Chapter 5
Creating Porous Ivory Towers: Two-Way Socialization Processes that Embrace Black Students' Identities in Academia

Rachelle Winkle-Wagner, Dorian L. McCoy, and Jamila Lee-Johnson

For many Black students and their families, education has long been seen as a way to achieve upward mobility as a great equalizer, even if the path towards mobility has often been difficult (Brown II & Davis, 2001; Du Bois, 1903; Jackson & Moore, 2006). We use the term Black to refer to people who have African, Afro Caribbean, Black Latina/o/x ancestry as a way to include all those who identify in part or in total with this heritage. This includes those who identify as multiracial where Black is one of their identities.

The doctoral degree stands as the pinnacle of academic achievement; and yet, aside from a few disciplines such as education, there are severe racial disparities in the enrollment and completion of PhD programs for Black doctoral students (Antony & Taylor, 2001, 2004; Gardner, 2008; Gildersleeve, Croom, & Vasquez, 2011). Despite many graduate programs across the nation being similar in terms of the academic disciplinary norms, student experiences vary across campuses (Golde, 1998; Walker, Golde, Jones, Bueschel, & Hutchings, 2008). A growing number of scholars argue that graduate students' socialization experiences vary by discipline, gender, race, and campus context (Antony, 2002; Antony & Taylor, 2001, 2004; Gardner, 2008; Gildersleeve et al., 2011; McCoy & Winkle-Wagner, 2015; Turner & Thompson, 1993; Winkle-Wagner & McCoy, 2016a). The primary constant on

R. Winkle-Wagner (✉)
Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis,
University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, WI, USA
e-mail: winklewagner@wisc.edu

D. L. McCoy
Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, University of Tennessee,
Knoxville, TN, USA
e-mail: dmccoy5@utk.edu

J. Lee-Johnson
Higher Education Leadership, University of Wisconsin-Whitewater, Whitewater, WI, USA

J. C. Weidman, L. DeAngelo (eds.), *Socialization in Higher Education and the Early Career*, Knowledge Studies in Higher Education 7,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-33350-8_5

many of these campuses, particularly if the campus is a predominantly White institution (PWI), is racial inequities in enrollment, persistence, and pathways to the professoriate (Daniel, 2007; Ellis, 2001; Turner & Thompson, 1993; Winkle-Wagner & McCoy, 2016b).

It is within the long history of racial disparities in doctoral education that we consider the doctoral socialization process for Black students in this chapter. We argue that one reason for the persistence of racial inequities is the often used one-way socialization process in graduate programs that assumes that students must set aside their differences to integrate themselves and their ideas into the norms of their discipline. Throughout the chapter, we consider doctoral student socialization as it relates to Black students. We use Black students as our reference so that we can situate our ideas within existing findings about a particular group of students as a way to contemplate what might happen if the graduate school socialization models changed. First, we examine some of the trends related to Black graduate students' doctoral or graduate school experiences. Then, we examine some of the primary models for graduate school socialization, including the Weidman et al. (2001) model, and the since revisited version of the model by Twale, Weidman, and Bethea (2016) which considered socialization for Students of Color. Terms such as "White" or "Black" are often capitalized. For similar reasons, we choose to capitalize terms like "Students of Color, People of Color" in our writing to reaffirm the voice, experience, and history of exclusion of students and faculty who are represented by these phrases.

Next, we consider how social reproduction theory (Bourdieu, 1979), and the concepts of cultural capital, social capital, habitus, and *field* (all defined in more detail below) might be useful in considerations about doctoral student socialization, particularly for Black graduate students. In so doing, we review some of our earlier work that used social reproduction theory with Students of Color (McCoy & Winkle-Wagner, 2015; McCoy, Luedke, & Winkle-Wagner, 2017; McCoy, Winkle-Wagner, & Luedke, 2016; Winkle-Wagner & McCoy, 2016a, 2016b). While our focus in the chapter is on Black graduate students in particular, we also reviewed scholarship that emphasized Students of Color as a larger group because that is often where Black students are included in the research (Gay, 2004; McCoy, Winkle-Wagner, Luedke, 2016; Twale et al., 2016; Winkle-Wagner & McCoy, 2016a, 2016b). We use the term (i.e., African American, Black, Student of Color, etc.) that the researchers used in their scholarship and point out specific studies that focused on Black students. Finally, we offer ideas for how social reproduction theory could be used to both disrupt the idea of a one-way socialization process for Black doctoral students and to offer thoughts on a possible two-way socialization process. We make an argument for future research and theory to consider new ways of creating socialization in graduate programs such that Black graduate students can become centrally included in academia. Our premise is that academia itself must change to a more inclusive, welcoming, and supportive space for all people from historically underrepresented and marginalized backgrounds (Gildersleeve et al., 2011).

Graduate School Socialization and Black Graduate Students

The doctoral degree stands as the pinnacle of academic achievement. Yet, aside from a few disciplines such as education, there are severe racial disparities in the enrollment and completion of PhD programs for Black doctoral students (Gardner, 2008; Gildersleeve et al., 2011). Despite many graduate programs across the nation being similar in terms of their academic disciplinary norms, student experiences vary across campuses (Golde, 1998; Walker et al., 2008). While individual graduate students' socialization experiences vary, racial inequities in outcomes for graduate students appear to be a commonality on many campus (Antony, 2002; Daniel, 2007; Gardner, 2008; Gildersleeve et al., 2011; McCoy & Winkle-Wagner, 2015; Turner & Thompson, 1993; Winkle-Wagner & McCoy, 2016a).

