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Abstract

This qualitative study explored the lived experiences of Black female doctoral students enrolled in education doctoral program at Predominantly White Institutions (PWI). Using semi-structured interviews, the study investigated the academic career development of Black female doctoral students guided by four research questions: (a) What perceptions do Black female doctoral students have of an academic career? (b) What factors shape Black female doctoral students’ academic career perceptions during the doctoral process? (c) What are the academic career intentions of Black female doctoral students? and (d) What factors influence the development of Black female doctoral students’ academic career intentions during the doctoral process? Participants included 13 individuals who self-identified as female, of African/African Diaspora descent, and were enrolled in an education on-site/face-to-face doctoral program at a PWI. Participants reported career intentions to either pursue a full-time faculty position or an administration positions within higher education. Three themes emerged from the data: (1) Higher Education is a Tough Terrain, (2) Access Makes a Difference, and (3) Self-Efficacy: I Can Do It! The findings from the study highlight Black women’s experiences with the intersection of race and gender during their doctoral studies, their perception of the academic environment as challenging, and their self-efficacy to continue pushing forward in pursuing the professoriate despite the perceived challenges. The study offers important implications for the development of interventions and career support for Black female education doctoral students in pursuit of the professoriate.

Key words: Black women; doctoral student; academic career; career development
Dedication

This dissertation is dedicated to my family: The Culver Family and the Hale Family. Your love, support, encouragement, prayers, and humor are such a valuable part of my life. I am blessed to have you cheering me on and keeping me going. This work is the product of the love, resilience, strength, intellect, and endurance of our family and a contribution to our family legacy.

This dissertation is also dedicated to the memory of Danielle E. Roberts, Ruth Baldwin, Gladys E. Culver and Erroll L. Isaiah (Uncle Erroll). Danielle, I miss you so much! You loved me fervently and supported me beyond measure. This work is dedicated to the memory of your love, encouraging voice, and compassion for people. Ruth Baldwin and Gladys E. Culver you always encouraged me to get an education and to learn as much as I can. This work is dedicated to all the ways you encouraged and supported my learning and helped me believe completing a dissertation would be possible. Uncle Erroll, you always encouraged and supported me and allowed me to run and jump into your arms no matter how big I had gotten. This work is dedicated to the memory of your consistent love and support, and our Walley Waffle conversations.
Acknowledgements

“To our God and Father be glory for ever and ever. Amen.” ~Philippians 4:20 To God be the Glory for the completion of this dissertation which was accomplished through His strength, provision, and grace. Thank you Lord for your faithfulness throughout my dissertation journey and for strengthening my faith and relationship with you throughout the dissertation and doctoral process. To you, Oh Lord, I ascribe glory and honor for all you have done! Worthy are you God!

I would like to acknowledge and extend my sincere appreciation to my dissertation chair Dr. Angela Coker and committee members: Susan Kashubeck-West, Mark Pope, and Sha-Lai Williams Woodson. Your wisdom, guidance, encouragement, patience, feedback, and mentorship made this dissertation possible.

To my parents Fonzie and Ramona Culver, thank you for the legacy of love, godliness, and hard work that you nurtured in me. Thank you for your unconditional love, prayers, words of encouragement, and sacrifices. To my aunt and uncle Vanessa and Bill Roberts, thank you for all the many ways you have supported, prayed for and encouraged me in this journey. Without your help, support and love, this would not be possible. To my brother, Fonzie Culver II, thank you for encouraging me -Love you lil bro!

To my childhood friends Adriann Winn, Imani Swoope, and David Hamilton thank you for loving me through this journey and supporting me. Thank you for listening, challenging me, praying with me, and for your friendship. Love you fam. To Amber Bell-Christian, Carrie White, Jilliene Johnson, Emmanuel Sterling, Misty Lewis, and Melaine Moore thank you for your support, love, and friendship through this journey.
To my sister Terri Madison (Rocki) and her family who adopted me as one of their own, thank you for loving me and providing me with a space to call home here in St. Louis. The love and support you have given is beyond measure and you will forever be family. Rocki your friendship and sisterhood has been a God given blessing. I am thankful for ways you have supported me through this process. Love you big sis!

To my sister Barbara Ward, thank you for accountability, friendship, prayer, love, and sushi outings. Thank you for editing my dissertation, making sure I got up early to write, and for encouraging me when I was discouraged. I am so thankful God brought you into my life and it is such a blessing to have a close friend like you.

To my research assistant Erika Cables, thank you for all your help and support. To Claire Martin, thank you for the support and encouragement you gave as a fellow doctoral colleague. Can’t wait to celebrate the completion of your PhD process ladies. To Michael McCully and Jessica Varner, thank you for your friendship, edits, and support.

To the Black female doctoral students that participated in this study. Thank you for your time and willingness to share your experiences with me; this dissertation is a reality because of you. I truly appreciate you allowing me to learn from you.

