tenure is not service—they don’t care about
service. It’s just something a lot of women have to do… and men too but if you look at the statistics the tax is different.

Sometimes Alicia will share to PhD advises to “not do committee stuff” because it “may not count” and “you don’t want to do too much” even though it “does get you known.” Other responsibilities include teaching undergraduate classes on identity and people, advising several masters and doctoral students, and teaching graduate classes. Outside Oakes University, Alicia reviews graduate student manuscripts for association awards, serves in editorial board roles, and “constantly” reviews for journals.

Alicia noted “two big life experiences” by her second year of the PhD around EDISJ. The first experience is that she married a person of color, which continues to develop her “every day” understanding of those with a racially-minoritized identity. The second experience that shaped her own identity was understanding her own sexuality as part of the LGBTQ+ community. For the purposes of this case summary, these experiences are left generalized to assist in the confidentiality of Alicia; however, they continue to impact her awareness which she describes as “life-changing.”

**Oakes University**

Alicia works at Oakes University which enrolls over 34,000 total students with over 4,000 enrolling as graduate students. About 350 doctoral degrees and 1,000 master’s degrees are awarded annually. Oakes University belongs to the Association of American Universities (AAU), an invitation-only organization of the 62 top public and private research institutions in the U.S. and Canada. In order to maintain their membership, Oakes University is assessed on a routine basis to exemplify: federal and industrial research support, membership in national academies, faculty awards, fellowships, citations, PhDs granted, postdoctoral appointees, and its
undergraduate education (AAU Membership Policy, 2018). As a Research I University, Oakes University has over 100 total graduate programs, and over 50 graduate minors and certificates.

Department of Social Science

The goal of the Social Science PhD program is to advance knowledge to address industry-based topics that impact global perspectives, the environment, and culture. Alicia told me the department wants to be “number one.” They view themselves as a top program.” However, she did note a difference between undergraduate and graduate forms of education. As a Research I university, their undergraduate program is strong; in regards to the graduate programs Alicia shared you might “compare apples and oranges” by comparing this PhD program in Social Science to another institution that has a greater focus on these industry-based programs. The department has over ten tenure-eligible faculty and several lecturers. Alicia shared that these are “some really, really good faculty.” The faculty have decades of experience and have a good focus to the type of research they conduct. I asked Alicia about the potential for doing “apolitical” scholarship within the department or if faculty approach research within that mentality. There seemed to be a mix of faculty where “many seem to ignore it while others do consider [EDSIJ] topics.” In terms of a graduate student population, they enroll over ten new PhD students a year and have a total graduate enrollment over 100 graduate students.

Disciplinary Community

This social science field would be characterized by Becher and Trowler’s (2001) disciplinary taxonomy as an applied, soft discipline where the nature of knowledge is functional, and concerned with the betterment of professional practice in applied settings. Alicia identified three transformative changes to their scholarly pursuits. First, the purpose and outcomes of education in this area changed early in the 1900s; second, at least three scholarly areas fractured
off to form their own areas within a higher education institution around the 1960s and 1970s; and third, a final fracture happened in the 1990s and early 2000s as further areas were reorganized and scholarly missions separated from this applied field of study. Alicia told me some of these areas have connected with “hard sciences” to get more support from grants and others desired additional equipment and support that their home department could not offer (Alicia referenced this happening both at Oakes University and across the nation in varying timelines).

Sustainability, racial discrimination, labor practices, gender inequality, and the economy as they intersect with culture overall represent academic topics of interest in Alicia’s disciplinary home since the latest disciplinary fracture in the 1990s and also indicate a greater focus into particular applied contexts than originally pursued. Originally, the field was meant as a means to enroll women into higher education. What the field values “depends on who you talk to.” “A lot” are invested in the sustainability as a “big” interest because it is “less harsh”, some in business practices, and some on digital technologies. Other academics focus on social inequalities topics “but not a ton.” Alicia mentioned there’s a “cluster of us who do it in my field, but I could probably name them. It’s not a whole lot.” She mentioned she “quickly became the person” who studies her topic in her field and perhaps if she was in a different field of study, “I’d probably blend in more.” Within the professional organizations, there’s significant racial and gender disparities of representation in the field. Alicia wasn’t aware of any formal pipelines for greater diversification but assumed there would be “informal pipeline programs.”

**Envisioning Her Role in Developing an EDISJ Orientation**

When we were nearing the end of the final of three interviews, I asked Alicia directly if she thought it was her role or responsibility to include EDISJ within her work in doctoral education. This was an important question for me to ask in order to unite the stories and
experiences across the department, institutional, and disciplinary aspects of her faculty work. I share her answer first, because although it was one of the last things we talked about, it showcases an influence that permeates through the rest of her case. She responded, “I feel it’s my responsibility. I feel that’s my responsibility in life.” This answer was no surprise to me as I had grown to learn that Alicia had a strong scholarly interest around EDISJ paired with some meaningful experiences in life that coalesced into a strong and multifaceted viewpoint. After asking her this question, I followed up with a moment of personal reflection. I shared some motivation for the dissertation; how faculty may unknowingly be demonstrating EDISJ work to PhD students; and how PhD students’ future roles can impact societal systems. In response, Alicia offered the opening vignette to her case. I became intrigued with her response while reading the transcripts as her reply started with a rhetorical question, which acted like a valve to allow her opinion to be expressed. The ideas that “it’s not easy to do,” “not everybody cares,” and “it took me a really long time” indicate the extra time and energy both personally and professionally that Alicia invested into approaching EDISJ into her role and responsibility in doctoral education.

I find Alicia hoping that her role and responsibility is what everyone should be doing—it should be intrinsic rather than extrinsic. For example, we talked about the best thing that could come from doing this work and she said, “I don’t know, being able to sleep? It’s certainly more work. I don’t know, in a way it’s more for [the students].” The peripheral rewards of being invited to be a campus speaker or the department receiving money to support the assistantship for a racially minoritized student is “not really an award.” She said she “would do it anyway” because there shouldn’t even be a reward. Alicia continued this idea of what everyone should be doing by sharing, “like there shouldn’t be some diversity award. Like that’s so stupid. I mean, I
guess it’s good, but it’s stupid that it exists. Like that shouldn’t be an award, we should all be doing it.”

Alicia produced several instances on what this looks in terms of the hopes and perspective she has around doctoral education. For example, Alicia believes that each student “is a really unique person” going through the PhD program. She guessed that the department and “most colleagues” would want graduates to become tenure-track professors at research institutions but pivoted back to this idea that “I think you have to ask the student their goal.” Alicia hopes that her advisees become “critically informed individuals.” To Alicia this meant that they knew how to use their newly acquired knowledge, understand where knowledge comes from, and utilize their truths to have effective conversations. She then mentioned that she has no preference on what they do as long as they finish. Alicia then clarified “that’s my hope, that they finish. That’s the number one goal.” Nevertheless, the most important thing immediately came back to is that “they are critical.” She acknowledged that the department chair “absolutely” wants equity minded, or inclusivity-minded PhD graduates and a part of Alicia’s role regarding curriculum is charged with thinking about diversity and inclusion. Still, she said her role and charge is only “one part” of the curriculum. Alicia seemed quite proud of one of her students who is “really good and challenges things, challenges me. She is what I think an ideal person who wants to go through the Ph.D. is. She’s critical of the classes she’s taking.”

Beyond the more conceptual examples, I did find distinct moments in our conversations that further exemplifies Alicia’s role and responsibility within doctoral education contexts. One area of attention is the work within advising doctoral students. When it comes to students’ own research, she won’t “force [advisees] to do a lot, but I won’t let them get through without [being critical, equity minded in] their dissertation.” This perspective expressed by Alicia was that
“anyone that wants to work with me probably has that goal” around including some type of EDISJ topic or perspective into their work. Alicia told me advisees can change their dissertation direction, if they need to find new materials to read, or find “some kind of experience” which demonstrates an advising strategy focused on the individual student. She adapts her advising or supervision support to needs of students—whether the student may interact with her 20 hours a week on research or communicate remotely via e-mail or video chat. Additionally, Alicia would rather help students find appropriate support like a “therapist if they need that kind of support” as others are better support for that type of “chit-chat.” She views students as professionals and that she is “a professional and advising their dissertation.” Overall, advisory experiences detailed a flexible advising strategy while acknowledging that advisees will have some expectation for doing EDISJ scholarship.

Acknowledging and addressing the racialized experiences of doctoral students was a frequent part of Alicia’s stories that again demonstrate distinct connections to day-to-day doctoral education experiences. The recruitment phase of doctoral education is where Alicia’s education and personal motivation come together. Alicia actively seeks out students of color and recruits them into the Department of Social Science. She knows and is “pretty mindful” that minoritized students “a lot of times are never asked” about their intentions for graduate school or historically don’t enroll. Therefore, she “consciously thinks about that” and will ask students directly or will ask colleagues outside of Oakes University if anyone has a student for an available assistantship. Alicia uses her status as a faculty member to work with an assistantship provider in hiring the students of color that she recruits. I thought it was interesting that Alicia was aware in this particular case that assistantship providers may be focusing on doing the work, but not necessarily who was employed to do the work. Beyond just her students, Alicia
mentioned how she has racially minoritized students coming to her with issues and concerns. She knows that they experience “microaggression after microaggression” and told a story on how even one time she did it, too. She told me how we all need to be aware of the tasks we assign to students because she gave a task to a student of color to “take out the trash”—a job that wasn’t as “glamorous” as setting up a display. She talked to the student a few minutes later and said, “oh I’m sorry” because “that would definitely be perceived by a person of color as this White person telling me to do this.”

**Learning How and Where EDISJ Can Take Place Within Doctoral Education**

I identified several formalized doctoral education processes or structures across individual, department, institutional, and disciplinary levels where Alicia indicated expectations on EDISJ. Consistently, the topic of finances was a key concern to Alicia which I think is another important takeaway; Alicia was able to connect the implications of financial insecurity, illustrated through multiple examples from personal experience in how finances are inequitably distributed across social identities, and its connection to a doctoral education context. Alicia’s Ph.D. program when she was a doctoral student did not offer departmental courses on EDISJ topics of interest so therefore she “audited a lot with another department.” Her dissertation adviser “knew nothing” of who Alicia wanted to study, but did know about the topic at-large. Auditing allowed Alicia “balance” course enrollment and “teach” herself without requiring them to fit into the program of study. Additionally, Alicia believed that formally enrolling in the courses “wouldn’t make me more marketable” as “diversity is not where the money is.” However, having a dissertation topic on diversity, in addition to her knowledge on diversity and inclusion, “is always on the list” and “I hit that for them really hard” in terms of faculty job interviews. Loans burdened Alicia during her Ph.D. where she had to do a dissertation with
something “available and ready, something that was accessible—I wasn’t going out and doing ethnographic field studies.”

Her department offers a few examples of how and where EDISJ can take place in doctoral education. The department has a quick time-to-degree completion if the students go full-time which limits the department from “stringing people along and making them pay all this money if they make no money.” Although another year would be beneficial for research, Alicia thinks the current practice is “responsible” and “makes it a little more accessible for students.”

The chair of the Department of Social Science was identified as a strong proponent of EDISJ in particular through financial support. For example, Alicia communicated to the department chair about a minoritized student needing funding for research at an off-campus location. The department chair said “just put [the request] in”; this was one moment where Alicia knew the chair found “informal” funding that was there but not necessarily known. To Alicia, this request is important. She shared:

I wouldn’t like just ask, to be honest, for another student necessarily. But I do that purposely. I think that it’s really important to ask. You know it’s like because of the engrained bias that’s happening. You know, it’s been bad for so long and so I’m going to help these students out. Other people obviously have advantage you know and I think our department chair recognizes that. They will certainly boost them with the funds that are available.

However, being a strong proponent had its limitations amongst a culture of general support for PhD students. When it comes to dissent or disagreement about where the department is in terms of EDISJ and where it can go, Alicia knows that even “the department chair can’t come off too
During the first interview I asked, “what do you think the purpose of doctoral education” and “who is doctoral education for” and Alicia clarified if the questions were about what she thought or what the department would say, or what we say we do versus what actually happens. As I am someone with a scholarly interest in doctoral education, I appreciated her questioning about what do we say versus what do we actually do; I wanted to hear both to see where and how the differences emerges. The purpose of the PhD in Social Science was one of those areas that required an espoused versus enacted conversation. Broadly, Alicia believes a doctoral degree “is set up to teach people how to think for themselves and to teach people to understand how knowledge is created broadly through research methods.” It is focused on teaching students “how we know things” and then being able to “replicate and create new ideas.” However, Alicia described a gap between who can attend and who does attend. Alicia believes it should be for “anyone who wants to understand how knowledge works, but “it is certainly not.” PhD programs require students to be “hoop jumpers” which detracts the “freethinkers” to actually want to come and do their own thinking. It’s also built for “people with a higher socio-economic status” because you have to go to conferences and “do research on little or no funding” as well as “live on little to no money.” I appreciated Alicia’s awareness around access problems as it highlights a potential bias in who enrolls and also demonstrated the financial burdens within doctoral education. An alternative delivery format within the department that condenses in-person requirements does “democratize education in a way;” however the decision was probably not motivated by “inclusion”, but Alicia gets the feeling it was that the department “wanted to increase enrollment.” Alicia and I discussed the merits of inclusion of this delivery format. In
one stance it offers education to those who typically would not consider attending Oakes University due to geographic distance. On another stance, it requires a particular level of socio-economic status to be able to afford the courses, and travel and pay for lodging intermediately to physically attend Oakes University for a short period of time each year.

Beyond the purpose of doctoral education and who it is for, coursework is another important aspect in a doctoral program. The PhD program in Social Science “has no formal milestones about EDISJ.” If students take courses that Alicia teaches, then they would have EDISJ in their coursework, but it is an elective and “not part of the core.” Even the course around EDISJ that Alicia teaches now had a vote of abstention amongst the other affirmative votes during its approval process which overtly and negatively expressed to Alicia that the faculty member did not approve of the topic or social identities taught. Alicia reflected some doubt if there would ever be a core class on it, but that “it should be core. I guess I could try to push for it to be core.” A core class however has to be “offered every year” so the problem becomes teaching load and consistent enrollment numbers. The core classes that are offered are centered around research, methods, and academic writing.

**Ways Institutional and Disciplinary Logics Inform Behaviors Related to EDISJ**

**Institutional Priorities and Values**

When it comes to priorities, Alicia told me “overall, the philosophical goal of the university is research.” She further elaborated that “I think here at Oakes University what gets you tenure is good research. I think teaching you have to be okay. Like what the Provost said, you have to be good—which isn’t excellent.” It is interesting to me that not only does Alicia communicate the goal as research but also compares it to another function of higher education teaching which the latter is seen as less important. She compared what the Provost said with an
experience at another institution where “bad” teaching evaluations would result in significant
teaching evaluations would result in significant responses. Being “good” isn’t clearly defined, in Alicia’s opinion; “they say it’s clear but it’s not very clear.”

What doesn’t seem to be as evident as research within the overall philosophical goal of the university is EDISJ. Alicia has experienced that “sometimes they do [talk about it] and sometimes they don’t. They need to say it over and over and they can’t stop saying it. When they say it, then it’s important.” Alicia questioned if “people would understand what it would mean to really have it embedded in all layers. It’s just not here.” She offered several examples to support this belief. Firstly, she mentioned that if the university “really cared” then her institutional service would be more focused and not spread so thin. In terms of the president showcasing support or understanding of EDISJ, Alicia mentioned her former university president “was clueless” and “seemed to have a problem in that area. They protested the president.” The current president has not made an impact “directly” to the point where Alicia has noticed, but she has recognized the importance of EDISJ communicated by the Provost’s office, however. They offered a curricular grant for financial support for faculty to create an EDISJ course. Alicia appreciated this grant because it prevents faculty from “doing too much” in a semester because creating a new course is a lot of work. This was a moment to Alicia where the institution showed they “really cared.” Additionally, the provost’s office supports continual programming around diversity and inclusion; the series on inclusion classroom practices is “actually really good” in terms of the content discussed and the structure of the program. Alicia would recommend the program to any doctoral student interested in learning more about EDISJ outside of the coursework. Lastly, Oakes University hired a senior administrator for diversity and inclusion
which is further evidence of how Oakes University is stabilizing and legitimizing diversity and inclusion efforts broadly.