Understanding the influence race has on the doctoral student socialization process is important, especially for Black students (Antony, 2002; Felder, Stevenson, & Gasman, 2014; Gardner, 2008). Race has been evidenced as a major factor on Black doctoral students' experiences in some studies (Daniels, 2007; Ellis, 2001; Gildersleeve et al., 2011; Turner & Thompson, 1993). These findings can help many universities to understand why graduate student socialization for Black graduate/professional students is important to their respective campuses. Our work is grounded in an assets-based idea of socialization for Black graduate students. In particular, we focus on ways to socialize Black graduate students as a means for offering specific ideas as to how socialization models, and newer approaches, might influence particular populations.

Ellis (2001) found that race was a salient factor in the doctoral experience, identifying four major areas of concern: (1) mentoring and advising, or the lack thereof, for some Black students; (2) the departmental environment excluding Black students; (3) interaction with peers being tinged with racial micro-aggressions; and (4) research and teaching training being inaccessible for some Black students. In addition to Black graduate students managing experiences of discrimination and marginality across their graduate programs (e.g., in the classroom, in teaching, during advising and mentoring, etc.), they also have to gain research and other practical skills while navigating graduate education. Graduate program skills will help Black students persist and will serve them well on the path to becoming faculty. In a call for more culturally responsive models of graduate student socialization, Gay (2004) noted that graduate Students of Color experience three major forms of isolation on their path to academia. She suggested *physical* and *cultural isolation*, *benign neglect*, and *problematic popularity* (the idea of being overly noticeable) all affect doctoral Students of Color and lead to a feeling of general isolation. Navigating this isolation is paramount to Students of Color being able to make it to degree completion (see also, Antony & Taylor, 2004; Gonzàlez, 2006; Taylor & Antony, 2000).

One reason for isolation among Black doctoral students is likely the treatment they receive by faculty in their academic disciplines (Jones, Wilder, & Osborne-Lampkin, 2013). Prior research has maintained the crucial importance of faculty mentoring for Black graduate students in particular (Antony & Taylor, 2004; Cole

& Griffin, 2013; Daniel, 2007; Gildersleeve et al., 2011; Taylor & Antony, 2000). Scholarship on the experiences of Black doctoral students argues that they do not receive the same mentoring as their White colleagues, particularly within PWIs (Jones et al., 2013; McCoy et al., 2017; Patton 2009; Patton & Harper, 2003). Other research suggests that even when White faculty attempted to be "race neutral" (McCoy et al., 2016, p. 236) in the way they engaged with Students of Color, the faculty mentoring might be perceived as racialized. In other words, race neutral or "colorblind" attempts in mentoring where faculty attempt to ignore race might be more likely to be received as racist and discriminatory because students' backgrounds are not as likely to be embraced (McCoy et al., 2016). Sometimes, in the absence of positive faculty mentoring, Black doctoral students have found it necessary to supplement faculty mentoring with peer mentoring, which can be beneficial but is likely not as connected to preparation for the academic discipline (Patton, 2009).

In sum, the disparate treatment of Black doctoral students indicates that socialization processes may not be implemented in equal ways, even if these socialization processes are considered as one-way and the same for all students who enter a particular discipline. That is, it might be the case that the more that faculty, administrators, and leaders within academic disciplines attempt to be race-neutral and avoid consideration of students' individual backgrounds, the more likely the students might be to experience graduate school as an exclusionary and isolating place. Given the disparities that Black students often experience in their doctoral programs, we consider a metaphor for how academia is responding to new groups of students and a way that institutional and disciplinary change might occur. Ultimately, it is our argument that through better and more inclusive models of doctoral students' socialization, racial equity in the academy might be made more tangible.

A Metaphor of Water Resistance and Permeability in Academia

Rooted in the notion that Black graduate students in particular have had and are continuing to have disparate experiences than their White peers, we consider a metaphor for the academy. Throughout our analysis, we use a metaphor of ivory towers, in part because this metaphor points out the way in which most higher education institutions were created by and for White people, and particularly, by and for White men (Dancy, Edwards, & Davis, 2018). The towers are considered "ivory" in that they have not fully included the racial and ethnic diversity that exists and that is possible. We also use a metaphor of water resistance and permeability, as we make an argument for the need for "porous" ivory towers that allow some water (which is a metaphor for new ideas and new types of people) to pass through. The ivory towers of academia have been historically, and arguably still are, resistant to new ways

of thinking and conducting work – they are impermeable, water resistant, and tightly sealed. However, as is the case when a major storm (i.e., tornado) hits, sometimes it is necessary to open the windows to let some of the wind and water pass through or the pressure will implode the building. The same goes for academia. As academic disciplines hold tightly to old norms and ways of performing the work, and to the idea that only one or two kinds of people can be fully included, they may implode from the pressure. Thus, we argue that the ivory towers must become more porous, allowing new ideas and people to come through and to be fully included.

This metaphor helps us to contemplate how disruptive it might be to offer inclusion in such a way that it actually leads to change in the academy. For many who hold tightly to the norms of their academic disciplines and the (White/Eurocentric) norms of the academy, this may feel as if the ivory tower is flooding, changing, and becoming permeable in ways that are uncomfortable, disruptive, and even terrifying. Thus, our metaphor of water resistance versus water permeability helps us to demonstrate the immense challenge that true racial/ethnic inclusion can be difficult for many academic disciplines. We maintain that if academic disciplines continue to try to "seal out" new ideas and new people, the ivory tower they hold dear will crumble from the pressure. First, we explain how the ivory towers became so impermeable, through the very socialization processes that we might have held up as an exemplar.