The completion of this dissertation is the result of the support, encouragement, and investment of a community of individuals who came alongside me throughout my dissertation journey. To my Gate Church family, extended family, doctoral colleagues (Emily Oliveira, Katheryne Leigh, Tara Vossenkemper, Katie Bohn, Brittany Murphy, Courtney Boddie) and the numerous friends and classmates who were a part of my doctoral journey and dissertation process, I am beyond grateful for the numerous ways you have supported and encouraged me. Thank you for your investment and support.
# Table of Contents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title Page</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstract</td>
<td>ii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedication</td>
<td>iii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledgements</td>
<td>iv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table of Contents</td>
<td>vi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter One: Introduction</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Process</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement of the Problem</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose Statement</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance of the Study</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition of Key Terms</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical Framework</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Feminist Thought</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Cognitive Career Theory</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delimitations</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization of the study</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter Summary</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter Two: Literature Review</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Women’s Experiences at Predominantly White Institutions</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access and Representation in higher education</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlling Images in higher education</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mammy</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jezebel</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sapphire</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crazy Black Bitch</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superwoman</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Altering Coping Strategies</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biculturalism</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code-switching</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shifting</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Careers</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Career Pathways</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Current Landscape of Academia</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Career Models</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Process of Women in Academia Model</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model of Career Development for Black Women</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Cognitive Career Theory</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using SCCT to Explain Academic Career Intentions</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Doctoral Process</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Student Socialization</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter Title</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty-Student Mentorship and Advising</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Student Wellness and Satisfaction</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Students’ Academic Career Intentions</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Students’ Career Choices</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors that Influence Pursuing a Faculty Career</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Academic Work</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter Summary</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter Three: Methodology</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Design</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical Framework</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Feminist Thought</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Cognitive Career Theory</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Analysis</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credibility</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependability</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformability</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transferability</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflexivity</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher Background</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher Biases and Assumptions</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective Journaling</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical Considerations</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explaining Purpose</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informed Consent</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection Boundaries</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Assessment</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidentiality</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data access and ownership</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter Summary</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 4: Results</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of Participants</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Analysis</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 1: Higher Education is a Tough Terrain</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Academic Environment is Political</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Continual Struggle for Balance</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academia is Still a Boys’ Club</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Student Focus Should be Prioritized</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme Summary</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 2: Access to Information Makes a Difference</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct learning experiences</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pursuing of the Professoriate

Vicarious learning experiences ............................................. 183
Theme Summary ....................................................................... 199
Theme 3: Self-Efficacy: I can do it! ....................................... 200
  I can do it! ......................................................................... 201
  Determination and resilience ............................................. 215
Theme Summary ....................................................................... 219
Summary of Member Checks .................................................. 220
Chapter Summary .................................................................... 223

Chapter 5: Discussion .............................................................. 226
  Summary of the Study .......................................................... 226
  Discussion of Findings .......................................................... 227
  Implications ........................................................................ 244
  Recommendations ................................................................. 247
    Black female doctoral students ......................................... 248
    Faculty, academic departments, and higher education institutions ..... 248
  Limitations ....................................................................... 250
  Suggestions for Future Research .......................................... 253
  Conclusion ............................................................................. 255

References ............................................................................... 257

Appendices
  Appendix A: Consent Form .................................................... 280
  Appendix B: Recruitment Message ......................................... 282
  Appendix C: Participant Screening Questionnaire .................. 283
  Appendix D: Interview Protocol ............................................. 285
  Appendix E: Follow Up Questionnaire .................................. 287
  Appendix F: Nondisclosure/Confidentiality Agreement .......... 289

List of Tables
  Table 1: Participant Demographic Summary ......................... 127
  Table 2: Participant Doctoral Background Summary ............... 128
  Table 3: Summary of Participants Career Intentions .............. 130
  Table 4: Coding Structure and Major Themes ....................... 133
Chapter One

Introduction

Black women have a long tradition of setting career goals designed to enhance their professional and personal development. According to the U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics (2017), Black women earned 10.3% of the doctorates conferred during the 2014-2015 academic year. When earning a doctoral degree, some Black women have professional aspirations of a faculty career, which is often the career trajectory of many doctoral students. Depending on their doctoral experiences, some Black women, however, continue their pursuit of a faculty career post degree-attainment, while others look toward non-academic career options. Although there is scant research on the experiences of Black women during the pre-tenure and post-tenure process, there is even less known about Black women’s academic career intentions and the ways in which they are shaped and altered during the doctoral training process. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to examine Black women’s career development within the context of their enrollment in education doctorate programs at Predominantly White Institutions (PWIs).