I asked Alicia questions to introduce me to the department’s values and branding, hoping to identify what the faculty and administrators in this field of study at Oakes University hold as their foundation and future directions. Again, Alicia asked for clarification about the espoused versus enacted values. She started by saying “they value research, faculty doing research.” Then, she paused and said “I don’t know really know what they value. It’s hard.” She referenced the department’s values and mission that would be online. Then she continued with “they want to do a lot of fundraising because they want more money in the department. I feel like I’m a fundraiser.” Alicia wants the cycle of funding to first stem from “enriching my classes and making the student experience richer” to draw donors to that future excellence of her program. The department recently rebranded but has to remain “generic” as its programs are “a little disjointed” which doesn’t seem to have a noticeable impact on her work. I resonated with this disjointedness as I myself struggled in how to reference Alicia in terms of her scholarly affiliations, or structures in higher education, respectively. Her own scholarship is a convergence of multiple scholarly pursuits and I struggled with an easy descriptor as there were so many terms or perspectives to consider. She pursues this new research and understanding through an applied and multidisciplinary field of study which has its overlaps and distinctions. Alicia is able to do this through her employment as a faculty member in this disjointed department so her department mission could only characterize her scholarship so much. Overall, Alicia seems to connect that the greater something is discussed or acted on the greater the value and importance—fundraising seems to have the emphasis, currently. For example, Alicia shared:
[if] everybody would be actively recruiting students of color, gay students, [and] students with different abilities, you know what I mean? We’d all be doing it. It doesn’t seem to be a core value because we don’t talk about it all the time. We do talk about fundraising a lot.”

Not only is Alicia tasked with this “fundraiser” role, but feels additional burden as the department seeks out funding from industry partners that do not always have a strong history of EDISJ support which requires further conversation.

When a former chair of the department shared information from an internal review years ago, the chair expressed that department was “doing a great job of diversity, equity, and inclusion.” Alicia disagreed with this depiction and questioned if “everyone is going to sit here and let them say that.” As mentioned from the opening vignette, Alicia stood up and shared in a “vulnerable” moment that “our biggest threat to ourselves is the fact that we don’t even see our own bias... We don’t know that we are marginalizing people in our department.” It was a “crazy” moment to experience, that the department chair would share that depiction of the department.

**Tenure as a Rewarding Ritual**

Alicia’s commitment to protecting her time helps her “work on the things that I know are important, that are going to get me to the goal. And so the goal is tenure. They always talk about research, so I’m going to spend most of my time researching.” Doctoral student placement is a consideration for tenure. Although students placed into tenure-track positions at research-intensive universities is a “bonus” for Oakes University, Alicia knows she could “argue it was just their goal” and she “supported their goal” if advisees took alternative career paths. From institutional service to teaching and advising, Alicia strives to balance work and life in what is often too difficult for many in the department to do. Alicia agrees that the work at Oakes
University “is never done,” and the Department of Social Science accepts too many graduate students if they want faculty to have “work-life balance.” Throughout our conversations, it was evident to me that Alicia had a real commitment to setting clear boundaries and expectations to ensure that her time was not mistreated by external requests or concerns. Nevertheless, Alicia believes she spends “a significant amount of time with my graduate students.”

Regarding departmental dynamics, some faculty are interested in EDISJ while others are not. There’s “internal bias” that her colleagues don’t seem to think about. Alicia knows that people “make [inappropriate] comments and stuff” but as a pre-tenured faculty member, “I can’t really push too hard because they vote on my tenure.” Alicia knows that even if they say pushing back won’t impact tenure, she believes it’s political and, “it always matters. Always. People always take things to heart.” Due to the perceived “grey” areas of tenure due to the lack of a faculty union, Alicia knows that any misstep could find its way back to the argument in favor of or opposition to her tenure eventually. For example, they could tell her that her “journal articles aren’t in the best journals.” When “things are pretty terrible,” Alicia will tell her department chair, but with most other things, she doesn’t say too much. Offering an additional layer to these norms within the department, a few faculty have joined together for monthly professional development around equity, diversity, and inclusion. Alicia shared excitement and appreciation with me in seeing this recent trend by her colleagues.

**Disciplinary Structures**

Within the greater scholarly community, Alicia also sees a variety of examples on considering EDISJ, generally. For example, one of her colleagues hosted a roundtable to critique the notion that they truly “do diversity work.” At the same conference, Alicia attended a presentation about how oppressors behave in society and “it wasn’t critical, they just studied it
because they thought it was interesting.” The department does have a culture of publishing with graduate students so whenever there is a project “we usually wrangle in some graduate students not to just do the grunt work but to put them in front of the presentation.” At conferences, faculty present with graduate students. In particular, Alicia said she will be mentioning the classification year of her PhD student to hint at the future hiring opportunity which gives an example that Alicia utilizes her faculty role to support her advisees. Interestingly, Alicia and her students were the only presenters at a recent disciplinary conference with any of the presentations in her research agenda at the intersection of culture, history, and people. While there were 20+ presentations on other topics research agendas listed above within the initial descriptions, this scarcity does validate how Alicia thought she quickly became the one who studies her topic. Out of the 17 disciplinary areas that one could submit a presentation to, six areas had explicit EDISJ language such as critical theory, feminist theory, critical pedagogy, socially responsible practices, and cross-cultural comparisons. No presentation, workshop, or keynote speaker had an explicit mentioning of doctoral education or advising.

Recognition and awards across both professional associations align with research, teaching, and service categories. Graduate students broadly were awarded for their scholarly promise, their study of a topic in historical contexts, or the best dissertation. Faculty who were recognized at this conference had biographies that mentioned their years of undergraduate teaching, their service to the association, the dollar amount of grants, and the number of dissertations they advised. Interestingly, the grants that Alicia has received have not come from large NSF or NIH projects but smaller travel scholarships and Oakes University grants. The other professional association Alicia attends does not have multiple strategic goals that connects research with “marginalized” topic for study, and diversify membership. They recognize students
for outstanding research, and they recognize faculty for outstanding research, years of service, and application within industry. Recently members recognized had their teaching, service, and research commended along with the number of publications and grants received.

Alicia finds at times, regardless if faculty do or do not study “social justice” topics, there’s still moments of apprehension by those who may be “afraid” of retaliation if they were to “push buttons.” For example, when writing about the marginalization of a group of people, a coauthor was concerned that they were “overstepping” with their language use, which Alicia found “interesting.” Alicia believed in writing “directly why this [issue] was wrong;” otherwise, she questioned why they started the project in the first place. On another project with a different coauthor, Alicia also sensed that they were “all afraid”—in this case it was being afraid of critiquing the discriminatory practices of the federal government. By Alicia sharing this story with me in detail, it became evident that “strong language” is required when there’s moments of equally strong discrimination being studied and critiqued within their work. Alicia knows she could “go stronger” with language but will instead make it “academic” to write about how those marginalizing groups of people “need to change.” Further, Alicia defends the use of “strong language” because she knows that “the editors, the reviewers are fine with it, because I also suspect that sometimes the reviewers don’t want to touch that because they’re afraid of being perceived as not social-justice oriented” but ultimately “it’s hard to know” what makes people afraid of engaging strongly in their writing.

**Within-case Analysis**

Alicia’s experience as a pre-tenured faculty at Oakes University provides vital examples for how she integrates equity, diversity, inclusion, and social justice within her work in doctoral education. The case summary offers insight and nuance into how the institutional “rules of the
game” (Thornton & Ocasio, 1999, p. 802) and the disciplinary norms in her field of study impact this integration. The first important topic to analyze is the multiple ways tenure is enacted within her pre-tenured experiences that inform and influence her integration of EDISJ. Additionally, the case findings indicate Alicia’s personal values provide insight into her expectations across department, institutional, and academic community spaces. Therefore, a second area of analysis is Alicia’s familiarity with the peripheral positioning (DiMaggio, 1988) of a foregrounded approach to EDISJ. This peripheral logic within the institution may contribute to how she feels tension throughout her faculty position. A final area of analysis is how these case findings reinforce many of the previous literature’s suggestions regarding the calls to action within doctoral education.

**Layered Impact of Tenure**

Tenure appears to be the convergence of multiple influences coming from the institutional value, the tenure guidelines, and her department colleagues. In order for Oakes University to remain an AAU member, many of the judging criteria draw from research (i.e. research support, faculty awards, fellowships, citations, and PhDs granted). To sustain their status as an AAU member, Oakes University inserts these research-intensive values within the rules of tenure and promotion. It is understandable, then, for Alicia to share from a faculty perspective that the overall philosophical goal of the university is research; membership persists as long as faculty are performing to high enough standards. Both professional associations consistently applaud and recognize members for research publications, and grant funding with secondary mentions to years of service to the association and teaching loads. Faculty colleagues also play a role in shaping tenure as they “vote on her tenure” which means they can help determine who is worthy of insider-outsider statuses (Tierney & Rhoads, 1994). The department
chair, college level evaluation committee, college dean, and external evaluators all have capacity within their materials to document and reward EDISJ within her work. This is also an example of what Thornton and Ocasio (1999) call legitimizing sources of power as they formalize what factors form the basis for distributing power within an organization.

Interestingly, it is largely implicit where any EDISJ work may belong within the forms and materials for the tenure process. Across the check list, cover sheet, and quantitative summary forms, there is no explicit mention of EDISJ. Within their faculty handbook, critical (as an adjective) is used to describe research analysis or review of previous scholarship; however, the meaning seems to be evaluative rather than the confrontation of power-laden systems. Half of the section on promotion and tenure does offer a broad meaning of scholarship and specific examples of scholarship categories. This detailing is not continued into the teaching or service sections where doctoral education responsibilities are usually organized. Only a strongly recommended template for a curriculum vitae from Alicia’s academic college offers a place to list graduate students and their thesis or dissertation titles.

Conformity of individuals towards the prevailing logic depends on why the pressures are exerted, who is exerting them, what the pressures are, how they are being exerted, and where they occur (Oliver, 1991). For Alicia’s case, achieving tenure would offer stability and support to continue pursuing the topics of importance—her EDISJ foregrounded topics at the intersection of history, culture, and people. The pressure seems to be layered throughout individual interactions (i.e. judgment from peers), departmental expectations (i.e. taxation on service) to larger organizational pursuits (i.e. AAU membership). The pressure of tenure is internalized by Alicia as largely informal rules (Thornton & Ocasio, 1999) as compared to her previous institution’s union. Issues resulting from this informality may be the reason for her realistic approach to what
she can accomplish working on department curriculum, knowing that a new EDISJ course would require a consistent enrollment flow (out of her control because she can only offer one faculty’s contribution to the total recruitment of new students), and extra teaching load (her contract for 50% teaching has her instructing many of the diversity courses in the department already). As Alicia shared, she is striving for balance and control of her time to align her work and accomplishments towards the values and interests of the rewarding structures. This shows support for Alicia’s successfully functioning within the prevailing logic despite feeling that tension.

According to the tenure resources from her academic college, content recommendations within tenure materials need to be predictable and stable enough to work in all situations in order to offer an equitable experience across departments. The categories are largely open because the “nature of scholarship varies across scholarly domains”. It would be up to Alicia to contextualize the specifics of her EDISJ work within the required sections across research, teaching, and service. For example, Alicia’s college tenure guidelines ask faculty to describe the departments approach to graduate advising, honors or awards for service, and for their research to produce products, be subject to peer review, and demonstrate visibility within their field. Alicia could demonstrate her individualized approach to advising and expectations for career outcomes, service to the institution through her service for diversity-related events at the department and institutional level, and her requests for guest speaking on her EDISJ research topic outside Oakes University.

Her research agenda could be depicted as vital, innovative, and novel within her interdisciplinary field of study as she and her students have been the only ones with presentations in their area of study the last few years. Those that have been co-authors were either her
advisees, shifted to new topics of research, were from a different field of study (and thus not going to the same conferences), or were nearing retirement still leaving her on the margins. Her research dissemination goes beyond book chapters and peer-reviewed papers into innovative roundtables, symposium seminars, and physical and interactive depictions of her scholarship. These latter mediums for her scholarly distribution indeed have been recognized consistency through her professional associations indicating some form of value. Knowing Alicia has several additional ways to distribute her research may be a challenge in comparison to those who primarily use peer-reviewed academic journals as standards of accomplishment as there may be more common consensus on the value of particular scholarly contributions.

Also, Alicia could include within her teaching philosophy perspectives on integration of EDISJ within doctoral education. Finally, she could mention her work towards one of the institution’s strategic goals which broadly focuses on diversity and inclusion efforts, as further contextualization of her EDISJ integration. I think this would be a realistic expectation for Alicia to undertake as she has a strong desire for earning tenure and has a positive and similar perspective around EDISJ with her department chair.

**Occupying a Peripheral Logic**

DiMaggio (1988) suggested insurgent logics endure in the peripheries of organizational fields when they are less privileged by the operating status quo. Then, they emerge at times of conflict and ambiguity (Suddaby & Greenwood, 2005). As characterized within Alicia’s case, several units and initiatives at Oakes University are tasked with diversity and inclusion professional development and awareness. Nevertheless, a sense of neutrality emerges as faculty are largely viewed equally on whether they consider EDISJ in their overall work. In particular, conflict looms within this case through the split between Alicia and her department chair, and the
rest of the department. Her colleagues who are dedicating time to ongoing professional development around diversity and inclusion may espouse similar beliefs to Alicia and her department chair but were not discussed through any of Alicia’s experiences as demonstrating a similar perspective. For the rest of the department, Alicia describes her colleagues as somewhat split across doing or not doing work related to EDISJ in doctoral education and that the department chair can’t push too hard either, limiting how the department can reflect Alicia’s values and expectations (Posselt, 2016). Despite her field of study having formal scholarly spaces that foreground EDISJ, Alicia finds herself pursuing a unique specialization or fractalization of knowledge (Becher & Trowler, 2001) as evidenced by being the only one at professional conferences presenting around her topic. Alicia’s ideal insurgent logic would create rules of the game where everyone would do “the [EDISJ] work”, the institution would talk about it all the time, one person wouldn’t be taxed to teach the EDISJ courses, underrepresented applicants would be more consciously pursued, and more scholars in the field would consider the foregrounding of positionality and EDISJ perspectives as vital rather than not being able to function apolitically.

Existing within a peripheral logic is apparent across all layers of Alicia’s faculty experience. Within the department, EDISJ doesn’t seem to be a core value because they “don’t talk about it all the time.” The branding was generic due to the disjointed programs which limit a common form of disciplinary pursuits (Becher, 1984); in addition, the fractures over the decades resulted less hard, pure pursuits and more emphasis in an applied context with an overall connection to culture (Becher & Trowler, 2001). The department values shared by Alicia were “research” and “fundraising.” Alicia would prefer that quality teaching and student learning would appeal to fundraisers supporting the department versus waiting on their funds to increase
student success. Although explicit examples of fundraising shaping integration of EDISJ, positively or negatively, was not present within the case beyond Alicia’s concern that some potential industry partners do not have a good track record with EDISJ, external market influences are still a concern as they can shape organizational priorities (Friedland & Alford, 1991). Market influences already move new PhD graduates to certain professions in the industry as Alicia knows from personal experience. A plurality of colleagues exists in the department as “many seem to ignore it while others do consider [EDISJ] topics.” Her past department chair acted as a historian (Tierney & Rhoads, 1994) by characterizing the department as doing a “great job” around diversity and inclusion. During this conversation, Alicia spoke up in disagreement demonstrating that the prevailing logic caused conflict with her logic. The department itself may be limiting the number of faculty who consider EDISJ within their teaching responsibilities. Alicia was hired in her faculty position to teach undergraduate and graduate diversity courses within her department, further isolating Alicia’s expertise structurally from becoming a greater normative skillset in the department. By hiring Alicia to teach these courses, it allows other colleagues greater freedom in how, if at all, they engage in EDISJ material within their own work.

Institutionally, the formal programming organized through the Provost’s office around diversity and inclusion seems to be the closest connection to strengthen this particular logic. However, limitations exist as the work out of the provost’s office (in addition to the commitment espoused of the department chair) is not solely diversity and inclusion programming but also addressing additional organizational priorities. Further, but limited, support exists in her academic community where what is valued seems to be the “less harsh” but still EDISJ research
topics and not going “too strong” on language use; Alicia said she would “blend in more” if she were in another field of study which shows some academic dissimilarity for her ideal logic.