Impervious Academia? Socialization Models for Graduate Programs

Research about the doctoral student experience considers socialization as a critical aspect of academic success (Austin & McDaniels, 2006; Gardner, 2010; Gardner & Barnes 2007; Golde, 1998; Lovitts, 2001; McGaskey, Freeman, Guyton, Richmond, & Guyton, 2016; Nettles & Millett, 2006; Taylor & Antony, 2000; Walker et al., 2008; Weidman & Stein, 2003; Weidman et al., 2001). For example, the ways that socialization have been described and defined often assumes that students are being socialized into existing norms, behaviors, and ways of thinking in their academic discipline (Golde, 1998; Weidman et al., 2001). While there is sometimes a description of the different identities that students bring with them, there is still an assumption that socialization is a one-way process: students come to campus or to an academic department and are taught what they need to know to engage in that discipline. There is little discussion of, or room for, ideas about how departments, institutions, and disciplines might change based on the students' identities and backgrounds. While there are a few major models of graduate student socialization (Austin, 2002; Austin & McDaniels, 2006; Weidman, Twale & Stein, 2001), we focus specifically on the Weidman, Twale & Stein model here.

The Weidman, Twale, and Stein (2001) Doctoral Student Socialization Model

One of the most often used models for doctoral student socialization is the model advanced by Weidman, Twale, and Stein (2001). A recent search (10 January 2020) suggested that the model has been cited and used more than 1050 times (https://scholar.google.com/citations?user=AV29yF0AAAAJ&hl=en).Labeled as an interactive socialization model, Weidman et al. (2001) described the socialization process through which graduate students progress as developmental, meaning that there is a process of growth and change. The model has been used to understand topics such as graduate students' professional identity development (Sweitzer, 2009), the role of doctoral students' advisors (Barnes & Austin, 2009), graduate students' experiences during their programs (Gardner, 2008; Gardner & Barnes, 2007) and pathways to the professoriate (Austin & McDaniels, 2006).

Weidman, et al. (2001) described the graduate school experience as a process of knowledge acquisition and the processes of socialization. In this model, they modified their earlier socialization framework that Stein and Weidman (1989), Weidman and Stein (1990) presented at national conferences and incorporated a developmental stage model of socialization (Thornton & Nardi, 1975). Weidman et al.'s (2001) model was extended from a model developed by Thornton and Nardi (1975) for undergraduate students. The model assumes that stages can be duplicated and can be present any time during the student's matriculation. The four stages: (1) anticipatory, (2) formal, (3) informal, and (4) personal, present a developmental framework for understanding the process that graduate and professional students experience during their graduate education (Weidman et al., 2001). Each stage contains a progression where each element of socialization *leads* to more involvement of students being engaged in their academic program, and with faculty. The four stages are explained in more detail below.

Anticipatory Socialization This is the stage in which the prospective students begin learning about the expectations, and attitudes of graduate programs. This stage serves as the preparatory and exploratory stage, where the prospective students begin to explore what it is like to be a graduate student and researches graduate programs. Prospective students have preconceived notions about their particular area of study, but these notions are usually modified based on the students' understanding of what they need to succeed. Prospective students at the anticipatory stage learn about the rules, department and university jargon, departmental norms, and what is deemed acceptable behavior for success in that particular program (Weidman et al., 2001).

Formal Socialization The primary difference between this stage and anticipatory stage is that the prospective student becomes a student and has been accepted into their program. The student begins to determine whether they are a good fit for that particular program and institution and they begin engaging in "role-rehearsal"

(Weidman et al., 2001, p. 13). In role-rehearsal, the students begin to observe and imitate other students who are enrolled in their program. For example, they initiate a research agenda and present at academic conferences.

Informal Socialization The informal stage of acquisition occurs when the graduate student learns informally the expectations for connecting with other graduate students. The new graduate students begin to receive behavioral cues, learn what is acceptable behavior, and are taught how to react and respond accordingly (Weidman et al., 2001). The students are then encouraged by faculty to develop their own relationships with peers, and to develop a social and emotional support system with classmates (Staton & Darling, 1989; Weidman et al., 2001). Weidman et al. (2001) reinforced that there is often social anxiety with fitting in and assigning status to individual departmental members. Peer support groups are highly encouraged at this level because it allows the students to support and communicate with each other. Having peer support is important, and at this stage it allows for community, social and emotional identification, cohesiveness, and connectedness (Twale & Kochan, 2000; Weidman et al., 2001).

Personal Socialization In the personal stage of socialization for graduate students, the student begins to develop a professional identity, and tend to stray away from their former self (Bullis & Bach, 1989). The graduate students begin to develop a new professional image, avoid old habits, and initiate development of a scholar identity. As a scholarly identity is initiated, it allows for the graduate students to understand that their program is developing them for their new profession and career (Weidman et al., 2001). Finally, the graduate students begin to establish higher expectations for themselves and begin to apply for competitive fellowships, scholarships, and assistantships. Students become more involved with professional associations within their discipline at this stage, and they often engage in research and presentations (Weidman et al., 2001, p. 15).

The Weidman, Twale, and Stein (2001) model has been one of the most widely applied ideas for understanding the process by which graduate students become scholars (Gardner, 2007, 2010; Langrehr, Green, & Lantz, 2018). Yet, as is the case with most models that are meant to be universalized, the model may not work for *all* students. This model of doctoral student socialization has been criticized for not applying as well to Students of Color in particular (Cole & Griffin, 2013; Daniel, 2007; Dortch, 2016a, 2016b; Felder & Barker, 2013; Griffin, Muniz, & Espinosa, 2012; Sallee, 2011; Winkle-Wagner & McCoy, 2016b).

The Weidman, Twale, and Stein (2001) model does not include race and stereotypes as factors. These factors are likely to be impactful for Black graduate students. For example, in Taylor and Antony's (2000) qualitative study, they found that stereotyping and racism were key factors that hinder the socialization of Black doctoral and professional students and other minoritized populations. Similarly, in Gildersleeve et al.' (2011) critical race analysis of doctoral education, they found that Black students dealt with perceived individual and institutional racism when

socializing with assistantship supervisors and their academic advisors. Another factor, that is not included in the model is funding. Often times, funding is a major aspect of the student's experience (Ehrenberg, Jakubson, Groen, So, & Price, 2007; Ehrenburg & Mavros, 1992). Some Black doctoral students have reported the necessity of leaving their doctoral program due to increasing debt or a lack of funding (Mendoza, Villareal, & Gunderson, 2014). Finally, while the Weidman et al. (2001) model does suggest the importance of mentoring, it is worth considering which mentoring practices work well for Black graduate students. An absence of culturally responsive mentoring can influence Black doctoral students' success in graduate programs (Cole & Griffin, 2013; Jones et al., 2013; McCoy et al., 2017; Winkle-Wagner & McCoy, 2016a, 2016b). Dortch's (2016a, 2016b) phenomenological study asserted that administrators and other professionals should implement support systems that focus on the experiences of Women of Color, specifically Black women, as a way to promote mentoring practices that are more likely to be culturally responsive. Ultimately, these critiques led Weidman and his colleagues to contemplate ways to revise the initial model, which is a testament to their scholarship more generally. The revised model attended to some of these criticisms, as we demonstrate below.

Weidman and Colleague's Revised Socialization Theory

Twale, Weidman, and Bethea (2016) advanced a revision of the earlier Weidman et al. (2001) model. The revised model focused particularly on Black graduate students and their socialization needs. A strength of this revised model is that there is some consideration of inequitable resources such as student-faculty interactions and mentoring for Black students in graduate programs, or a lack of funding to complete their degree programs (Twale et al., 2016). Many of the concerns that we mentioned above, such as the cultural responsiveness of the initial model or the lack of attention toward financial resources, were considered in the model's revision. In Twale et al.'s reflection on the older model, the authors recommended resource redistribution in the form of increased demographic diversity in students and faculty within programs, incorporating a multicultural perspective in pedagogy and learning, following students' access to financial or socialization resources (e.g., opportunities to collaborate with faculty or attend conferences). These recommendations would likely aid in some of the inequities that Black students report experiencing in graduate programs. For instance, if a multicultural perspective were incorporated into graduate programs, Black graduate students might not feel as isolated intellectually or relative to their backgrounds (Dortch, 2016a, 2016b; Jones et al., 2013). A more diverse student and faculty population might help relieve some of the lack of support that Black students have reported with their academic advisors and other staff or faculty (McCoy et al., 2016). A clearer and more transparent funding model within graduate programs, as prescribed by Twale et al. (2016), would likely aid in the experience of funding disparities too.

The revised model specifically included some emphasis on faculty climates, entering students' preparation and dispositions, and the need to teach knowledge, skills, and dispositions (Twale et al., 2016). The notion of embracing students' backgrounds would likely help students to feel less like "aliens" (Winkle-Wagner & McCoy, 2016b, p. 9) especially on predominantly White campuses. The revised model is ultimately more responsive to students' background and dispositions in ways that could lead to a more nuanced and bi-directional approach to socializing doctoral students.

Cracking the Ivory Tower: Assets-Based Approaches to Bourdieu

In our larger body of research, we often use Bourdieu's (1979) social reproduction theory to guide our thinking about inequality and how inequalities can be intergenerationally transmitted. Bourdieu (1979) was concerned with how status and privilege is passed from one generation to the next, such as through families and schools. Bourdieu (1979) identified four theoretical concepts through his research on French class status and class mobility: *field* (the social context, such as a school or a community); cultural capital (knowledge, skills, abilities or competencies that are rewarded in particular setting such as educational contexts); social capital (social relationships and obligations that can be rewarded in social settings); and habitus (a set of dispositions or tastes that structure what actions seem viable for a person to take). These concepts are useful to explore how some students may enter educational settings with backgrounds that more closely align to the educational setting than other students. For example, if a student begins graduate school and they have parents/guardians who earned terminal degrees, that student may initially have advantages over students whose parents/guardians do not possess advanced degrees.

The one-way graduate school socialization processes are solidly embedded in academia and in many academic disciplines. It is unsurprising that many scholars have used theorists such as Bourdieu (1979) to reinforce the "necessity" of these approaches (Winkle-Wagner, 2010). For instance, when education scholars began to apply Bourdieu's concepts, they often framed the statistical modeling in a zero sum game way where the concept of cultural capital was defined as something that was *only* possessed by people in elite statuses (DiMaggio, 1982). Subsequent scholarship, mirroring the initial adapters of Bourdieu's concepts, and DiMaggio in particular, continued to frame concepts such as cultural capital as something that was owned by the elite group, and was not a possession of those in low-income or less elite backgrounds (DiMaggio & Mohr, 1985; Katsillis & Rubinson, 1990; Mohr & DiMaggio, 1995; Noble & Davies, 2009; Roscigno & Ainswoth-Darnell, 1999). Social capital scholarship took a similar path where scholars began to frame studies in ways that maintained an individual either possessed high-status social capital, or they did not. Thus, the concepts began to shift and were considered as either an advantage or a deficiency: students either had possession of cultural and social capital, or they lacked cultural and social capital (Musoba & Baez, 2009).

The outcome of this framing of Bourdieu's concepts was that many students who were from low-income backgrounds or who identified as Black or African American began to be viewed as students who needed to be given *more* social and cultural capital. They were considered students who were *lacking* in important skills, competencies, abilities, and social networks (Yosso, 2005). Concepts such as socialization became one way to contemplate how to provide for underrepresented students "lacking" of social and cultural capital. Eventually, the emphasis is pushed to the individual student, and if the student is somehow different from other students, there is an assumption *that particular student* should change.