**Addressing Multiple Calls to Action**

Individually, and as part of the department, Alicia does integrate EDISJ within her work that follows some of the recommendations within doctoral education scholarship. Interestingly, neither professional association shares publicly-available resources for faculty to better their teaching, research, service, or evaluations of PhD experiences and programs. In fact, Alicia’s actions and reflections are evident across the primary concerns in doctoral education: (1) admissions, (2) advising, and (3) programmatic milestones. By mentioning that the department talks about fundraising more than recruiting diverse students, the Department of Social Science has a need to reconsider Gardner’s (2010) and Stacy’s (2006) calls for faculty to reconsider pools of applicants. It appears evident that Alicia is considering that call as well as Posselt’s (2016) hope that departments reinterpret their norms and academic identities. Although within the periphery, aspiring doctoral students still make their way to work with Alicia and she has demonstrated a strong commitment to finding underrepresented students and those interested in critiquing power and systems. She is mindful around the participation historically of minoritized students and the differential treatment they receive. The conscious recruitment of underrepresented students seems to be a novel idea in comparison to the descriptions of the department at large, placing her once again within the periphery. Although the alternative delivery of their PhD does offer more folks an opportunity who do not geographically relocate, significant barriers exist by enrolling full-time employees as part-time or full-time students within this format and requiring personal spending for lodging, transportation, and food during multi-week visits to campus.
Advising seems to be a process where little tension exists in Alicia’s faculty experience. Gardner and Mendoza (2010) and Golde and Dore (2001) both illustrated that students benefit when working with advisers with closely aligned interests, and who show concern for the student beyond strictly academic requirements. Alicia’s advising demonstrates the strong integration of EDISJ within doctoral education which is interesting as it is also the most individualized faculty responsibility. Alicia asks students what their career goals are and supports them towards that direction. She acknowledges non-academic aspects of their life providing recommendations to seek therapists during difficult times. Also, Alicia views students as professionals and advises their dissertation to maintain professionalism. The frequent references about funding and assistantships also demonstrates an adviser who is willing to utilize their faculty role to support students. The taxation from being a primary person that hears students’ stories of microaggressions does support advisees and non-advises above and beyond the standard (Sallee, 2011). For these reasons, it does not appear that Alicia operates solely from an apprenticeship model approach (Kwiram, 2006; Mena, Diefes-Dux, & Capobianco, 2013). The space she gives for individualized career and academic exploration, in addition to students coming to her with critical dispositions previously, shows that a more collaborative or responsive advising approach is what Alicia utilizes.

The programmatic calls for action from graduate education scholars are found within Alicia’s case as well. Alicia utilizes her resources, primarily financial, to strive for a difference in enrollment—something that colleagues are also aware of, but don’t seem as committed to as Alicia or her department chair. The department’s PhD program can graduate full-time students quicker than other programs at Oakes University which is a positive towards reducing debt (Bok, 2013; Cassuto, 2016). Even though Alicia would like an additional year for students to further
their research experiences, the financial benefits still appear strong enough for a change unlikely to occur programmatically (Golde, 2005). Curricular changes have been made with the addition of the graduate diversity course Alicia teaches. However, the one abstention vote amongst the approval votes shows that more work is needed towards welcoming EDISJ into doctoral education. The only area not mentioned was any overspecialization of course content that would limit advisees abilities to secure multiple careers across industry and academia (Cassuto, 2016).

In summary, Alicia responds accordingly to tenure expectations and guidelines, and the consistent tension created through her peripheral positioning across many layers of the institution and field of study. This case demonstrates varied experiences that meaningfully integrate EDISJ in ways that the literature would overall support. Advising doctoral students offered the clearest example of her integration abilities and was one of the few areas where doctoral students and doctoral education were under her sole guidance and consideration. Alicia is aware of where further integration could go (i.e. department enrollment strategies and espoused priorities) to further develop such an approach within her work in doctoral education. Despite a department and institutional culture where the work is never done, and where tenure expectations have Alicia controlling much of her time, the motivation from her personal lived experiences remain unchanged. These experience persist personal standards for her faculty work which also act a filter that assesses the institutional, department, and disciplinary environments around her.

**Concluding Vignette**

Alicia provides a rich and complex perspective as a pre-tenured faculty who has a strong commitment personally and professionally to EDISJ broadly. From the experiences and perspectives gathered, Alicia’s integration of EDISJ in doctoral education is grounded in multifaceted and personal experiences in EDISJ, a committed department chair to EDISJ, and a
hope for critical informed advisees, as she negotiates tension across the reward structures of tenure, faculty collegiality, and her critiques of the industry. This case provides strong rationale that the status of tenure is an overwhelming reason for considering an enriching integration of EDISJ as tenure is the professional goal, the source of collegial resistance, and the mechanism for the university to enact its values. Alicia summed up the difficulty of tenure at Oakes University during one of the interviews which provides a summary to this overall case:

"Yeah, I’m a pre-tenured junior faculty member, that sums it up, that I can only say so much and I can’t force anyone to do anything. And if I come off too hard I will lose my job. And so it creates a lot of internal dissonance, right? Because look at people like Angela Davis was on the Top 10 FBI Wanted List, [and] was removed from her position directly, right? Because she was speaking up for what she believed, and she stood her ground, right? She didn’t care, right? In a selfish way, I do care. I’m the bread winner for my family. I have to maintain income or I don’t know what else to do. And so if you speak up too much, right, we are also not in a union school. So I’m an individual who doesn’t have a way or an official safe way to have a grievance process if I did feel I was treated differently."
CHAPTER 5. A CASE AND ANALYSIS OF A STEM FACULTY MEMBER

In this section, I present a case summary for Jay, a tenured, STEM faculty member at Oakes University, both pseudonyms. I also offer a within-case analysis of Jay’s integration of EDISJ within their work in doctoral education. This case summary begins with an opening vignette to offer an immediate, vicarious experience into the participants. Then, I present a body of narrative description to further define the case and the participants’ contexts. Lastly, I offer descriptive detail, quotations, and assertions to examine in-depth the three subquestions of this study: (a) what do these faculty envision as their role in developing such an orientation within doctoral students, (b) how have these faculty learned how and where equity, diversity, inclusion and/or social justice can take place within doctoral education, and (c) in what ways are institutional logics and disciplinary logics informing these faculty’s behaviors related to equity, diversity, inclusion, and social justice in doctoral education?

Introductory Vignette

In addition to having conversations about current social issues being awkward, especially if it happens too much, you also have to worry about whether it’s appropriate or not, right? I’ve actually heard one of our higher-up university leaders say something that stuck with me. And I think it matters. I think it’s true. And I think that’s important. They said, “You are protected legally by any liability associated with what you teach at the university.” Working with graduate students is part of our teaching formally. But they said, “You’re only protected as long as what you’re teaching has to do with your area of expertise.” I’m hired as a STEM faculty, but I’m also selected for helping with diversity and inclusion initiatives; but is that a teaching job or a supporting job? I don’t know. But at the time I was hired as a STEM faculty, so I’m supposed to teach and talk to grad
students about STEM, not about diversity at that point, right? You want to be appropriate, then you also have to be careful not to overstep boundaries, right?

**Incontestable Descriptions**

Jay is a tenured professor in the Department of STEM at Oakes University. Born outside of the United States, he identifies with having minoritized racial and ethnic identities. He attended a large public university with an interest to be a scientist; he experienced financial hardships growing up, so it was more economically viable than a private university, but it was still challenging. In a conversation with their undergraduate thesis adviser, it was suggested that if Jay really wanted to attend graduate school, applying to schools in the United States was the best way. After completing his undergraduate degree, Jay came to the United States for graduate school. Jay even served in a postdoc role for a few years after completing his PhD. Jay’s first description of graduate school to me was that it was a good educational experience, the location was a great place financially, and there were not a lot of distractions outside of one’s research. However, Jay also mentioned:

I immediately experienced microaggressions or little forms of discrimination, either directly or because I was part of a larger group of a minoritized group. That was a very eye-opening experience to me. Back home, there had been a lot of racism and discrimination to some groups. When I came to this country, I felt that first hand.

These discriminatory practices continued after graduate school; as Jay said, “my life experiences inform how I feel about things and what I do about things or what I say, right?” Although becoming a citizen of the United States, an accomplishment Jay is very proud of, he still gets the impression from others that he is [more] proud of his ethnic heritage. He told me, “I am proud [of my ethnic heritage] but [I] now consider myself first a U.S. citizen.” Jay acknowledged he
used these experiences of discrimination as a catalyst to do educational outreach to diverse young people through his primary professional association to generate their academic interests in STEM. Consequently, he has been nominated and awarded in the past for his outstanding commitment to diverse populations although he shared, “[awards were] not the reason why I was trying to do it.”

One of the first things we talked about during our interviews was for Jay to define equity, diversity, inclusion, and social justice (EDISJ). Equity had to do with “fairness” and “bias.” He shared an example about faculty candidate pools and issues that can arise around unconscious bias. Jay defined diversity as a “wealth of opinions, backgrounds, and experiences.” He then referenced and agreed with how their college dean shared the importance of being able to work with others across the globe. When it came to inclusion, he referenced another senior administrator who said inclusion is “looking around the table and seeing who’s not there”—Jay said he “loved that” perspective even though he “hates to define it as a negative” but that perspective makes it “very clear” to him. Jay even said that hearing this definition “changed my life or personal opinion.” Jay expressed a difficulty separating social justice from equity and inclusion and told a couple stories instead. From personal experience he has learned to support other marginalized identities because “you don’t have to be personally offended to recognize that other groups are getting the shorter end of the stick and don’t get social justice.” He viewed social justice as something to strive for even if groups have made progress because “it doesn’t mean they have equitable, comparable lives to say the majority White population.”

I asked Jay why he wanted to be a faculty member. He told me his decision was practical. The academic professional association would send out statistics and information in magazines about job growth prospects. Jay saw these statistics where 40% of PhDs find jobs in academia;
so saying no to teaching, meant saying no to about half the job market. In addition, the academic application process was about a year longer than the industrial process, so he was able to start with academic prospects before needing to consider industry. By the time his postdoc was finished, a faculty job was already lined up. Jay balanced this practicality with the comment that “I enjoy teaching and really, really, really like research; I like working with young people and meeting more creative students.” Early on as an Assistant Professor, a third of faculty responsibilities focused on research, two-thirds focused on teaching, with very little service. Nowadays, it’s more balanced with a third of time being asked for research, teaching, and service, respectively. He has his own line of research in STEM (a pseudonym) and supervises a research team towards the discovery of new knowledge. He attends a dozen or so conferences and other institutional visits to discuss their research due to the nature of being an academic. In terms of teaching, it has ranged from a graduate class taught every semester to only one every other academic year due to increased demand for undergraduate teaching loads and course buyouts. Service has increased in the last few years, as he has become more involved in diversity and inclusion initiatives across the university. In terms of advising, Jay has helped graduate several students in the years he’s been a faculty at Oakes University—with a few more currently at different stages of their PhD milestones. Jay serves as a co-adviser to about a third of these students due to the multi-PI projects that fund these doctoral students. Although most advisees complete their degree, a few have departed before completion due to alternative career plans, health concerns within one’s family, and another’s struggling research project.

**Oakes University**

Jay told me, when talking about academic reputations at research conferences, that “Oakes University is one of the founders of academic research in the country. We’re an AAU
institution, a research-intensive institution, we are not a “small place.” Jay works at Oakes University which enrolls over 34,000 total students with over 4,000 enrolling as graduate students. About 350 doctoral degrees and 1,000 master’s degrees are awarded annually. Oakes University belongs to the Association of American Universities (AAU), an invitation-only organization of the 62 top public and private research institutions in the U.S. and Canada. In order to maintain their membership, Oakes University is assessed on a routine basis to exemplify: federal and industrial research support, membership in national academies, faculty awards, fellowships, citations, PhDs granted, postdoctoral appointees, and its undergraduate education (AAU Membership Policy, 2018). As a Research I University, Oakes University has over 100 total graduate programs granting doctoral degrees, and over 50 graduate minors and certificates.

**Department of STEM**

Within one of the colleges at Oakes University is the Department of STEM. The Department of STEM is “at the PhD level, a PhD granting research-oriented department.” The current chair “has a good, heavy emphasis on teaching, but we’re still a research department.” Teaching loads in the department went up 25% a few years ago; Jay attributed it to the fact that over half of the undergraduate population at some point will take a class the department offers. The department has over 20 tenure-eligible staff, with several non-tenure track and lecturers. The department enrolls over 150 doctoral students with about 25 to 35 new students enrolling every year. About half of the students are international and half are domestic students. Jay thinks these two student demographics complement each other. The domestic students “tend to be much better at problem solving” while the international students “tend to have a stronger background of knowledge—a majority are both types of students though.”
The mission statement for their PhD in STEM is to equip students with skills, knowledge, and abilities to create new knowledge for today’s problems. Some of the top-tier students nationally who pursue this type of academic program desire the coasts of the United States in order to attend some of the bigger, prominent schools or in larger cities to find a Top 5 or Top 10 school. Therefore, the Department of STEM tends to recruit and find students that come from smaller campuses, private colleges, or those already in their area that don’t want to go to those larger, coastal and urban universities. Initially, doctoral students are placed with a temporary adviser until they find a permanent research team and faculty adviser based on mutual interests and available funding. All doctoral students take two required courses related to conducting research.

**Disciplinary Community**

Utilizing Becher and Trowler’s (2001) disciplinary knowledge taxonomy, Jay’s academic area is characterized as a pure hard disciplinary community in which knowledge is cumulative, theoretical, and with clear criteria for knowledge verification; although they do operate within a post-positivist tradition (Crotty, 2013). Due to their pure disciplinary pursuits, their disciplinary knowledge experiences “raiding parties” of applied disciplinary communities who assume aspects of their disciplinary values and knowledge for their own or mutual benefit (Becher & Trowler, 2001, p. 45). Jay described his discipline as relatively stable in how it organizes within a higher education institution. The last fracture or sub-disciplinary split happened in the 1960s to create an interdisciplinary field between two STEM fields while the other traditional areas in his discipline held stable since that split. These traditional areas of STEM have historically been ranked highly at Oakes University with recent dips in ranking due to the increased prestige and
competition from other programs as Oakes University has struggled to increase the number of faculty positions in this discipline.

Amongst Jay’s professional associations and peer departments, he described that most colleagues care about “grand challenges” that can improve people’s lives such as sustainability, improving health, and improving the environment. In particular, Jay has a membership with the largest professional association in his discipline that espouses a mission that their scholarly work and endeavors will benefit people and the environment. This association promotes its sense of prestige and positive community recognition for publishing rigorous scientific manuscripts in their several disciplinary journals. Scholars in the community have recognized the positive and negative impact their work has had over the decades and there’s efforts now to address some of those concerns. Jay told me it is a common understanding that there’s not enough racially-minoritized candidates within faculty search pools. In the last ten years, Jay has noticed a change from individual to collaborative projects due to funding opportunities preferring multiple primary investigators.

**Envisioning His Role in Developing an EDISJ Orientation**

As the focus on my study was specifically within a doctoral education context, it was important to connect our conversations around EDISJ and his faculty experiences back to the PhD. To do so, I initially asked at the end of our first interview what Jay thought the purpose of doctoral education is and who should pursue a PhD. One takeaway from Jay’s interview is his balance between following the traditions of research-intensive doctoral education while including his personal mindfulness as he is able. First, Jay shared that to him a PhD is not “just sort of another paper or certificate” that you have to provide in order to access a specific job but instead teaches skills and knowledge beyond theoretical knowledge. Jay’s belief aligned with his
depiction of his department’s as they both agreed that they, “just want people to be successful regardless of what [students] decide to do.” Jay differentiated that a bachelor’s degree in STEM would allow someone to do the work, but a PhD in STEM would allow someone to be “independent,” “experts in the world in their specific area of research,” and “make executive decisions”, know where to communicate results, and how to advance results forward. Those that want “higher level responsibility” and lead a group should complete a PhD program—that’s “who should do it.”. His biggest concern is to make sure that everybody is employed after they graduate. After the degree completion, Jay wants them to be passionate about science and technology regardless of what they do; “we need as many supporters as we can.” As he continued to talk about what he wants for students after graduation, Jay mentioned he wants them to care about diversity and care about the “needy or the marginalized” and then went back to an academic thought, “if they stay academics, I hope they find a good fellowship.” While he was supportive of students’ interest in participating in professional associations, he did want them to be part of their local community wherever they ended up as well.

In a more day-to-day characterization, Jay’s time with students is dominated by research talk. Overall in Jay’s faculty responsibilities, research is a key expectation; he said research is a “simple word” to describe his need to direct original research, find funding, talk to students who are actually doing the work, publish results, and promote his and the research team’s work. He opens office hours most days of the week and encourages students to come in to talk about their research. Jay told me that “the most successful students that get the most interesting data and the best papers, tend to talk to me every day.” Weekly research team meetings serve as an opportunity for students to update other members on their research and to solicit feedback on manuscripts and presentations. I asked Jay the role he takes in these meetings and he said, “I’m
very involved. I ask a bunch of questions. It’s meant to prepare for presentations outside the meeting or for those headed to their preliminary exam—I know what kinds of questions people ask from the committee, right?”

Now that we have a characterization of his commitments to research, we can now see how his role and responsibility around EDISJ is considered. Jay mentioned “for some reason, I tend to recruit people that already had a social conscience” so they have a bit more willingness to talk about social issues or topics but not always. He said that he “purposely” creates an environment where people have to work with other students that “don’t look like them, that don’t sound like them.” He again referenced language by the academic dean of the college for rationalizing why diverse groups are important. He hopes taking on these conversations will “impact our students and the next generation…I feel like that’s what we have to do just to have a better, more equitable society, right?” Due to his professional association commitments to engage underrepresented youth in STEM work, he does ask doctoral students to participate in outreach and will offer a small honorarium; the students “tend to put that kind of activity down in their resumes” as well.

Despite the clear commitments to respond to the pressures of research expectations for both faculty and doctoral students, something more seems to be happening, as we saw from the opening vignette. I noticed an internal dialogue about needing to be careful, mindful and deliberate about wanting to be appropriate within proper boundaries as he had some confusion. This dialogue or mindfulness became a key takeaway that moves through the entire case. I asked Jay directly if it was his role or responsibility to include EDISJ within his work in doctoral education. Jay responded that he does think it is part of his role to the extent that he feels it is possible to include it. He pressed he comment further by sharing that not only does he include it
but that sometimes, “I feel like I’m taking risks in order to include it… I’m someone who is very open about these things.” Jay was clear on a limit though by mentioning, “you can only do so much”, “I don’t want to push too hard”, and “I might raise the issue but not to the point of making them uncomfortable.”

This deliberation about being appropriate and not overstep boundaries can be seen through Jay’s “every now and then” approach to talking about “social issues.” As an aside, Jay usually did not define what specific social issues he was having to negotiate with students, but throughout the interviews he did bring up the general climate in the United States about President Trump or about the comments from his congressional representative when referring to the “very challenging political times” in which we are living. As we know, one-on-one conversations with students are predominately about the research that is going to be part of their dissertation. Jay did say other things come up in conversation as well; “I mean we also get along. So, every now and then, we mention a few things about how things are going. But, 95% of the time conversation and the whole discussion is about the research for the PhD.” In describing some of his interactions with the research team, Jay told me:

we do bring into conversation more personal conversations every now and then of some of the issues of the moment. We all don’t agree; not everybody feels comfortable with the discussion. Every now and then we have an informal conversation as part of another larger conversation, and then people start talking about random stuff.

He noticed across these two types of meetings that based on students’ personal experiences, some only want to talk about “their research and their dog” or just are careful how they keep an open mind to “discuss issues of the day.”
I generally enquired if his students want to be equity-minded scholars or inclusive scholars as compared to just “scholar.” He’s answered that he is consistently surprised with what students want to think about in terms of these “social issues.” He told me two stories about students that illustrated how personal, political, and familial experiences can shape students towards or away engaging in EDISJ topics. These two stories matched the same two students Jay had referenced in how folks respond differently to these informal conversations Jay offered a summary sentence at the end of these two stories by saying, “so it’s super weird. I mean I talk about these things all the time. But it’s not always easy and they’re not always receptive.” I asked for clarification about “I talk about these things all the time” and Jay said, “Not all the time, but this is always in mind, but it’s not as easy as it may seem… not even from those that have experienced discrimination.” Beyond knowing if his EDISJ service responsibilities gives him agency within his teaching role with doctoral education, what becomes important is his mindfulness stemming from his hopes and seeing the benefits of diversity being filtered through wanting to be appropriate and not overstep boundaries.

**Learning How and Where EDISJ Can Take Place Within Doctoral Education**

Jay’s ability to talk about EDISJ across his professional life demonstrated EDISJ in doctoral education is varied and somewhat bound. He recognized how the institution, the department, and the academic community all contribute to EDISJ—whether positively or negatively. Across Jay’s interviews, journals, and collected documents, access for and representation of underrepresented populations is both a source of personal learning and in his focus how EDISJ can take place in doctoral education. The department has minimal involvement with EDISJ although Jay and his students showcase multiple places where EDISJ can take place. The disciplinary community at large espouses a commitment towards attributing the quality of a
PhD program to its diversity which influences student applicants and industry recruitment opportunities who both respond to rankings for decision making. The disciplinary community also create support for underrepresented populations through association subgroups.

**Access and Representation**

Most of Jay’s learning about EDISJ at the institutional level came from faculty search experiences. Therefore, he frequently gave these examples when asked for specific instances. Initially, I was disappointed that doctoral education was being conflated by faculty searches because I wanted to understand more about the former. By talking to Jay more, I learned that candidates in faculty search pools are indeed a reflection of how institutions treat newly minted PhD students. Jay had experience learning about evaluative biases from a faculty training program which strives to retain more “women and other minority identities” into the professoriate. Jay was able to repeat many of the race and gender statistics gleaned from his training on the biases that occur during faculty searches. To retain new scholars though across these identities, Jay knows that they have to move away from just “calling up an old buddy from grad school to send his best student to apply.” Additionally, Jay participated in some NSF-funded activities that support underrepresented STEM graduate students into the professoriate as well.

Although new pipeline programs of underrepresented students are being explored across the university, no action has yet been taken by the department specifically to one day impact their contributions of quality and diverse faculty candidates. Jay mentioned EDISJ is on the “radar” of the chair and the main administrator, and “it is much more so now than it was before.” Jay seemed to indicate that these department leaders want things to improve but would require some assistance— “I’m not sure that the chair or other people are necessarily equipped with the
way to do things or how to react to things. They mean well though.” Jay has the impression that the academic college thinks the department does not have a more diverse student body because “we don’t want to,” but he reaffirmed, “we want them, we just have to keep trying.”

**Top-Down Versus Bottom-Up Departmental Action**

One takeaway is how inactive or passive the department is characterized as through Jay’s stories. I asked Jay if similar implicit bias programs were offered to teach doctoral students about these concerns for an equitable process. Jay said, “it’s usually done either at the university-wide or sometimes college level.” Jay’s placing of formal trainings at the university level matched his belief that the department would not have an EDISJ course required for all PhD students in the department as, “there’s people that already have similar things even though they’re not for credit—like in the Graduate College.” For example, a Dean of the Graduate College offered resources, in terms of diversity and inclusion across the university to Directors of Graduate Education.

Throughout the three interviews, I asked Jay about the times in which EDISJ “shows up” at the department level based on the topic we were discussing. For example, I wanted to ground Jay’s definition of equity, “being judged fairly with just treatment,” in context to see how, if at all, it was present. Jay said, “yes” it was something discussed and followed up by sharing:

I am not aware of any situation where our graduate students failed or expressed they weren’t being treated fairly based on anything. I do feel like there’s some implicit bias where people don’t realize they are limiting teaching opportunities or other leadership roles from international students. But, in terms of research I think we’re doing fine. I can’t remember the last person that didn’t pass their preliminary exams.
To emphasize this example, Jay recounted a personal story on how as a graduate student he also noticed that domestic students were also being privileged for the teaching assistantships “even though, in many instances, the international students were quite good.”

Jay’s experiences with doctoral students directly demonstrate a difference than the department’s characterization. In terms of inclusion, Jay said doctoral students were bringing up issues around family separations at the U.S. border, before that DACA, and before that the travel ban. “Every now and then” students sent an e-mail to all department faculty to “show up” and “come to our discussion.” Graduate students also mentioned that the physical space wasn’t visually welcoming, as the decades of recognizing successful scholars and disciplinary legends through physical markers resulted in a systemic misrepresentation across race and gender, and asked Jay to do something about it as he was recently announced to be taking more service responsibilities around EDISJ. The way he expressed his internal reaction to these students seemed like an awakening moment by saying, “Oh my God, this is my job now, it makes total sense to me. I was like, yeah we should change it.”

As I had learned that EDISJ was “always in mind” for Jay, I asked if there were any examples of that deliberation to further tease out his (re)action compared to the department’s or institution’s. Jay mentioned he had a graduate student from a religious group that another student would tease. One of those times happened during a research group meeting; Jay told me, “I said, “that’s not acceptable. You cannot make comments of other people’s religions at all, period. Please apologize and never do that again.” That student was receptive.” Jay voluntarily continued with a story where he didn’t speak up. More senior and tenured faculty would tease a senior faculty colleague behind their back about this individual’s minoritized identity. Jay said, “I never spoke up. That makes me feel bad.” Asking the difference between the two experiences
Jay said, in one “I was in a situation of power” and in the other, “I was at the bottom of the pyramid.”

**Space within the Disciplinary Community**

Across the academic community, rankings play an important role in EDISJ in doctoral education. Jay mentioned two common approaches to determine a program’s rank. The first is a synthesis of the perceptions of what other department chairs across the country have of your specific program. The second way is through the National Research Council which, among all metrics, has some areas that have connections with EDISJ including (a) years that it takes to graduate, (b) how diverse the program faculty are, and (c) how diverse your student body is. I further pressed Jay on what rankings do for doctoral students. He stated that job opportunities often correlate with rankings and “particularly the best students know that.” From Jay’s perspective, it would be more difficult for a graduate from a lower-ranked program to be hired at a higher-ranked program. Additionally, industrial recruiting cares about rankings, too. Jay knows that the “Top 100 companies tend to recruit mostly just from the Top 10 programs” so if you want a chance you have to find a way in yourself. While many are “rallying against rankings” Jay feels like “it is going to be very hard to change it ever.”

Similar to the department chair and administrator meaning well, the same sentiment is present within the academic community. Jay’s perspective is that “the majority of the academic community cares a lot about diversity and that it is not as representative as it should be.” He believes there are reasons for this lack of representation in which “some [reasons] might be systemic”. Further, Jay mentions that there are people that are aware of it but “we don’t have a solution yet… I mean we haven’t found a solution and I don’t know why.” The lack of solutions at the disciplinary level reflects the similar messages from the department as both have
awareness but are limited in their actions. The professional association has a committee for
diversity that Jay said would be the space to learn about EDISJ within the discipline. Jay
referenced specific subgroup committees and initiatives for women, Black STEM professionals,
and “a little bit on LGBT professionals.” According to the association, resources on inclusive
excellence, implicit bias, mentoring, and past symposium presentations serve as ways to
“advance” their discipline through EDISJ. At their latest conference, only one program was
focused on race in the disciplinary community, and half of the programs offered about women in
the disciplinary community were awards presentations. This left less than 10 programs total on
the experiences of or contributions from women in the discipline. Jay was not listed as having
any involvement with any of these sessions. A recent executive report was published with details
on advancing the PhD to adapt to the needs of a global world; the report focused on the need for
alternative career pathway training, examination on funding security for doctoral students, and
being realistic about the number of students that should be admitted into a program based on
institutional and departmental resources. Out of EDISJ, diversity was the most frequently
referenced which was operationalized to mean supporting the access and success of students that
reflect the regional, national, and international communities in which this discipline does its
work.

Ways Institutional and Disciplinary Logics Inform Behaviors Related to EDISJ

Institutional Priorities and Values

Overall, faculty loads were extremely “leadership dependent” meaning “priorities
changed completely when we went to new [institutional leadership]” except when it came to
EDISJ. The previous administration, according to Jay, was “very, very research oriented” and the
current administration is “very teaching and service oriented.” I followed up with Jay about how
the institutional leadership changed expectations around EDISJ. Jay said, “in terms of diversity and inclusion, I feel like there’s been much more stability in terms of our leadership caring about it.” Jay continued:

I feel like the higher you go in the chain of command the more people are aware of what the challenges are and what things we really need to prioritize which kind of makes sense. The chairs and provosts have experience. There’s a reason why the higher-ups get paid more.

While Jay seemed secure in how these higher-ups with more experience were prioritizing the challenges, it did not prevent him from experiencing issues from others in positions of power.

The topic of appropriate boundaries came up again when working with institutional leaders. For example, Jay attended a faculty training workshop where a facilitator was talking about conflict “as anything that went against current practice—the establishment.” The message that was coming across, according to Jay, was “if you disagreed with something you should just shut up and go with the flow.” Jay decided to speak up and said “I disagree with this. This is not being confrontational. This is just speaking up about stuff. Look at what’s happening in the country.” Jay told me that is seemed like others were a bit surprised “because they were telling us don’t speak up and I spoke up.” Someone else in the workshop did speak up to affirm Jay’s opinion which he appreciated.

When the Dean of the Graduate College offered those resources in terms of diversity and inclusion across the university to Directors of Graduate Education and his department did not respond, Jay brought it up because he was embarrassed by his department. However, Jay acknowledged:
but I’m not the director of graduate education, and there’s only so much that I can do. I brought it up. I brought it up again. For some people, they realize that we’re not as diverse as we should be. Or our competitors, they realize that we should be more diverse.

But when given the opportunity they missed out. It’s kind of frustrating

Jay even thinks that some individuals “have not adapted to the times” and unfortunately “the way that they are addressing it is exactly the way to mess it up.” Jay said he would not like to come off as confrontational because when he was pre-tenured he raised a concern like this and it came back to him later that this confrontation was seen as complaining about a colleague. He continued to share that sustaining collegiality is important because “you’re working together forever. So, you have to be very careful.”

Some successes have been realized. One example of institutional legitimacy and stability is in reference to the previously mentioned faculty training program, the one that taught Jay about biases during the evaluation of faculty candidates. Although spanning multiple institutional administrations, “it was NSF funded, it worked well, people liked it, and then the Provost institutionalized it.” The program has its own webpage with past research affiliates, resources for departments, and a recorded history of notable press releases and stories. Jay knowingly benefitted from this program that lasted across these multiple administrations. Referring back to the time when graduate students asked for the physical space to be made more visually welcoming, Jay shared that although he had some “dread in the moment” as he “thought it was going to be impossible to convince the chair, the administrator, and big wig faculty” he “was actually pleasantly surprised”. One of the senior faculty told him that they thought about addressing the issue a while ago but never did due to not having a good enough solution to the
problem. Jay helped find a solution that was possible by offering “straightforward” suggestions to administrative leaders.

**Disciplinary Influences and Scholarly Pursuits**

The department has a tradition of research which was seen impacting Jay’s time with students. To achieve tenure to associate or full professor, faculty in the Department of STEM are “expected to generate a reputation for yourself nationally and eventually internationally.” This STEM area is “very demanding” as Jay sees having higher standards than other departments. Jay referenced an applied, pure field of study that can raid their disciplinary knowledge for application in industry while Jay and his colleagues remain challenged to produce new knowledge from the lab. Jay was a bit frustrated that the scholars in this field of study have fewer publication requirements for tenure and get paid significantly more despite doing very similar work; he attributed it to the scarcity of scholars in that field versus the ample amount of scholars in his discipline. The National Science Foundation (NSF) also challenges Jay’s energy as they categorize knowledge as transformative or incremental; depending on how his research findings and implications play within the academic arena determines if Jay can get into the transformative disciplinary journals. Jay’s expectation is that even “incremental” results should be published to ensure he and his students get credit for the work they did. Although it’s not a majority opinion, Jay’s colleagues think that they should be more demanding of their students academically; Jay thinks that “this criticism could be used to improve things in general” and that “it’s healthy.” I asked if current expectations would prepare students for their own tenure aspirations, and he said, for the most successful students, their PhD experience should offer them enough opportunities to see what is required for original research. Jay showed support for research efforts overall in his discipline as they work towards improving people’s lives in areas like
sustainability and health. Jay feels that some of the issues in the country right now could be addressed by having a connection to “science and the scientific methods” pursued by academics in his discipline.