It is important to note that Bourdieu's concepts are most useful when used as a full theoretical apparatus, with analysis of *field*, cultural capital, social capital, and habitus (Winkle-Wagner, 2010). When Bourdieu's concepts are used together, it is clear that the initial intent of these concepts are to explore how some forms of cultural and social capital might be valued more than others in particular settings (Olneck, 2000). If a student were to enter a setting (i.e., a college or university) and find that their cultural capital was not valued, this would not necessarily imply that the student did not possess cultural capital. Rather, it could imply that the *form* of cultural capital the student already possessed entering their program was not valued in that setting (*field*). An analysis that considered a student to already possess useful forms of background capital that were not valued in a particular setting such as a college campus would then place more emphasis on the campus and not the individual student (see Carter, 2003; Olneck, 2000 Winkle-Wagner, 2009; Yosso, 2005).

Scholars have considered ways to highlight the forms of capital that students might bring with them to campus (Carter, 2003; Yosso, 2005). For instance, Carter (2003) considered dominant and non-dominant forms of capital as a way to show how all people have capital, but some forms of capital are considered dominant and some are not. Yosso (2005) developed the theoretical concept of Community Cultural Wealth (CCW) as a way to demonstrate the varied ways that Students of Color bring experiences and talents to their respective college campuses as a form of capital. Yosso (2005) argued that Communities of Color "nurture" (p. 77) cultural wealth (capital) through six forms of capital: aspirational, navigational, social, linguistic, familial, and resistance. In this chapter, we focus on each form of capital, with the exception of linguistic capital, and its relevance to graduate Student of Color, particularly Black graduate students.

Aspirational capital is one's desire to maintain a hope/dream for the future, despite obstacles they may have or have not experienced (Yosso, 2005). In a doctoral context, aspirational capital has significant influence because pre-doctoral students who desire to attend a doctoral program must have the motivation and initiative to apply and enroll in their programs and these aspirations can be assets in the process. Additionally, while many pre-doctoral students desire to attend graduate programs they may have also experienced some challenges before applying (i.e., low GRE scores and/or lower grade point averages throughout their undergraduate careers). *Familial capital* is cultural knowledge that is gathered from family, and even from communities (Yosso, 2005). It is embodied in the quote "It takes a village to raise a child." Familial capital is important during the doctoral phase because

many doctoral students are often the first in their families and communities to pursue a degree beyond a bachelor's degree. Often, familial capital is imperative in graduate education because many doctoral students' families have encouraged them to pursue this degree, but may not understand how the pursuit of a graduate degree works. *Social capital* is the network of people and resources one has built which helps them navigate the institutions they choose to attend (Yosso, 2005). Social capital is significant in the context of graduate education because this is often how graduate students are connected to internships, jobs, and publishing opportunities; and is based on the advisor's personal network, reputation in the university environment, or even who they may know. *Navigational capital* refers to students' skills and abilities to navigate "social institutions," which includes educational spaces (Yosso, 2005). Navigational capital is critical because it plays a major role in the type of experience the doctoral student will have: negative or positive. This capital is critical during the doctoral student's matriculation, because it is how graduate students learn to engage with faculty, administrators, and staff at the institution they are attending. *Resistance capital* is the knowledge and skills fostered through oppositional behavior that challenges inequality. This type of capital is centered in Communities' of Color legacies of resistance as a way to successfully pursue education without losing a sense of self. Part of Yosso's (2005) critique was grounded in the way in which Bourdieu's concepts had been translated in academia and Bourdieu's ideas have been used in educational research in ways that promote deficiency thinking or the idea that some groups are lacking particular skills (Winkle-Wagner, 2010). Yosso's (2005) idea is an assets-based approach: a way to counter deficit thinking and assert the valuable aspects of students' backgrounds before and when they enter graduate school.

A Porous Academia? Social Reproduction Theory and Two-Way Socialization Models for Graduate Programs

We identified socialization processes that are less rigid, more inclusive, and reciprocal; meaning that socialization into graduate programs can be conducted in a way that allows students to assert the importance of their identities and backgrounds. Previous research has framed this as a two-way or bi-directional socialization process (McCoy, 2007; McCoy & Winkle-Wagner, 2015; Tierney, 1997). For example, in a multisite critical case study project of summer institutes in the humanities disciplines, socialization processes were found to be two-way (McCoy & Winkle-Wagner, 2015). Students of Color were encouraged to find and make space for their background identities and their ideas within the academy. The summer institutes not only helped students to gain socialization into the "traditional" humanities disciplines; but the students were also socialized so that they should and could bring their identities into academia and work to change the norms of their discipline (Winkle-Wagner & McCoy, 2016a).

One way we argue that Bourdieu's theoretical apparatus, when used in its entirety, might work well as a socialization model is through the concept of *field* or social setting. That is, if research and practice were to thoroughly understand the *field* of origin for a doctoral student, the process of socialization could be more bi-directional. The *field* of a student's origin, if better understood, could be connected. For instance, in our research on summer institutes in the humanities disciplines, there were deliberate attempts to connect students' backgrounds with the academy and preparation for graduate school, and this connection was primarily achieved through overlapping the *field* of origin with the *field* of the academy (Winkle-Wagner & McCoy, 2016a). One way that this connection of the *field* of origin and the *field* of the academy was achieved was through a deliberate selection of readings authored by Scholars of Color. Students within the institutes were then deliberately encouraged to compare the readings authored by Scholars of Color that may have reflected some of their own backgrounds, with the other forms of scholarship (with primarily White authors), in their disciplines (Winkle-Wagner & McCoy, 2016a).