Through talking to Jay in the interviews and gathering documents (e.g. news releases, and faculty profiles), I started to recognize that Jay’s current research had some potential considering equity or justice in his work. I pursued this new presumption within a journaling question to see how Jay came to this research agenda. A key takeaway is how his response highlights both the impact of tenure and an awareness of inequality. Jay described his current research agenda as “a combination of things” with “all kinds of motivation.” He mentioned that after tenure “you have a bit more freedom in terms of exploring things that might or might not turn out as easily or with the same success as other things.” In response to “tragedy” events across the world, current industry practices around his area of study is “heavily regulated.” Therefore, Jay realized his [specialism] in STEM is best positioned to find out alternatives in consideration of environmental and economic scalability. He identified how his work could impact workers and “relatively poor regions” across multiple continents.

Jay has several experiences in the broader disciplinary community which offer some support for his beliefs. Nevertheless, Jay described that the discipline espouses “a very positive, very strong message of diversity and inclusion for the scientific community.” He thought he “could just go on, and on, and on” with examples but limited himself to only a few. Interestingly, Jay told a story about what this can look like in his discipline which shows some complexity to one’s motivation. For example, Jay organized a conference symposium and was told by a seasoned colleague to include “enough women and underrepresented people” to ensure funding and approval. Jay questioned this intention by mentioning, “maybe he was just telling me that
because he just wanted it to go through rather than because he thought that was the right thing to
do. I did it because of everything.” Jay has this belief that if you have enough people that care
about diversity then even those that don’t really want to care, do have to care. He said, “it’s not a
lofty way to go about things, but it works.” This summarizes some of Jay’s thoughts about how
there is a diversity of viewpoints in the discipline and that not everyone agrees on these diversity
and inclusion messages. He knows there’s outliers to those who try to support the “careers of
women and a bit of LGBT” professionals, but overall he’s seen a large amount of support. Jay is
correct about “a bit” on “LGBT”. At their latest conference, exactly one program was held
featuring mostly new or emerging “LGBT”-identified scholars’ research; over 15 subgroups
whether having an underrepresented population mission co-sponsored it within their
programming track. Jay was not listed as having any involvement with any of these sessions. He
doesn’t believe that anyone is telling these outliers to not value it, “it’s just individuals deciding
to focus on themselves.” Based on these examples in total, there seems to be opportunities to
incorporate EDISJ into the heavy research agenda of the department through the existing
scholarly priorities of the discipline to still reap the rewards of tenure to one day be one of the
“higher-ups” that determines the priority of challenges facing the university.

Lastly, Jay shared a fascinating example that connects scholarly pursuits, the prestige of
institutions, and the experiences of doctoral students together. Since Oakes University is a
research-intensive university, Jay mentioned the expectations “in terms of the number of
graduates, amount of research funding, and number of papers” is higher for them than other
types of institutions. However, he said the strictly based on research, the smaller schools are
“much more creative” because “people at the bigger schools tend to be extremely conservative.”
Jay supposed that Oakes University would not have hired a faculty member in a new line of
research 30 or 40 years ago because it wasn’t a “proven, established field.” Now that this field has had international recognition for some of the most innovative research, the smaller schools who have excelled at it are now considered prestigious and the bigger schools have hired faculty to do that work. When at national conferences, Jay seems faculty and graduates from these bigger schools as “stressed out, way more stressed out” and he perceives that they do not enjoy when smaller schools get recognition that the bigger schools think they don’t deserve. When Jay and his students present, some of the bigger schools give them this “small school” treatment as if they do not belong among the AAU universities. This frustrates Jay as he recognizes the strong traditions of Oakes University, but resolved it as “some people don’t know or don’t want to know.”

**Within-case Analysis**

Jay’s experience as a tenured faculty at Oakes University offers several insights into how he integrates equity, diversity, inclusion, and social justice (EDISJ) within his work in doctoral education and the role of institutional and disciplinary logics in his integration. The case summary showcases Oakes University as an institution where senior administration is aware of diversity and inclusion, and a disciplinary community that provides support for those that are also aware of the issues and opportunities of representation of diverse people. However, his department may not be demonstrating similar awareness or support as the institution and disciplinary community. Jay’s case demonstrates the nuanced relationship between one’s personal beliefs and professional expectations within a research-intensive environment. Overall, Jay’s integration presents four important areas for further analysis: (a) Jay’s overall agreement with the authority systems and structures of Oakes University; (b) his commitment to and congruence with the overall research endeavors of both department and university; (c) his
informality and reactionary tendencies of integrating EDISJ within his work in doctoral education despite espousing stronger personal hopes and beliefs; and (d) scattered connections with the calls for action within doctoral education.

**Following the Institutional Belief and Authority Systems**

As Friedland and Alford (1991) shared, logics are the belief systems and organizing principles that furnish guidelines for group and individual actions, and how authority is exercised within institutions. Jay has bought into the beliefs about diversity and inclusion, follows the authority systems at Oakes University, and responds accordingly within his own work. His definitions of diversity and inclusion offer an initial insight into his internalization of these beliefs. After he shared that diversity is a wealth of experiences, he went on to state the value of diversity by repeating the words of his college dean. Utilizing the words of an institutional leader to further his own ideas of diversity showcases the congruence between Jay and an institutional figure of power. Then as Jay defined inclusion, he said he “loved” the perspective from another senior administrator and said that their definition was “very clear.” Jay even described this as life changing for him. Social justice was more difficult to define, and no administrators were referenced in his definition; rather, he told two stories of the United States as examples of the issues around social justice.

Further agreement with Oakes University’s positioning around EDISJ is shown through the affective language found within the opening vignette. Jay seems to have a great deal of respect and admiration for the senior leadership of Oakes University. He referred to senior leadership as “higher-ups” and said that the higher you went in the “chain of command” the more aware people were of the “challenges” and “what things we need to prioritize.” Prior to his questioning of how his faculty role should consider EDISJ, he characterized his response to the
“higher-up university leaders” advice around teaching your expertise as “something that stuck with me, “I think it matters,” and “I think it’s true.” As Jay teaches graduate coursework infrequently, his advising of doctoral students provides almost all of his interactions with doctoral students. Realizing the hierarchy of Oakes University and characterizing university leaders as knowing what is best is what DiMaggio (1988) and Jackal (1988) meant by institutions remaining durable through constraining action and identities of actors. Jay shapes his own reality by giving credence that university leaders know best and know what to prioritize leading to limited tension or conflict. Even when these leaders’ advice caused Jay to share confusion about how his selection for diversity and inclusion initiatives could be labeled for teaching or supporting aspects of his job, he showed agreement and gave positive value to such advice. This ambiguity and struggling resulted in him sharing that he established for himself a standard on appropriateness to not overstep boundaries.

Jay’s ability to illustrate diversity and inclusion concerns within and outside doctoral education at Oakes University may be the result of what Twale and De Luca (2008) outlined as an organization legitimizing normative behaviors through approval or indifference. The approval would be diversity and inclusion of underrepresented groups while less frequently was the institution recommending action around justice. Jay primarily focused on gender and race when referencing topics of concern around EDISJ—which is no surprise as those two social identities were the focus on the NSF training initiatives at Oakes University (increasing numbers of underrepresented racial and ethnic identities, and women). Even the professional association largely focused on underrepresented populations as race and gender exclusively with no resources, but did have a subgroup on “LGBT scholars.” Though he had the information himself, Jay said for doctoral students to learn similar information about bias would be done at the
university or graduate college level, illustrating and preserving the centralization and formality of diversity and inclusion training at the institution. The same rationale was utilized as evidence for the suggested reason why an EDISJ course wouldn’t be offered in the department in the future. Jay consistently referred to information from the faculty candidate evaluation training as he responded to my questions about issues and opportunities around EDISJ in doctoral education. Even the concern to recruit of more diverse doctoral students into the discipline and including diverse people on the conference symposium were additional examples in how Jay may be influenced to focus on racial and gender identities.

Commitments to Research Endeavors

The convergence of a strong personal and community-wide commitment to research also impacts Jay’s integration of EDISJ within his work in doctoral education. Becher (1984) described academic cultures as a shared way of thinking and a collective way of behaving, and Oakes University has an academic culture focused on research. Additionally, Tierney and Rhoads (1994) showed that universities hire faculty with the assumption that they will espouse the same values as the institution to make it easier to uphold traditions and norms. Jay certainly mirrors a commitment to research. He also is under additional pressure for transformative knowledge and noticing the raids from an applied, pure field that gains more recognition and financial compensation for similar work than Jay’s STEM discipline. One of the first things I learned about Jay was that he enjoys teaching and “really, really, really likes research.” The use of “really” three times places an extra emphasis into why he wanted to become a faculty member and shows a good alignment between Oakes University and Jay.

Jay works in an organization in which multiple levels indicate a research-first focus. As Jay shared, “Oakes University is one of the founders of academic research in the country. We’re
an AAU institution, a research-intensive institution, we are not a small place.” His professional association touts their prestigious journals due to their rigorous standards for scholarship. He continues talking about the department level standards that operate “at the PhD level, a PhD granting research-oriented department.” The research produced through this discipline generally does not relate to EDISJ and rather focuses on the development of new processes, innovative research designs, and investigations into scalability, energy efficiencies, and material properties. Even with highlighting the teaching expectations in the department at-large, Jay reinforced “we’re still a research department.” Lastly, the PhD is focused on equipping students to “create new knowledge”—another example of a research focus. This is congruent with why Jay estimated that during one-on-one meetings “95% of the time conversation and the whole discussion is about the research for the PhD;” he is fully emerged into a disciplinary environment that has a high degree of consensus on what the purpose of their existence is. This 95% focus on research does not seem to be complementary with having social issues “always in mind” as Jay said he does. Productivity at research-intensive schools is valued and thus rewarded through tenure (Becher & Trowler, 2001; Tierney & Rhoads, 1994). As Jay shared, to achieve tenure to associate or full professor, faculty in the Department of STEM are “expected to generate a reputation for yourself nationally and eventually internationally” and their department is under higher standards than other departments. This further informs Jay towards conformity as there exists greater pressure for success (Oliver, 1991).

**Informal and Reactionary Integration**

Jay’s personal beliefs about wanting to successfully educate people about empathy, have his advisees care about their community after their PhD, and being awarded for his community outreach to diverse populations seems a bit scattered within his faculty role. From all that I’ve
learned about Jay, his idea that “you don’t have to be personally offended to recognize that other groups are getting the shorter end of the stick and don’t get social justice” speaks the truest representation of him personally. By experiencing discrimination immediately after coming to the United States Jay desires to support other identities, just like he did when one of his students was made fun of about their religious identity, and how he “felt bad” that he didn’t speak up about his colleagues making fun of another faculty member. However, he seems to block or filter personal beliefs into his professional practice in doctoral education. In particular, I would characterize Jay’s integration of EDISJ as informal and reactionary due to the conflict that can arise when there is a mismatch between personal beliefs and professional expectations (Becher & Trowler, 2001; Tierney & Rhoads, 1994; Twale & De Luca, 2008).

As doctoral advising is often viewed as an independent, solitary, and isolated training between only a master and apprentice (Barnes, Williams, & Stassen, 2012), Jay should feel the greatest amount of freedom to integrate EDISJ within his advising. However, that doesn’t appear to be the case. Jay was clear on a boundary as influenced by that idea that you are “protected as long as what you’re teaching has to do with your area of expertise.” Jay’s “every now and then” approach to incorporating EDISJ into one-on-one and research group advising is bound by feelings that “you can only do so much”, “don’t want to push too hard”, and “I might raise the issue but not to the point of making them uncomfortable.” Although he provides “space for people to talk about [social] issues,” he characterized it as informal conversation as part of a larger conversation. Jay doesn’t always introduce the topics but doctoral students do as well as part of the “random stuff” people may talk about in a meeting. He hopes these informal conversations that pop up impact his students in the long term—probably as a result of his hope for people who have empathy in the future. While I heard about these boundaries generally, I
didn’t hear Jay talk about discomfort or boundaries specifically when the focus on the one-on-one or team meetings were about research. The former is predominately about the research that is going to be part of their dissertation, and the latter helps prepare advisees for presentations outside the meeting or for those headed to their preliminary exam.

Another filtering influence is Jay’s concern about the importance of sustaining collegiality as a tenured faculty because as he understands it, “you’re working together forever.” The promotion and tenure acts as both a formal but also ambiguous process keeping new faculty stuck between disciplinary cultural values and performance standards (Becher & Trowler, 2001). He was frustrated that the director of graduate education within the department did not accept the Graduate College’s offering of diversity and inclusion resources; however, after bringing it up, said there’s “only so much I can do” showcasing another example of boundaries. Currently, Jay thinks that some individuals “have not adapted to the times” and unfortunately “the way that they are addressing [EDISJ topics] is exactly the way to mess it up.” Jay said he would not like to come off as confrontational due to a pre-tenured experience where he was seen as confrontational. Jay knows there have been negative consequences and it hoping those that “mean well” will come up with better solutions that currently are not developed.

Becher (1984) shared that some faculty see their disciplinary efforts as apolitical and value-free, while others may see their discipline being influenced from scholar’s positionality and self-expression. Jay situates informal integration through an instrumental movement which are acts situated within conflict that seek to redress injustice, challenge structures, or strive for new policies (Rao et al., 2003). As mentioned previously, Jay’s attempts to add EDISJ into the structures such as advising or departmental training leads him to share, “I feel like I’m taking risks in order to include it… I’m someone who is very open about these things.” However, when
it’s reactionary there doesn’t seem to be as much risk allowing for a stronger instrumental movement. For example, he shared that “every now and then” students send e-mails to all department faculty to “show up” and “come to our discussion” around EDISJ; Jay is one of those faculty members that will show up. In reference to the moment during the research team meeting where the student was made fun of about their religious identity, Jay reacted to prevent further discrimination utilizing a “situation of power.” When graduate students from the department told him the physical space wasn’t visually welcoming, Jay thought, “it makes total sense… yeah, we should change it.” Although he expressed dread that administrators weren’t going to be convinced to change the physical space, it exemplifies a break in the filter between personal beliefs and professional expectations. Another break in the filter is Jay’s community work with diverse young people to generate their academic interests in STEM. These spaces illustrate unique circumstances where Jay enacts his recognition that “other groups are getting the shorter end of the stick” through his faculty role to address some of EDISJ topics within his disciplinary and institutional community.

**Addressing Multiple Calls to Action**

Overall, Jay’s awareness of EDISJ integration within his work situates around only a few components of concern for doctoral education. Jay knows the department does not compete with the Top 5 or Top 10 programs, and a greater representation of underrepresented students within their PhD program would positively contribute to their programmatic rankings. He mentioned that folks are interested in improving the diversity of the admissions applicant pool but haven’t made any significant differences yet. He said there’s a lack of solutions right now and that they haven’t figured it out. As mentioned before, advising is a critical aspect of doctoral student success. Jay offers time “every now and then” to talk about non-research activities which is
supported by Gardner and Mendoza (2010) who showed that advisers who show care beyond admission and dissertation processes have students who persist to degree completion at greater rates. Jay does not appear to be aware as an adviser of any discriminatory practices within the department that would create a chilly climate (Sallee, 2001), but he did speak against a microaggression occurring in front of him during a research team meeting. He sees multiple academic paths as appropriate beyond a tenure-track position at a research-intensive university and shows no signs of two-track advising his domestic or international students in either direction (Cassuto, 2016). Jay makes no comment about other doctoral education improvements around time-to-degree completion (Bok, 2013), financial burdens (Golde, 2005), overspecialization of coursework, or outdated expectations around the dissertation (Cassuto, 2016).

In summary, Jay’s case gives nuance to relationship between one’s personal beliefs and professional expectations within a research-intensive environment. The sense of protection offered to those who stay within their academic expertise seems to be the biggest influence into his integration of EDISJ. Jay possesses a wealth of important personal and professional experiences that currently benefit his advisees and has been recognized for his diversity and inclusion work outside the university. Focusing on representation of underrepresented racial and gender identities is a strong aspect of Jay’s mindfulness. He shows interest in achieving those goals through the admissions process; however, Jay is not the director of graduate education nor the department chair which limits his influence. He utilizes his personal recognition of discrimination to address conflicts within informal or reactionary manners while preserving collegiality within formal processes or new possibilities within the PhD program.
Concluding Vignette

When I hear all that Jay had to say, it is evident and clear that he wants to act in a way that integrates EDISJ into doctoral education. He is a believer that the PhD program appropriately prepares students with advanced research skills and experiences and the institution has current support structures for student learning around EDISJ, and trusts in the awareness of institutional leadership about diversity and inclusion topics. He experiences tension in the difficulties of the department to recruit and retain underrepresented faculty in the current political climate. Jay seems to have developed a more socially-conscious research team of doctoral students and thinks that social issues or personal experiences of his students have a space within his work across doctoral education. The last thing Jay told me when we were finishing our final interview together is written below which offers support for this claim and overall hopes for a greater connection between research-intensive expectations and hope for a more diverse and empathic scholarly community.