Another way that Bourdieu's concepts can be used in a bi-directional socialization approach is to evaluate which form of cultural capital is valued within an academic discipline. Using our metaphor of a porous academia, these efforts are ways to ensure that the academy is more easily able for variations and differences to flow through the walls. For example, it is eminently doable to list some of the important theories, terms, approaches to writing, methods, and general norms within a particular discipline. While these are the areas of training that are often held back until a student arrives in a particular department for graduate school, if programs were to do this work beforehand (i.e., before students matriculate), faculty and staff could then gauge what "cultural capital" they were actually valuing as a department or a discipline. The norms of a particular discipline could be taught and disrupted in summer bridge programs, doctoral inquiry courses, prospective student visit days, or during seminars and colloquiums within the programs. By making the cultural capital that has been historically valued in the discipline more transparent, we argue that it is more likely that the relevant/valued cultural capital could be expanded. Students could be honored relative to their backgrounds and perhaps new forms of cultural capital could begin to be valued. Departments could host listening sessions to hear about students' backgrounds, ideas, and assets they bring with them into their programs. However, the reality is that some reshaping of cultural capital will be on an individual level between faculty and students through culturally responsive mentoring practices (see for example, Jones et al., 2013). These individual mentoring practices would still have the power to eventually reshape departments and disciplines if deliberately articulated and expanded (e.g., brought to faculty meetings as exemplars for their peers).

Finally, relative to social capital, there might be better ways to connect the social capital of origin (families, communities) with academic disciplines. Community engaged scholarship, where scholars conduct research closely with community members, is an idea that is moving in this direction. But there are likely creative ways that departments could better connect with students' communities and families of origin. This too might occur on an individual faculty or staff level. More

holistic forms of mentoring are often described by students as being connected to their families or communities, at least at the level of asking students about their significant others (Jones et al., 2013). For example, in our research on mentoring, some faculty consistently asked students about their parents, sibling, and communities; and students experienced this as a more holistic form of mentoring (McCoy et al., 2016).

Ultimately, we are calling for a different type of socialization within graduate programs, one that we focused toward Black students, but one that we argue could be adapted for work with multiple groups of underrepresented students over time. A two-way socialization process implies that an academic discipline is porous enough to be changed by the inclusion of new types of students. Our point is not to universalize and say that there is only one way to socialize students into the academy. Rather, we are taking issue with any model that attempts to be a one-way or one-size-fits-all (Feagin, Vera, & Imani, 2014/1996) model in higher education. Thus, while we maintain that the two-way socialization model could apply to multiple populations, to dogmatically apply the idea to any population would miss the point of the two-way process. The implication is that the discipline, and those within it, would be open and willing to change as new populations, and the resulting ideas and knowledge that could come from these new groups, enter the fields. New populations of graduate students *and* existing faculty, staff, and students must all have openness to learning and to change for a two-way model to work.

Our hope with a two-way socialization model is that as students mature into scholars, the discipline begins to represent new ways of thinking, new ways of writing, new approaches to mentoring students, and new approaches to conducting research. These new approaches would be identified through the two-way socialization process – a more porous academy. That is, as students enter academic disciplines, the discipline would be open to socialization from students on the experiences and assets (the Community Cultural Wealth) they bring with them into their graduate programs. As Black graduate students ultimately create change in the discipline, they would also be socialized into the "traditional" norms of the discipline. But, the traditional norms of campus would be changed too. That is, after engagement with Black students, the campus would change and so would the students. As Black graduate students are exposed to the traditional norms of the academy, they would also need to be actively encouraged to criticize traditions as racist, sexist, classist, etc. (Dancy et al., 2018). Some of these criticisms would need to come from faculty, administrators, and those who are socializing the students such that students could then feel empowered to launch their own critiques. The socialization process would be conducted in such a way that there was openness to the idea that the disciplinary and departmental norms could also change. Socialization that came from academic disciplines would be almost historical in manner (i.e., this is how things were done and we are continuing to change).

We assert that a new model of graduate student socialization would allow space for students' backgrounds to be viewed as assets. Faculty, staff, and administrators would need to make their mentoring, teaching, and learning practices flexible enough to allow for changes based on students' backgrounds, needs, and assets.

While we emphasize Black graduate students in this chapter, we recognize that socialization may need to differ among various racial/ethnic groups, gender, and socioeconomic groups. While our focus is on the needs of Black graduate students more generally, we realize that Black men and women may have very different experiences and needs in graduate programs (see for example, Dortch, 2016a, 2016b). We also need to point out the importance of carefully assessing the needs of students with various racial/ethnic backgrounds. That is, Black students may have very different needs, background assets, and experiences than Latinx, Asian American, or Native American students. Ultimately, a two-way socialization model allows for space, flexibility, and change in a way that current (i.e., historical or traditional) models may not.

References

Antony, J. S. (2002). Reexamining doctoral student socialization and professional development: Moving beyond the congruence and assimilation orientation. In *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (pp. 349–380). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Antony, J. S., & Taylor, E. (2001). Graduate student socialization and its implications for the recruitment of African American education faculty. In W. G. Tierney (Ed.), *Faculty work in schools of education: Rethinking roles and rewards for the twenty-first century* (pp. 189–209). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Antony, J. S., & Taylor, E. (2004). Theories and strategies of academic career socialization: Improving paths to the professoriate for Black graduate students. In D. H. Wulff & A. D. Austin (Eds.), *Paths to the professoriate: Strategies for enriching the preparation of future faculty* (pp. 92–114). San Francisco: Jossey- Bass.

Austin, A. E. (2002). Preparing the next generation of faculty: Graduate school as socialization to the academic career. *The Journal of Higher Education, 73*(1), 94–122.