“...And I mean, do we know that these are difficult times, right? Why would people ever separate a little three-year old from their parents, right? I mean that’s just [a] lack of empathy. And during these times, there are people that end up in the positions where they make those decisions [who] are educated people that went to a university. So, if we are more successful in educating people about empathy, rather than just the hard sciences or knowledge, we have a better chance of not repeating those mistakes. So that’s what has been on my mind.”
CHAPTER 6. CROSS-CASE DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In this section, I provide a cross-case discussion to compare Jay’s and Alicia’s cases. In doing so, I strive to illicit convergent and divergent patterns to further analyze their cases (Yin, 2017). Initially, I reflect how doctoral education can be viewed differently within one’s involvement in higher education and the implications of those differences. I then detail parts of institutional and disciplinary logics that became significant aspects for my analysis. Convergent and divergent patterns are presented between the two cases. After, I discuss limitations of the study, contributions to the literature, and offer implications for practice from the within-case and cross-case analyses. Lastly, I suggest future research directions to continue this study’s research agenda and emergent topics of interest.

**How Doctoral Education is Viewed**

The data collection and analysis processes taught me about how areas of doctoral education enter the work that faculty do—which was different from my positionality as the researcher as a current doctoral candidate. In particular, doctoral education as a standalone process is rare and more commonly connected within graduate education broadly or as part of wider impact responsibilities like teaching or institutional service. After data collection, I started reading through the interview transcripts for anything interesting and relevant I wanted to generally capture. Through the process of reading our conversations multiple times, I realized that finding easily contained experiences about their work in doctoral education was not as straightforward as initially projected. For example, I would ask about potential programmatic changes for their doctoral advisees and would get stories about both undergraduate and graduate teaching loads. Further, if I asked about how doctoral students could learn about EDISJ at Oakes University, I would get responses about events that all students, staff, and faculty could attend or a graduate class that was open to undergraduate and master’s students, too. I had learned through
data analysis that my approach to doctoral education was a bit different than where my
participants viewed it. Every space I enter, whether it is as a researcher for this study, as a
doctoral candidate in a PhD program, or research assistant, is predominately viewed through my
doctoral student status. I gain experiences and knowledge within the university community that
directly impacts my abilities to work through programmatic milestones or help with future goals
after the PhD. I knew that a common occurrence in the literature was to name it graduate
education when talking about doctoral education but did not previously realize the greater
meaning behind its interrelatedness across faculty responsibilities.

This lesson learned about doctoral education within the larger work of faculty produces
two perspectives for discussion. First, what becomes important when discussing the two cases
collectively is the strength that one-on-one advising, doctoral student admissions, and future
career placements have for examining doctoral education without fear of the convergence of
broader responsibilities or competing purposes. Also, not only is it difficult to find standalone
doctoral education spaces, but in terms of their overall responsibilities it is a small percentage of
their time per week. If we look at Jay, a third of his time is teaching which covers teaching
weekly, any course preparation, grading, talking to undergraduate teaching assistants, mentoring
and advising of students, and supervision of research and internship experiences. If Jay worked a
normal 40-hour work week, just over 13 hours per week would be dedicated to his several
graduate students, and his undergraduate or graduate course per semester (each class is weighed
at about 10% according to Oakes University). Although faculty are working more hours than the
normative 40 hours for a full-time job, it still shows how far and widely spread Jay’s work is
within a typical week to be able to focus on doctoral education. Once again, while every hour of
my day is classified as part of the doctoral student process, not every hour of Jay’s day or week is for doctoral education.

The institution does lead faculty towards a blending of multiple purposes between doctoral education and other responsibilities as they have directors of *graduate* education, and even a *Graduate* College; the naming specifies a combination of educational purposes because it’s not a director of doctoral education, a Doctoral College, or a Master’s College. The nature of the advanced degree supersedes the differences between the types of advanced degrees and certificates offered. Both Jay and Alicia respond accordingly to the department’s need for teaching across all forms of their education, and their service roles extend to include but also beyond doctoral education contexts. This study highlights the importance of studying individual motivations or behaviors within advising and the recruitment of students, and research agendas as compared examining calls for action around programmatic changes at the program or department level of analysis.

**Institutional and Disciplinary Logics as Analytical Frameworks**

As mentioned previously, this analysis of Jay’s and Alicia’s cases were driven by the use of institutional logics and disciplinary logics. Of upmost importance for developing a deeper understanding into the participants’ lives, I leaned into the perspective that organizations seek stability, predictability, and legitimacy, and are interest driven as they seek to survive (Oliver, 1991). I also prioritized Twale and De Luca (2008) as they shared that through approval or indifference behaviors become legitimizied by the institution and become more self-regulated and normative by faculty. I focused on Thornton and Ocasio’s (1999) three mechanisms of institutional logics: (a) how power is exercised, (b) how they control behavior, and (c) how they shape appropriate responses (which I operationalized as shaping reality). Regarding disciplinary
logics, Becher (1984) argued academic cultures owe their very existence to a common form of pursuits and epistemological considerations. These common pursuits give the disciplinary community a sense of power. The literature was quite consistent about the significant importance that tenure has within the institution (Bok, 2013; Cassuto, 2016, Tierney & Rhoads, 1994, Twale & De Luca, 2008). Within this study, tenure was a valuable example of how the borderlands of the pursuits of new disciplinary knowledge and how disciplinary communities organize within higher education institutions are connected. Tenure helps communicate the primary message in how to succeed as a faculty member, outlines the rituals for access to power, and supports greater freedom of academic pursuits (Bok, 2013; Cassuto, 2016; Tierney & Rhoads, 1994). In terms of shaping the appropriateness of one’s work, I utilized teaching, research, and service (Metzger, 1987; Tierney & Rhoads, 1994) as the larger categories shaping behavior within informal and formal policies, rules, and decision-making committees (Becher & Trowler, 2001; Tierney & Rhoads, 1994).

**Patterns Across the Cases**

The Department of STEM and the Department of Social Science provided the two spaces within Oakes University to further explore the influence of institutional and disciplinary logics into the work with doctoral education. This study was framed around the idea that disciplinary communities may convey EDISJ as core or peripheral values and therefore have different approaches to integration within their work. The Department of Social Science was chosen as the core value community while the Department of STEM was the peripheral value community based on surveying their publicly available documents such as the mission statements of the PhD program, course catalogs, and faculty profiles. However, after the data collection and analysis processes, I believe the differentiation between these two academic communities and their work
around doctoral education to be attributed to more than just a disciplinary influence. As Tierney & Rhoads (1994) characterized, academic cultures are the interplay between five sociological forces: (a) national, (b) professional, (c) disciplinary, (d) individual, and (e) institutional.

Furthermore, Becher and Trowler (2001) distinguished the interaction between the individual and their colleagues, environment, and work as a vital aspect on how professional attitudes and values are gradually shaped towards “codes of practice” and higher levels of “membership” (p. 48). Although the mission statement, course catalogs, and faculty profiles gave insight into differentiating the two programs from each other through a disciplinary perspective (i.e. different influences from the disciplinary force), the subsequent converging and diverging patterns between the two cases are best rationalized through the remaining four forces.

**National**

The social science and STEM disciplines within these cases differ across Becher and Trowler’s (2001) categorization of disciplinary communities through the areas of the “object of inquiry, the nature of knowledge growth, the relationship between researcher and knowledge,… and the results of research” (p.36); nevertheless, they both are influenced by national forces. The national force stems from the overall culture of society and influences what societal problems are important to address (Tierney & Rhoads, 1994). These priorities are within the socialization process where PhD graduates are expected to develop the skills necessary for doing research that is valued in the academic arena (Rutz, 2008; Weidman, 2006). Valuable research also serves to legitimize standards of quality and practices within disciplinary communities (Posselt, 2016). It is unsurprising for both participants to identify research topics with direct interest to society and industry partners alike. Jay characterizes his STEM community as having many people who care about the “grand challenges” like sustainability and improving health, and recognizes the
positive and negative impact their work has had globally. He goes on to say that the academic community shares a very positive, very strong message of diversity and inclusion. Alicia describes her field focusing on similar areas of concern like sustainability, labor practices, and gender inequality. Both have racial, gender, and sexual identity representation issues within their communities. They also witnessed various levels of consideration of EDISJ within presentations. Additional examples included Jay sharing that there’s “a large amount of support” for the career development of underrepresented scholars, and Alicia sharing that “a lot” of scholars focus on different types of inequalities across race, environment, labor, and social issues. Concurrent to this widespread awareness, it is likely differences persist within and between disciplinary communities in how EDISJ is foregrounded or backgrounded with research agendas due to methodological differences (Carspecken, 2012). This methodological understanding would explain the differences that faculty colleagues had on whether they considered EDISJ in their work when they simultaneously may have been engaging in topics connected to EDISJ.

**Professional**

The full potential of the tenure and promotion process as a reward system and as a ritual for allocating power is consistent across both cases depicting the influence of the professional force (Tierney & Rhoads, 1994). It is expected that students who graduate with a PhD have, to some degree, self-regulated across behaviors and mindsets to department norms making it easier on the higher education hiring unit to reward and persist the norms of their culture (Golde, 2005; Lovitts, 2001). Alicia, within her pre-tenured status, described issues of speaking up too much, withholding comments about colleagues unless very problematic, and the grey areas around the tenure process both in the department voting process and the institution. It appears the microaggressions towards doctoral students may be one part of the larger set of issues Alicia
described. Jay did not speak up to defend a colleague while a pre-tenured faculty member with his more senior faculty colleagues because he was at the bottom of the pyramid. Now that Jay has earned tenure, he still articulated that sustaining collegiality is important because “you’re working together forever. So, you have to be very careful.” Tenure’s impact on this everlasting collegiality may not stop Jay or Alicia from behaving a particular way, but it creates a filter that at least impedes judgment if just for a moment.

Another clear commonality under the impact of tenure was the amount that you can influence other colleagues to do something. Tenured professor Jay unsuccessfully “brought up” interest to accept the invitation from the Graduate College to the director of graduate education in the department; after the department declined, Jay said “there’s only so much I can do.” From Alicia’s perspective, even the department chair has limits when advocating for EDISJ. She shared, “you can’t force the faculty to do too much. You have to motivate them, and they are tenured.” Limits to what seems possible around the conventions of tenure also emerged as exemplified as boundaries within both cases. For Alicia, she sets boundaries to maximize her time towards both the university’s priority for research and her professional approach in advising. Alicia talked about not going over on service, and encouraged students to be mindful about their own overcommitments to professional association involvement. Jay’s boundaries rise from the understanding that he was hired to research and teach STEM. That opening vignette for Jay offers deliberation into what exactly he was originally hired to do and how his current service role institutionally can or should relate to his original faculty responsibilities and expectations. He has some amount of academic freedom as an expert in STEM to talk STEM but he valued the legal opinion that it’s important to be aware of the consequences if you drift out of your scholarly expertise.
Disciplinary

I steeped over the complexity of disciplinary logics from both cases and utilized peer debrief to situate some tension around this force as it intersects through multiple social and organizational structures. Jay’s need for cumulative knowledge contributions within STEM differs from Alicia’s scholarly expectation for applied knowledge within the multidisciplinary Social Science. Therefore, as Jay finds additional pressure from raiding parties of his knowledge, Alicia and her students remain uniquely positioned to make novel and innovative contributions. Jay’s community is striving for large NSF grants of hundreds of thousands of dollars. Not only does the NSF provide funding to continue research agendas in STEM, but they also are markers for the value of knowledge (i.e. transformative or incremental knowledge) (Labaree, 2004). Meanwhile, Alicia’s own scholarly pursuits have not resulted in large or government grant applications. Interestingly, the outstanding scholarship and exemplar faculty award recipients in her field of study had biographies that detailed their garnering of over a million dollars in grants; these individuals are part of the same fractured field of study Alicia told me about that pursued hard sciences for the access to grant funds.

Jay and Alicia’s professional organizations, academic colleges, and departments are interested in increasing the numbers of underrepresented populations, almost exclusively focusing on gender and race. The way this is operationalized through the discipline or field of study is another difference between the two cases. First, Alicia’s avenues for presenting research at her associations come with six explicit knowledge areas beyond any subgroup affiliation that support a critical or foregrounded approach of EDISJ topics, issues, and opportunities. For Jay, his association has one topic, the environment, that supports an extensive formal and foregrounded (Carspecken, 2012) structure for research dissemination. Within their disciplinary
course offerings, we see no EDISJ course content within Jay’s discipline as the focus on the environment has not necessitated a new, formal course within the department. For Alicia, we see multiple elective, not core, courses taught exclusively by her. This is an important distinguish that parallel’s Becher and Trowler’s (2001) understanding that disciplines are a combination of both the disciplinary knowledge and the knowledge communities; individuals or their groupings do not lose their own taken-for-granted habits or values due to their participation within social and cultural structures (Abbott, 2001). So in their own ways, Jay’s disciplinary community organized within Oakes University does not reflect their professional association and community values, and Alicia’s field of study relies on her to support an alignment of values from the national and international levels back down to their organization under Oakes University.

Therefore, this important takeaway across the cases illustrates variable impact of the disciplinary force onto EDISJ and doctoral education both separately and concurrently. As Golde et al. (2006), through the Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate, characterized doctoral education as a means to develop *stewards of the discipline*—“someone who can imaginatively generate new knowledge, critically conserve valuable and useful ideas, and responsibly transform those understandings through writing, teaching, and application” (p.73), the consistency across both cases for doctoral education to advance knowledge and research is quite unsurprising. Both disciplinary communities as a whole and by individual actors reward and support scholarly awards for rising scholars, doctoral research assistantships, travel scholarships, research teams, and doctoral courses towards the specific advancement of research and acquisition of disciplinary knowledge. Both cases tell us that the disciplinary force does influence doctoral education and topics around EDISJ. For example, as both disciplinary communities consider underrepresented members as a strategic priority, we see that reflected in recruitment efforts
departmentally and institutionally through pipeline programs or financial support leveraged by the department. As Alicia’s community has a greater saliency of EDISJ topics, it is also unsurprising that graduate students would be offered the opportunity to formally learn through coursework connected to EDISJ.

Overall, the influence of the disciplinary force, in these cases, sets the boundaries for the personality, character, habits of mind and heart, and general scholarly dispositions of their disciplinary community (Golde et al., 2006). We can see that Jay’s encouragement to publish even incremental results with his students is related to the high levels of performance competition in the disciplinary community. His colleagues connect academic rigor and the lack of students failing with criticism that perhaps the demands on students to be experts in their field could be strengthened. Alicia shows concern for the connection between some disciplinary pursuits that do not yield high value in the marketplace and its direction connection therefore on the experiences and time-to-degree completion for students. Both cases show the disciplinary communities supporting students through multiple career paths rather than just tenure-track faculty positions at research universities (Cassuto, 2016). These two cases best demonstrate how the disciplinary force continues to stabilize the mission of doctoral education and how it addresses some, but not all, areas related to EDISJ as forms of action, values, or content.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sociological Forces</th>
<th>General Theme</th>
<th>Select Example from Jay’s Case</th>
<th>Select Example from Alicia’s Case</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>Disciplinary research with direct interest to society and industry</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; health Have to move from just “calling up an old buddy from grad school to send his best student to apply”</td>
<td>Sustainability, racial discrimination, labor practices, and gender inequality [if] everybody would be actively recruiting students of color, gay students, [and] students with different abilities…We’d all be doing it. It doesn’t seem to be a core value because we don’t talk about it all the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Representation opportunities across race and gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>Participants set boundaries to remain a level of professional around confrontation</td>
<td>Now that Jay has earned tenure, sustaining collegiality is important because “you’re working together forever. So, you have to be very careful.”</td>
<td>Alicia described issues of speaking up too much, withholding comments about colleagues unless very problematic, and the grey areas around the tenure process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplinary</td>
<td>NSF grants as a value for scholarship</td>
<td>Jay has pressure to publish incremental results with doctoral students</td>
<td>Alicia and her students remain uniquely positioned to make novel and innovative contributions which vary in value for industry careers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Course offerings as an example of the potential disconnects between disciplinary knowledge and knowledge communities’ offering courses on topics with a range of connections to EDISJ</td>
<td>No courses offered related to EDISJ that the disciplinary community researches</td>
<td>Alicia is the only faculty member teaching EDISJ courses. Limited by teaching load to teach more topics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Personal experiences before, during, and after the PhD continue to provide influence behavior</td>
<td>Jay acknowledged he used experiences of discrimination as a catalyst to do educational outreach. He has learned to support other marginalized identities outside of his own</td>
<td>Alicia noted “two big life experiences” by her second year of the PhD which she referenced in how people need personal experiences to make them angry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>University programs show support for underrepresented doctoral students and faculty professional development</td>
<td>University offers EDISJ development for faculty and students</td>
<td>University has funds for supporting diverse students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership priorities are ambiguous</td>
<td>Jay is unsure teaching expertise protection includes EDISJ, but was selected to do service after tenure</td>
<td>Alicia was hired to teach diversity to students. Institutional EDISJ service has limited return</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Individual

A similarity across the cases is the role that personal experiences have within their integration depicting the influence of the individual force (Tierney & Rhoads, 1994). Personal experiences and worldviews come with students as they start their PhD program and encounter some type of (re)learning process due to the expectations of socializing into the professional community (Gardner, 2007; Golde, 2005). Lovitts (2001) and Gardner (2007) described clearly though that these personal experiences do not disappear once admitted but rather are leveraged to navigate the challenges and standards within socialization processes. Therefore, these personal experiences before, during, and after the PhD continue to provide influence into their future faculty positions—as seen in both cases.

Experiences and personal understanding of difference and discrimination are significant contributions they both bring to their faculty roles. Alicia noted those “two big life experiences” by her second year of the PhD which she used as an example when referencing how people need personal experiences to make them angry. She feels that it is her responsibility in life, not just within her capacity within her doctoral education work, to integrate EDISJ. Jay acknowledged he used experiences of discrimination as a catalyst to do educational outreach to diverse young people to generate their academic interests. From these personal experiences he has learned to support other marginalized identities outside of his own because “you don’t have to be personally offended to recognize that other groups are getting the shorter end of the stick;” this is also the reason he wants to teach others empathy beyond theoretical knowledge. Neither of them does the work though for awards—they have stronger motivations. For Alicia, graduate level preparation and research agendas supplement her personal beliefs towards integrating EDISJ. For Jay, his institutional service around EDISJ supplements the decades of personal convictions he
has about not waiting to get personally offended to understand other perspectives and experiences. Both participants have deep, personal interests which then permeate into the work with doctoral education.

A divergent pattern is seen between the cases within doctoral student advising. Overall, Alicia’s case did not yield a single constraint into how she advises students. She sought out funding that was not necessarily known, she utilized her faculty position to place students into assistantship roles, supports a number of career paths, and anticipates that anyone who works with her will have some type of critical approach within their dissertation. Alicia’s tension comes from outside her advising such as the amount of personal influence you can have into programmatic curricular changes, the treatment of minoritized students across the program, and the burdens that come with being the instructor for current (and future) diversity courses. Jay feels like he is taking risks in his advising and is concerned about pushing too hard and making students uncomfortable by raising contemporary social issues. His appropriate boundary setting considers social issues to the extent he feels it possible. He takes a more informal and reactionary stance towards the social issues in his research meetings. Jay comes across as having a greater focus onto the research endeavors within his lab and students’ dissertation work.

A second difference emerges within how their individual experiences are expressed through the language they utilized around EDISJ integration. I find Alicia’s approach to EDISJ to employ more action-based vocabulary than Jay’s empathy-based language. For example, Alicia’s first and most important hope for her students is that they are “critically informed individuals” who know where knowledge comes from, and how to utilize it to have effective conversations. Alicia emphasizes the doing part of EDISJ. She says, “it’s good” that diversity awards exist, but that there “shouldn’t be an award, we should all be doing it.” A core value is
something that “we’d all be doing” and something we talk about “all the time.” In the opening vignette, she mentions that being informed is not easy to do because “not a lot of people put in the time” to be informed due to a disconnection with their research. Jay situates his approach in a more care or empathy perspective. Although Jay doesn’t talk about EDISJ all the time, it is “always in mind.” He wants his advisees to “care” about diversity and the marginalized. The academic community is described as a majority “[caring] a lot about diversity.” The limitations of the department chair or others in the department were hedged with language such as “they mean well” indicating a care or concern mindset. Even the institutional leaders are depicted as being more consistent regarding the care they espouse for EDISJ compared to the fluctuating priorities within research or teaching expectations during administration changes. The ending vignette for Jay showcases his hope that if we can teach more people “about empathy” then the repetition of social problems may stop. Although Jay and Alicia do have many similar experiences with meeting the research expectations of the university, feeling the impact of tenure, and having a personal commitment to EDISJ—a primary difference is Alicia’s action-based versus Jay’s care-based language.

Institutional

Socialization is seen as ongoing through experiences with various institutional processes, traditions, relationships, and rules that govern the culture— influencing both new and seasoned faculty (Becher & Trowler, 2001; Lovitts, 2001; Tierney & Rhoads, 1994). The value of studying two faculty within two different departments but at the same institution is the ability to see how the institutional force (Tierney & Rhoads, 1994) influences their disciplinary communities. Looking across both cases collectively depicts how Oakes University’s values permeate and find their way through the organizational layers. As mentioned previously, Oakes
University has several diversity and inclusion roles and systems in place that offer clearer interpretations on where and how EDISJ are enacted within the university. They recently created a Vice President of Diversity and Inclusion role overseeing a division of diversity and inclusion connecting across staff, faculty, alumni, and community spaces. They have developed reach through steering committees, action groups, and identity-based associations for inclusion training and support. As Jay mentioned, the university has a training on how to minimize bias during faculty recruitment. Alicia showcased the prevalence of institutional financial support for racially and ethnically underrepresented graduate students. Work out of the Provost’s office and Graduate College further demonstrate the legitimized conventions for teaching of diversity and inclusion skills as part of professional development for students, staff, and faculty. Both Jay and Alicia communicated positively that these latter two spaces in particular were implementing positive and quality work.

Both Alicia’s and Jay’s academic colleges and departments continue to show similarities. At the academic college level, both colleges that house their departments visibly demonstrate diversity and inclusion as priorities within their missions, visions, and strategic priorities. Alicia’s college goes a bit further by sharing equity and justice as goals as well, which is not seen within Jay’s college. Both colleges showcase this priority while serving all types of applied, pure, hard, and soft disciplinary pursuits (Becher & Trowler, 2001). Additional commonalities are seen through the mission statement for their PhD in STEM and the PhD in Social Science as they both strive to have students advance or create new knowledge that address societal problems with their disciplinary skills and topics. This aligns well with the AAU membership and priorities of a research-intensive university.
Several unconnected differences emerge within their approach to EDISJ integration. Alicia was clear that she was hired within a formal role to teach diversity to both undergraduate and graduate students. She is cautious with her institutional diversity and inclusion service due to its limited return on investment for earning tenure. In comparison, Jay knew it was his service role to practice diversity and inclusion which he was selected to do. For Jay, he showed concern with how to best integrate within his teaching role, which was operationalized to him as graduate advising during the study. Another difference is how senior administrators at Oakes University are portrayed. Alicia is certain that the current priority of Oakes University is research and that is also what is talked about most by leadership. In comparison, Jay feels that current leadership is much more teaching and service oriented as compared to the previous administration which was heavily research focused. Both Alicia and Jay experienced the same transition to a new President but described how EDISJ shows up institutionally a bit differently. Jay does have more access to higher levels of organizational leadership; Alicia mentioned she did not feel the impact from the current president, but knew the past leader had “problems in that area.” These differences illustrate the ambiguities and contradictions that occur throughout organizational operations and how prevailing logics vary in stability (Rao et al., 2003; Suddaby & Greenwood, 2005; Townley, 1997).

**Limitations**

Three limitations of this study are important for further discussion. First, no direct observations were conducted as part of the methodological investigation into participants’ integration within their work in doctoral education. Both participants had active research teams that would have served as a primary spot for witnessing doctoral student interaction and considerations of doctoral education. Yin (2017) designated direct observation as one of the three
potential methods to utilize for case study investigation. Direct observation is considered an ideal method for determining what actually is practiced or performed by the participant in comparison to what is stated in an interview (Stake, 1995). Finally, these observations could have provided a good record of incontestable descriptions (Stake, 1995, p. 62) of the case for further analysis.

A second limitation of the study comes from the focus onto the individual faculty member as the unit of analysis for case study methodology. This unit of analysis offered opportunity to gain greater understanding of individual aspects of doctoral education, such as doctoral advising. However, it limits understanding several other parts of doctoral education that are mediated through collective decision processes. Examining curricular changes to programmatic milestones or deciding the admissions status of student applicants would require studying multiple faculty members within the same department or considering the graduate faculty of the department as the unit of analysis.

A final limitation is the nature of self-reported data as part of the data collection process. Information that could not be verified through multiple data points could have a selective bias within the reporting (Connelly, 2013). Participants may have shared information regarding past experiences with colleagues, the institution, or the disciplinary community that would have required further corroboration had observational data or document contested this description. As part of the initial institutional review board request, a social and psychological risk was identified as participants, through their disclosure of stories and experiences, may have experienced unsettling awareness about their knowledge and attitudes around equity, diversity, inclusion, and social justice. Participants in this study, or elsewhere, may perform to a higher standard around these topics to avoid being seen as unaware, inactive, or discriminatory.
Contributions to the Literature

This case study provides ample evidence to support past literature across graduate education and faculty socialization literature; in addition, the descriptive and analytic summaries within and between the cases also give insight into the individual level of faculty work in doctoral education. Although much of the literature cited in this study can be found within examples from the descriptive cases summaries, I will focus on what I consider significant, rather than incremental, contributions. This study showcases that indeed most discussions on higher education diversity focuses heavily on structural diversity that focuses on number counts over the actual experiences of students and faculty (Bender, 2006). Even the professional associations focused on increasing numbers of underrepresented members. This contribution shows a need to differentiate between the top-down influences around diversity and inclusion versus individual experiences and hopes that, in this case, illustrated a wider range of connections to EDISJ.

For both Alicia and Jay, their cases confirm the importance of considering admissions decisions, non-assistantship financial support, and requirements for degree completing as deeply determined by department faculty. For example, Posselt’s (2016) scholarship on graduate admissions committees should be considered categorically different than Noy & Ray’s (2012) study on the impacts on the adviser-student relationship. When asking for examples about EDISJ at the department level, five out of six elements that impact stages of doctoral student socialization were discussed as current considerations by both participants or aspects of interest by the department. Specifically, these elements are advising and adviser selection, financial support, coursework and examination, teaching assistantships, and time-to-degree completion; only annual reviews were not discussed (Golde & Dore, 2001). Beyond their faculty
responsibilities, both cases support the idea that faculty interact within the socialization process along a spectrum of alignment of old values towards institutional norms (Golde, 2005; Lovitts, 2001). For Alicia and Jay, they both carried personal experiences about discrimination and difference within them into their faculty roles which informed much of their thinking about their role and responsibility to integrate EDISJ within their work. They both self-regulated behaviors to match the most important value at Oakes University, research, with no mention of tension or unrest on why that was the primary value of the institution (Golde, 2005; Lovitts, 2001; Tierney & Rhoads, 1994). Tension did emerge around lesser valued or more ambiguous aspects such as teaching and service which aligns with understanding around how conflict emerges in organizations (Suddaby & Greenwood, 2005).

Alicia’s case and Jay’s case provide support separately for four areas of previous literature. First, Alicia’s case illustrates the burden on underrepresented faculty to create supportive environments (Gardner & Mendoza, 2010). Literature around who is selected to teach or serve remains vitally important for tenure expectations. This may mean that faculty are influenced to integrate EDISJ due to institutional expectations of their racial or gender identities. Second, she also highlights that inclusion through program admissions can come from a financial maneuvering tactic to stabilize revenue streams (Cassuto, 2016). Inclusion will mean different things, so it will be important to consider the values of inclusion from the community (Labaree, 2004) and ways to inform a wider understanding of inclusion. Including folks with access to financial capital to cover the costs of doctoral education is different than including those with a historically-restricted access to finances broadly, and specifically regarding access to doctoral education in the first place.
Third, Jay’s case illustrates the power of professional associations and academic journals when it comes to the strength of influences around research and disciplinary pursuits (Austin, 2002; Becher & Trowler, 2001; Lovitts, 2001; Tierney & Rhoads, 1994). The influence of professional associations serves as a mechanism of the community of scholars (Labaree, 2004) to negotiate and consider how EDISJ foregrounded or backgrounded research (Carspecken, 2012) will be valued in the marketplace of ideas. Transformative and incremental contributions, regardless of the researcher’s interpretations, is in part determined through the dialogue of the researcher, reviewers, and editors. If EDISJ is to be considered novel or innovative, the case communicatively will need to be made. Lastly, Jay shows that promotion and tenure rituals impact seasoned faculty (Tierney & Rhoads, 1994); in particular Jay filtered speaking up about diversity-related topics due to the power differential as a pre-tenured faculty, and then as a tenured faculty, to support long-lasting collegiality within the department. Even during his faculty workshop where he disagreed about the definition of conflict did Jay describe that experience others were a bit surprised about him speaking up to the facilitator. This is important because an individual espousal of power is still in interaction with others’ access to power thus resulting in more than just one’s willingness, awareness, and ability to integrate EDISJ as the barriers towards action within their work in doctoral education.

Although these cases both discussed targeting or hoping for a more diverse groups of doctoral students, they still omitted discussions of a wider age range of students, those with more industry than academic experience, and those with familial responsibilities or hopes for a family—all areas that recent literature mentioned needs attention (Gardner, 2010; Stacy, 2006). This case also shows that apprenticeship models (Kwiram, 2006; Mena, Diefes-Dux, & Capobianco, 2013) are more on a continuum rather than an all-encompassing scenario. While
both expect that students learn the habits and ways of a researcher, whether that be to converse with others or conduct original research successfully, both shared sentiments that students can pursue any future career path. This will place a further burden on faculty and staff to understand what future career paths those are and to support students who do not choose to support the normative pathways of their disciplines. As Cassuto (2016) defended, multiple-track career paths should not be considered less than the optimal tenure-track path, but should be considered an alternative path espousing similar value for its impact in education, industry, or governmental contexts. This study provides evidence that learning the skills to become an expert does not mean the same as become an expert within the same career field as their adviser. This distinction should allow greater space and ability for newer scholars as doctoral students to explore EDISJ-based topics as they develop their own independent research agendas and scholarly identities. Faculty who support multitrack paths for their students, should not only know how to scaffold experiences to best support students’ goals, but also how to advise students of their ability to consider EDISJ in their own work if it is not being demonstrated by others within their disciplinary community.

**Implications for Practice**

This case study strived to understand how two faculty integrate EDISJ within their work with doctoral education. I utilized disciplinary and institutional logics frameworks to understand their role and responsibility for integration, and the external influences in how and where they considered EDISJ in doctoral education. Integrating EDISJ is vital for faculty to consider in order to have doctoral students imitate these concepts, values, mindsets, experiences, and behaviors into their own practices (Lovitts, 2001; Mendoza, 2007; Patton, 2009; Sallee, 2011). Alicia’s and Jay’s descriptive case summaries paired with the analytical within-case and cross-
case analysis yields implications across the individual level, department level, institutional level, and disciplinary level to consider how faculty integrate EDISJ into their work in doctoral education.

**Individual**

Faculty members should recognize the tremendous value of their personal experiences before and during their faculty careers. The unfortunate reality that both participants have experienced or witnessed acts of discrimination and have had aspects of who they are be minoritized within greater societal structures resulted in strong personal motivations to feel responsibility to integrate EDISJ. Those faculty members who benefit from any identity of privileged status should consider the institutional and community forms of diversity and inclusion recognition as attempts to legitimize such experiences or skillsets (Friedland & Alford, 1991; Rao, Monin, and Durand, 2003; Townley, 1997). Further, the work from institutional or departmental units around diversity and inclusion should be considered efforts to support greater awareness and education for those who do not have those personal experiences as motivation.