Austin, A. E., & McDaniels, M. (2006). Preparing the professoriate of the future: Graduate student socialization for faculty roles. In *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (pp. 397–456). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Barnes, B. J., & Austin, A. E. (2009). The role of doctoral advisors: A look at advising from the advisor's perspective. *Innovative Higher Education, 33*, 297–315.

Bourdieu, P. (1979). *Distinction. A social critique of the Judgment of taste*. (R. Nice, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Brown, M., & Davis, J. (2001). The historically Black college as social contract, social capital, and social equalizer. *Peabody Journal of Education, 76*(1), 31–49. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/1493004

Bullis, C., & Bach, B. W. (1989). Socialization turning points: An examination of change in organizational identification. *Western Journal of Communication, 53*, 273–293.

Carter, P. L. (2003). " Black" cultural capital, status positioning, and schooling conflicts for low-income African American youth. *Social Problems, 50*(1), 136–155.

Cole, D., & Griffin, K. A. (2013). Advancing the study of student-faculty interaction: A focus on diverse students and faculty. In *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (pp. 561–611). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Dancy, T. E., Edwards, K. T., & Davis, J. E. (2018). Historically White universities and plantation politics: Anti-blackness and higher education in the Black Lives Matter era. *Urban Education, 53*(2), 176–195.

Daniel, C. (2007). Outsiders-within: Critical race theory, graduate education and barriers to professionalization. *Journal Sociology & Social Welfare, 34*(1), 25.
DiMaggio, P. (1982). Cultural capital and school success: The impact of status culture participation on the grades of US high school students. *American Sociological Review, 47*, 189–201.
DiMaggio, P., & Mohr, J. (1985). Cultural capital, educational attainment, and marital selection. *American Journal of Sociology, 90*, 1231–1261.
Dortch, D. (2016a). The strength from within: A phenomenological study examining the academic self-efficacy of African American women in doctoral studies. *The Journal of Negro Education, 85*, 350–364.
Dortch, D. (2016b). The strength from within: A phenomenological study examining the academic self-efficacy of African American women in doctoral studies. *The Journal of Negro Education, 85*(3), 350–364.
Du Bois, W. E. B. (1903). *The Souls of Black Folk*. New York: Penguin.
Ehrenberg, R. G., Jakubson, G. H., Groen, J. A., So, E., & Price, J. (2007). Inside the black box of doctoral education: What program characteristics influence doctoral students' attrition and graduation probabilities? *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 29*(2), 134–150.
Ehrenberg, R. G., & Mavros, P. G. (1992). *Do doctoral students' financial support patterns affect their times-to-degree and completion probabilities* (No. w4070). National Bureau of Economic Research.
Ellis, E. M. (2001). The impact of race and gender on graduate school socialization, satisfaction with doctoral study and commitment to degree completion. *Western Journal of Black Studies, 25*(1), 30.
Feagin, J. R., Vera, H., & Imani, N. (2014/1996). *The agony of education: Black students at a White university*. Routledge.
Felder, P. P., Stevenson, H. C., & Gasman, M. (2014). Understanding race in doctoral student socialization. *International Journal of Doctoral Studies, 9*, 21–42.
Felder, R., & Barker, M. (2013). Extending Bell's concept of convergence: A framework for understanding the African American doctoral student experience. *International Journal of Doctoral Studies, 8*, 1–20. Retrieved from. https://doi.org/10.28945/1754
Gardner, S. K. (2007). "I heard it through the grapevine": Doctoral student socialization in chemistry and history. *Higher Education, 54*(5), 723–740.
Gardner, S. K. (2008). Fitting the mold of graduate school: A qualitative study of socialization in doctoral education. *Innovative Higher Education, 33*(2), 125–138.
Gardner, S. K. (2010). Faculty perspectives on doctoral student socialization in five disciplines. *International Journal of Doctoral Studies, 5*, 39–53.
Gardner, S. K., & Barnes, B. J. (2007). Graduate student involvement: Socialization for the professional role. *Journal of College Student Development, 48*, 369–387.
Gay, G. (2004). Navigating marginality en route to the professoriate: Graduate students of color learning and living in academia. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 17*(2), 265–288.
Gildersleeve, R. E., Croom, N. N., & Vasquez, P. L. (2011). "Am I going crazy?!": A critical race analysis of doctoral education. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 44*(1), 93–114.
Golde, C. M. (1998). Beginning graduate school: Explaining first-year doctoral attrition. *New Directions for Higher Education, 1998*(101), 55–64.
González, J. C. (2006). Academic socialization experiences of Latina doctoral students: A qualitative understanding of support systems that aid and challenges that hinder the process. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education, 5*, 347–365.
Griffin, K., Muniz, M., & Espinosa, L. (2012). The influence of campus racial climate on diversity in graduate education. *Review of Higher Education, 35*, 535–566.
Jackson, J. F., & Moore, J. L. (2006). African American males in education: Endangered or ignored? *Teachers College Record, 108*, 201–205.

Jones, T. B., Wilder, J., & Osborne-Lampkin, L.'. T. (2013). Employing a Black feminist approach to doctoral advising: Preparing Black women for the professoriate. *The Journal of Negro Education, 82*(3), 326–338.

Katsillis, J., & Rubinson, R. (1990). Cultural capital, student achievement, and educational reproduction: The case of Greece. *American Sociological Review, 55*, 270–279.

Langrehr, K. J., Green, C. E., & Lantz, M. (2018). *The implications of doctoral students' professional socialization experiences in graduate training*. The Counseling Psychologist, 0011000017748588.

Lovitts, B. E. (2001). *Leaving the ivory tower: The causes and consequences of departure from doctoral study*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

McCoy, D. L. (2007). Entering the academy: Exploring the socialization of African American male faculty at HBCUs and PWIs. *Journal of the Professoriate, 2*(2), 75–91.