Those who are interested in integrating EDISJ within their work in doctoral education should consider the following strategies. Firstly, doctoral student advising is a quality opportunity for faculty-student interaction (Cassuto, 2016; Lovitts, 2001) that can support EDISJ goals. Faculty members serve students well by providing positive assistance through dilemmas of personhood, beliefs, and conflicts (Gardner & Mendoza, 2010; Lovitts, 2001); however, faculty need to be aware and open to those differences (Cassuto, 2016; Golde & Dore, 2001) to make a positive difference. One-on-one or group advising spaces can provide opportunities to discuss the lived experiences of their students within the doctoral program, advertise professional development opportunities for students, and offer instances for students to engage in
conversations with other peers and colleagues. Second, faculty members with doctoral students researching within their expertise area should foreground the connections between their research agenda and EDISJ topics. These conversations should make abundantly clear the connection between the advancement, creation, or construction of new knowledge and the implications for any positive impact across the layers of society (Carspecken, 2012). If these graduate roles are funded research opportunities, consideration should be made to those historically unwelcomed into doctoral education. Faculty are the actors who admit students into these selective graduate programs (Posselt, 2016), and are the ones who have the most influence in helping them stay or leave (Cassuto, 2016; Lovitts, 2001). Lastly, faculty members should seek connections with other departments and programs where limited engagement is taking place to create cross-disciplinary events or groups that offer space for continual learning and reflection for both doctoral students and faculty colleagues.

**Department**

Faculty members who desire integration of EDISJ within departmentally-influenced components of doctoral education have additional considerations. Golde (2005) outlined that admissions decisions, financial support, the requirements for degree completion, and the curriculum are all determined and controlled by the department or program faculty. As part of overall recruitment plan, departments should seek students who have been historically underrepresented, who espouse a commitment to EDISJ, or who have research agendas that have connections to EDISJ outcomes. Departments have been asked to reconsider the pools of applicants to include more variety of student demographics (Gardner, 2010; Stacy, 2006) and acknowledge the programs own diversification (Posselt, 2016). A more focused connection to EDISJ through the identity of department members or research agendas would challenge the
status quo of department norms around whether faculty members consider EDISJ as part of their work. Faculty can contribute to curricular review committees to encourage entire courses dedicated to EDISJ within their discipline or make explicit how students who desire EDISJ as part of their doctoral experience can fulfill those goals outside the department. If faculty are also the department chair or the director of graduate education, they should be attuned to the institutional opportunities for trainers outside of the department to serve as educators for their students. As described within Alicia’s case, faculty colleagues can participate in ongoing professional development that would strengthen an awareness, appreciation, or advocacy for EDISJ topics. Although, these programs are usually more awareness raising to inform a general disposition of action, future implications of their learning can be tailored directly to aspects of their faculty responsibilities within doctoral education.

Departments can also develop tenure guidelines, resources, or suggestions that explicitly mention and give value to the integration of EDISJ. Labaree (2004) described how a community of scholars forms by including some and excluding others to create shared definitions, values, and standards. Each department should have foregrounded language that speaks to the goals of the department and doctoral education in relationship to contributions towards EDISJ to ease the tension around a faculty member’s role or responsibility for integration. Both departments of the study had academic colleges that directly acknowledged diversity and inclusion within their mission statements. While the social science department continued referencing similar language, the STEM department did not. Greater congruence in mission and purpose would lead towards a less ambiguous role of EDISJ. Additionally, departments can work internally to discuss how collegiately, the ritual of the tenure and promotion process should be defined, and additionally how to report concerns of problematic behaviors of colleagues.
Hiring units should recognize the value of personal experience around EDISJ as a strength and talent of faculty applicants—whether that is intrinsic motivation for self-improvement and better self-awareness skills, possessing historically underrepresented viewpoints and experiences, or work outside of academia that contributes positively to EDISJ. Those who already espouse a personal commitment and interest to integrate EDISJ reduces the burden of the institution to supplement the lack of a personal conviction with ongoing professional development opportunities. An advantageous outcome of having highly educated persons in positions of power experience an education integrated with EDISJ content is the chance that systemic barriers can be changed due to a reinterpretation of these communal values (Brown & Strega, 2005). Institutions themselves should specify the explicit rewards and recognition for EDISJ within tenure and promotion paperwork. Just as Oakes University’s Provost described that the goal for faculty’s teaching is to be “good,” recognizing EDISJ work formally would help shape the legitimacy of integration from indifference (Twale & De Luca, 2008) to ambiguous (Suddaby & Greenwood, 2005) to eventually legitimized (Friedland & Alford, 1991; Rao et al., 2003; Townley, 1997).

Higher diversity is viewed as having higher scholarly excellence, creativity and problem solving, innovation in research and preparing professionals for multicultural communities, and greater diversity of ideas, image and institutional reputation (Golde et al., 2006). Institutions with embedded diversity, inclusion, and equity values approach the standards of “inclusive excellence” (Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2013, p. 1). This standard is valuable (Elkana, 2006; Golde et al., 2006) which can help an institution reward such behaviors in order to sustain itself (Friedland & Alford, 1991). A wide variety of institutional programming
and staffing roles address EDISJ outside of strictly a recruitment perspective. These programs and staff should create intentional resources and support for doctoral education. Lastly, institutions should continue to acquire and distribute funding for EDISJ course development, doctoral education professional development, and supplemental funding in order to assist faculty in increasing the number of students who can enroll in a doctoral program.

Disciplinary Community

Due to the high research expectations for faculty at AAU universities, and the importance of doctoral education as a means to develop independently capable scholars for research in particular, disciplinary communities need to be aware of their role in influencing how research is valued and how further academic pursuits within their community consider EDISJ. For example, EDISJ may be a novel or innovative proposition within the framing of a study, the methods, or implications of new research depending on the disciplinary or field of study community. As Swales (1990) outlined, academic genres, like research articles, have habitual conventions and structures of academic writing. Therefore, when authors deviate from that path, it requires further support and meaning through the authors’ words on the justification for such choices (Swales, 1990; Weston, 2009). Editorial boards should consider a wide array of responses including but not limited to: (a) providing special issues for EDISJ-based content, (b) train reviewers on the positive, rather than deviant, value of EDISJ, or (c) shape their aims and scopes of publication to consider the role EDISJ may have broadly within its scholarly conversations. Overall, this would strengthen the value of EDISJ in spaces where it may not consistently be within the rules of the game (Friedland & Alford, 1991).

Additionally, if EDISJ is not considered as part of the prevailing logic and discourse of academic ideas, those positioned within insurgent logics (Suddaby & Greenwood, 2005) should...
consider it a challenge to discuss the ways EDISJ can and should appear across academic pursuits and its connections to the other forces onto academic cultures (Tierney & Rhoads, 1994). In one example, advocates could illustrate how Becher and Trowler’s (2001) conceptualization that disciplines are a combination of both knowledge and members, bound in social and cultural structures within knowledge communities (Abbott, 2001), is in conflict with viewpoints that some faculty see their discipline as apolitical and value-free (Becher, 1984). A prevalent attitude of a value-free community would very likely shape current (e.g. faculty) and emerging (e.g. doctoral students) community members’ habits of heart and mind (Golde et al., 2006) differently than one that acknowledges its biases and positionality. In cases like Jay, EDISJ-minded scholars should dialogue with agencies like the NSF to discuss criteria for research evaluation and its impact on EDISJ outcomes. These efforts would have a direct impact on doctoral education as doctoral students look to those experts of their community for examples of success—seeing EDISJ more consistently and widely would shape generational mindsets.

In addition, disciplinary communities should be mindful of the ways that EDISJ is rewarded and legitimized through professional associations. For those who have a peripheral interaction with EDISJ should offer reading and training materials online for members and should legitimize EDISJ’s consideration by senior leaders of the organization or association and through reward mechanisms. For the latter, there is no question that race and gender remain important diverse identities for pathway programming; associations should be mindful of the ways to encourage participation across further identities like ability, and sexual orientation. These professional communities should expand onto themselves Posselt’s (2016) call for doctoral programs to reflect and hold a mirror up to their committees, their program, and to
themselves, to see who and what is being reflected back in order to reinterpret the norms of academic identities in their spaces.

**Future Recommendations for Research**

Although collecting documents helps inform a researcher about the participant and their environment for corroboration of self-reported data, direct observation would help strengthen any study’s findings. Future research should consider the means to directly observe participants’ integration of EDISJ within their work in doctoral education. Direct observation is considered an ideal method for determining what actually is practiced or performed by the participant in comparison to what is stated in an interview and could provide a good record of *incontestable descriptions* (p. 62) of the case for further analysis (Stake, 1995). Beyond doctoral program admissions committees (Posselt, 2016), curricular meetings, research teams, and group advising meetings all show promise through these cases’ interviews as spaces for further analysis.

These faculty-guided work spaces would also support a different unit of analysis—from individual faculty member to program-level faculty collectives. Several tension areas from participants in this study was from collegiality and tenured-faculty, as well as collective decision-making processes such as curriculum changes. Focusing on how faculty as a collective influence integration could further characterize the role of the discipline, the institution, and the ritual of tenure. Another unit of analysis could move from individual faculty within one disciplinary community to multiple within the same department or program. We see in the findings of this study how the role of tenure shapes an individual’s ability to integrate EDISJ; further nuance across multiple ranks, years at the institution, social identities, and past socialization experiences in graduate education could provide greater detail in the similarities and differences within one disciplinary community.
Both Jay and Alicia mentioned the importance of research at Oakes University, an AAU member institution with a large enrollment of graduate students. Other universities who are not AAU members, and who have fewer graduate students and programs, still offer doctoral degrees. Understanding the research-intensive expectation and high number of doctoral programs may be different than understanding an educational environment with fewer programs and students. Future research should consider the role of other rewards and rituals for rules of the game at other institutional types as the negotiation of what is valued for faculty may be the same (research, teaching, service) but differentially enacted based on institutional missions, values, and interaction with other sociological forces (Tierney & Rhoads, 1994). Each case provided some description of participants’ experiences across the early, middle, and later stages of doctoral education; however, further intentionality into particular stages could provide greater understanding on how institutional and disciplinary logics or any of the sociological forces influence faculty integration. In particular, doctoral education is outlined as four stages of socialization by Weidman et al. (2001) as (a) an anticipatory stage, (b) a formal stage, (c) an informal stage, and (d) a personal stage. Each stage is depicted as having unique opportunities and challenges for doctoral students across admissions and orientation, coursework, preliminary exams, dissertation, and entry into a scholarly profession. Strong advising acknowledges a student’s past life experience, maintains open lines of communication, and shows interest in their work and welfare all of which may need to be differentially enacted across different stages and structures of doctoral education (Barnes et al., 2012; Noy & Ray, 2012; Patton, 2009). Future research could consider how faculty integrate within each of these stages of doctoral education and any converging or diverging patterns in institutional or disciplinary influences. This
direction could strengthen the calls for action on where faculty are consistently integrating and where there may be a void of or unnecessary barriers for integration.

**Conclusion**

This case study illustrates how faculty are continually interacting with socialization processes at the borderlands of disciplinary communities organizing within higher education institutions. Overall, the influence of the disciplinary force, in these cases, sets the boundaries for the personality, character, habits of mind and heart, and general scholarly dispositions of their disciplinary community in which tension or conflicts of multiple logics exist (Golde et al., 2006). Jay’s case illustrates the power of professional associations and academic journals around research and disciplinary pursuits in a competitive discipline and its direct influence on a research-intensive focused approach with students. Alicia and her advisees research remains quite novel in their field of study although not producing large grant funds that previously fractured parts of her field shifted to decades ago. Unfortunately, despite a larger saliency of EDISJ in her field, as compared to Jay’s, the course distribution is structured in a way to place a heavy burden on one faculty member (Alicia) to handle the teaching load for diversity courses. Both participants had deep, personal interests of EDISJ which then permeated into the work with doctoral education through action-based or care-based language.

Opportunities for integration of EDISJ are possible throughout all of doctoral education although not equally attainable. A majority of doctoral education processes are maintained through the collective decision-making processes of faculty colleagues resulting in boundary setting to maintain collegiality and realistic expectations. For both Alicia and Jay, their cases confirm the importance of considering admissions decisions, non-assistantship financial support, and requirements for degree completing as deeply determined by department faculty. For
example, Posselt’s (2016) scholarship on graduate admissions committees should be considered categorically different than Noy and Ray’s (2012) study on the impacts on the adviser-student relationship. Faculty with personal motivations to integrate EDISJ do so in context of their overall faculty responsibilities which go beyond strictly doctoral education spaces. This distinction shows a need to differentiate between the top-down influences around diversity and inclusion versus individual experiences and hopes that, in this case, illustrated a wider range of understanding and connections to EDISJ. The descriptive case summaries, the implications of the study, and future research directions offer recommendations for how faculty members can continue to integrate EDISJ as a value-set, as a form of action, and as part of one’s identity as they shape and are shaped by the influences of their institutional and disciplinary logics.
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APPENDIX B: INTERVIEW AND JOURNALING PROTOCOLS

RESEARCH NOTES: How do two faculty integrate equity, diversity, inclusion, and social justice within their work with doctoral education?

1. What do these faculty envision as their role in developing such an orientation within doctoral students?
2. How have these faculty learned how and where equity, diversity, inclusion and/or social justice can take place within doctoral education?
3. In what ways are institutional logics and disciplinary logics informing these faculty’s behaviors related to equity, diversity, inclusion, and social justice in doctoral education?

Throughout the interview, questions will shift in focus from an individual, departmental, and disciplinary perspective. Mention the this “roadmap” as you begin each interview.

Interview #1

1. Tell me about yourself
   a. Your background
   b. Your educational path and experiences
   c. Your career path
   d. How you decided to become a faculty member
2. Describe the typical day/week/semester for you as a faculty member here
   a. Research
   b. Teaching
   c. Service/community involvement
   d. Professional organization involvements
   e. Any other aspects the typical day/week/semester
3. How would you define:
   a. Equity
   b. Diversity
   c. Inclusion
   d. Social justice
4. How have you learned about equity, diversity, inclusion, and social justice?
   a. From your undergraduate education?
   b. From your graduate education?
   c. During your faculty career?
   d. Life experiences?
5. What do you think the purpose of doctoral education is?
   a. Who is it for? Who does well?
   b. What are the anticipated outcomes or goals?
   c. When might there be moments where your vision for doctoral education differs from others and how, if at all, is that difference resolved?
   d. What do others in your department think about the purpose of doctoral education?
   e. How might your discipline think about the purpose?
6. Is there anything you’d like to go back to and talk more about?
Interview #2
1. Is there anything from the first interview you’d like to talk more about?
2. Tell me about the department you work in
   a. What’s important or valued?
   b. What are its priorities and concerns?
   i. And within the context of doctoral education
3. Tell me about the graduate program(s) & students you work with
4. To what extent do you think doctoral education in your department/at your institution considers the following, based on your definitions:
   a. Equity
   b. Diversity
   c. Inclusion
   d. Social Justice
   i. What might be an example of…?
5. How would you describe the discipline/field of study you have expertise in?
   a. What defines your field?
   b. What are some of the assumptions or perspectives that ground your field?
   c. What’s important or valued?
   d. What are its priorities and concerns?
6. How would you describe your discipline/field of study in relationship to:
   a. Equity
   b. Diversity
   c. Inclusion
   d. Social Justice
7. When might there be moments where your perspective on equity, diversity, inclusion, or social justice differs from others and how, if at all, is that difference resolved?
   a. Within your department
   b. Within your discipline/field
8. Is there anything you’d like to go back to and talk more about?

Interview #3
1. Is there anything from the second interview you’d like to talk more about?
2. What are you learning about how the institution you work at understands these terms—equity, diversity, inclusion and/or social justice?
   a. What about your department/program?
3. When are you asked to give attention or consideration to equity, diversity, inclusion, and social justice
   a. Who usually gives you those suggestions or recommendations?
   b. What do you think they expect of you?
   c. When do you personally implicitly/explicitly act?
4. When you envision your students graduating from the program, how would you describe your hopes for them as their teacher/mentor/advisor/colleague?
   a. What their passions are
   b. What they do within a career
   c. Their ability to participate in the professional/disciplinary community?
5. When do you see your role or responsibility to include equity, diversity, inclusion, and social justice into your work with doctoral education?

6. What do you think your advisees or students in your program are learning about equity, diversity, inclusion, or social justice?
   a. From you
   b. From the department
   c. From the institution
   d. From the discipline

7. Is there anything you’d like to go back to and talk more about?

Journaling Questions

Standard Questions
1. Looking back at the interview, what were some of the important ideas or topics you’ve continued thinking about?
2. What new things have you learned about yourself since the last interview?
3. What unresolved questions arose from the last interview?