McCoy, D. L., Luedke, C. L., & Winkle-Wagner, R. (2017). Encouraged or "weeded out" in the STEM disciplines: Students' perspectives on faculty interactions within a predominantly white and a historically black institution. *Journal of College Student Development, 58*(5), 657–673.

McCoy, D. L., & Winkle-Wagner, R. (2015). Bridging the divide: Developing a scholarly habitus for underrepresented students through summer bridge programs participation. *Journal of College Student Development, 56*(5), 423–439.

McCoy, D. L., Winkle-Wagner, R., & Luedke, C. (2016). Colorblind mentoring?: Exploring white faculty mentoring of students of color. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 8*(4), 225–242.

McGaskey, F., Freeman Jr., S., Guyton, C., Richmond, D., & Guyton, C. W. (2016). The social support networks of Black males in higher education administration doctoral programs: An exploratory study. *Western Journal of Black Studies, 40*(2), 141–158.

Mendoza, P., Villarreal, P., & Gunderson, A. (2014). Within-year retention among Ph. D. students: The effect of debt, assistantships, and fellowships. *Research in Higher Education, 55*(7), 650–685.

Mohr, J., & DiMaggio, P. (1995). The intergenerational transmission of cultural capital. *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility, 14*, 167–200.

Musoba, G., & Baez, B. (2009). The cultural capital of cultural and social capital: An economy of translations. *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research, 24*, 151–182. Springer Netherlands.

Nettles, M. T., & Millett, C. M. (2006). *Three magic letters: Getting to Ph. D*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Noble, J., & Davies, P. (2009). Cultural capital as an explanation of variation in participation in higher education. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 30*(5), 591–605.

Olneck, M. (2000). Can multicultural education change what counts as cultural capital? *American Educational Research Journal, 37*(2), 317–348.

Patton, L. D. (2009). My sister's keeper: A qualitative examination of mentoring experiences among African American women in graduate and professional schools. *The Journal of Higher Education, 80*(5), 510–537.

Patton, L. D., & Harper, S. R. (2003). Mentoring relationships among African American women in graduate and professional schools. *New Directions for Student Services, 2003*(104), 67–78.

Roscigno, V. J., & Ainsworth-Darnell, J. W. (1999). Race, cultural capital, and educational resources: Persistent inequalities and achievement returns. *Sociology of Education, 72*, 158–178.

Sallee, M. (2011). Performing masculinity: Considering gender in doctoral student socialization. *Journal of Higher Education, 82*(2), 187–216.

Staton, A., & Darling, A. (1989). Socialization of teaching assistants. In J. Nyquist, R. Abbott, & D. Wulff (Eds.), *Teaching Assistant Training in the 1990s* (New Directions for Teaching and Learning, No. 39) (pp. 15–22). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Stein, E. L., & Weidman, J. C. (1989). *Socialization in graduate school: A conceptual framework*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the association for the study of higher education, Atlanta, GA.

Sweitzer, V. (2009). Towards a theory of doctoral student professional identity development: A developmental networks approach. *The Journal of Higher Education, 80*(1), 1–33.

Taylor, E., & Antony, J. S. (2000). Stereotype threat reduction and wise schooling: Towards the successful socialization of African American doctoral students in education. *Journal of Negro Education, 69*(3), 184–198.

Thornton, R., & Nardi, P. M. (1975). The dynamics of role acquisition. *The American Journal of Sociology, 80*(4), 870–885.

Tierney, W. G. (1997). Organizational socialization in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education, 68*(1), 1–16.

Turner, C. S. V., & Thompson, J. R. (1993). Socializing women doctoral students: Minority and majority experiences. *The Review of Higher Education, 16*(3), 355–370.

Twale, D., & Kochan, F. (2000). Assessment of an alternative cohort model for part-time students in an educational leadership program. *Journal of School Leadership, 10*, 188–208.

Twale, D. J., Weidman, J. C., & Bethea, K. (2016). Conceptualizing socialization of graduate students of color: Revisiting the Weidman-Twale-Stein framework. *Western Journal of Black Studies, 40*(2), 80–94.

Walker, G. E., Golde, C. M., Jones, L., Bueschel, A. C., & Hutchings, P. (2008). *The formation of scholars: Rethinking doctoral education for the 21st century*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Weidman, J. C., & Stein, E. L. (1990). *The professional socialization of graduate students in educational administration*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration, Pittsburgh, PA.

Weidman, J. C., & Stein, E. L. (2003). Socialization of doctoral students to academic norms. *Research in Higher Education, 44*, 641–656.

Weidman, J. C., Twale, D. J., & Stein, E. L. (2001). *Socialization of graduate and professional students in higher education: A perilous passage?* (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, Vol. 28, No. 3). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED457710.pdf

Winkle-Wagner, R. (2009). *The unchosen me: Race, gender, and identity among Black women in college*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Winkle-Wagner, R. (2010). *Cultural capital: The promises and pitfalls in education research: ASHE Higher Education Report* (Vol. 36, p. 1). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Winkle-Wagner, R., & McCoy, D. L. (2016a). Entering the (postgraduate) field: Underrepresented students' acquisition of cultural and social capital in graduate school preparation programs. *Journal of Higher Education, 87*(2), 178–205.

Winkle-Wagner, R., & McCoy, D. (2016b). Feeling like an "alien" or "family"? Comparing students and faculty experiences of diversity in STEM disciplines at an HBCU and a PWI. *Race Ethnicity and Education.* https://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2016.1248835 Available online first at: https://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2016.1248835

Yosso, T. J. (2005). Whose culture has capital? A critical race theory discussion of community cultural wealth. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 8*, 69–91.