Research on Black women’s academic careers has explored a multiplicity of barriers that impede advancement (Bonner & Thomas, 2001; Gregory 2001; Henderson, 2005; Patitu & Hinton, 2003; Zamani, 2003). Barriers long documented in the literature include institutional cultures that privileges White male identities (Alfred, 2001; Allen, 2011; Croom & Patton, 2011), family career conflict as a result of family responsibilities (Ahmad, 2017; Allen, 2011), isolation and marginalization (Croom & Patton, 2011; Grant, 2014; Henry & Glenn, 2009; Patitu & Hinton, 2003), discriminatory work
environments (Ortega-Liston & Rodriguez Soto, 2014; Zamani, 2003), lower salaries (Banerji, 2006), and lack of mentorship and cultural capital (Allen, 2011; Croom & Patton, 2011; Grant, 2014; Patitu & Hinton, 2003). Summarizing the struggles Black women face in academia, Trotman (2009) stated, “the research literature is consistent. All conclude that black women faculty are the most stressed, the least satisfied, almost the least represented, possibly the least supported, and the most overworked of all faculty in academe” (p. 81).

Black women’s pursuit of the professoriate has been characterized by many successful strides, as well as continued barriers to overcome. Researchers (e.g., Henry & Glenn, 2009; Pitt, Vaughn, Shamburger-Rousseau, & Harris, 2015) have argued for an increase in Black women in full-time faculty positions, especially at PWIs. Black female representation is essential, as Black women bring important and differing experiences (Pitt et al., 2015), provide mentors, role models, peer advisors, and confidants for other Black women (Henry & Glenn, 2009; Patitu & Hinton, 2003), and contribute to institutions of higher education, reflecting the diversity that positively influences student success and mirrors society at large (Patitu & Hinton, 2003; Turner, González & Wood, 2008). For instance, Gibbs and Griffin (2013) denoted improved learning and research outcomes as advantages of a diverse faculty. Indeed, in the academic climate, diversity within the faculty facilitates the broadening of research inquiry and creativity in problem solving.

Recognizing the benefits of a diverse professoriate, institutions and funding agencies have invested considerable resources in recruitment, program, and mentorship efforts to diversify the professoriate (Gibbs & Griffin, 2013). Gibbs and Griffin (2013)
conceded, however, that such diversity initiatives have evidenced slow transformation within the professoriate. Likewise, in looking at the experiences of Black women in pursuit of the professoriate, the assessment remains laden with difficult realities. For example, in a concluding discussion on African American faculty at PWIs, Harley (2008) contended that

Pursuing a career in academia is a rigorous process with explicit and implicit requirements. African American women faculty frequently face obstacles not experienced by their white colleagues. The literature suggests that for many African American women faculty at PWIs the positives are greatly overshadowed by the negatives. (p. 34)

This statement highlights an academic landscape that remains pointedly difficult for Black women to enter and navigate. Mirroring Harley’s (2008) conclusions, Roach and El-Kahawas (2010) argued that, when pursuing an academic path, women have a more difficult journey and encounter barriers related to acquiring resources for research and obtaining the support for persisting in the profession.

Importantly, the above description should be considered in light of the current state of higher education. In the current academic workforce, tenure-track faculty and full-time positions are increasing difficult to obtain due to the reduced availability of full-time academic posts in many institutions (American Federation of Teachers, 2009; Antony, 2002; Helm et al., 2012; Hurlburt & McGarrah, 2015). For example, Mazurek (2011) described the higher education landscape as having an increased dependence on part-time faculty. Mazurek (2011) explained, in the United States, approximately three-fourths of college faculty work in contingent positions; whereas one-fourth enjoy tenured
or tenure-track positions. Given these academic realities, it is important to investigate factors that facilitate Black women’s entry into academic careers.

Research has increasingly recognized academic careers as best understood from a developmental perspective, with the doctoral process being the earliest stage of a faculty career (Curtin, Malley, & Stewart, 2016). The prevalent perspective of doctoral education is based on a socialization/apprenticeship paradigm, where graduate school serves as the beginning of the socialization and career development process (Gasser & Shaffer, 2014; Haley, Jaeger, & Levin, 2014; Shaw & Stanton, 2012). One’s academic career is thought to commence as one functions in an apprentice role throughout the doctoral process. Scholars, however, have begun to criticize studies that only consider socialization, noting they lack responsiveness to the changing academic workforce and applicability to underrepresented minorities in higher education (Bieber & Worley, 2006; Haley et al., 2014; Jazvac-Martek, 2009). For example, Haley et al. (2014) noted that socialization theory only accounted for a segment of understanding, as it did not take into account race, gender, and other cultural identities. Therefore, it is instructive to study academic career development, taking into account the academic climate and Black women’s intersecting identities.

In exploring Black women’s decisions to pursue and persevere in an academic career, many studies have looked at women currently in academia. Extant research on women in academic careers has largely focused on beginning career academics (Nielsen, 2017), with a growing body of research investigating mid-level academics (Hermanowicz, 2016; Hormes, 2016). Very little research, however, has explored career perceptions and intentions looking specifically at students currently in the doctoral
process. Examining the role of doctoral education on academic career development is important, as scholars have identified doctoral education as essential to the preparation and success of one’s academic career (Dinham & Scott, 1999).

Within literature on academic career development, doctoral education is considered a primary pathway to academia. Hermanowicz (2016) contended, “there are arguably no other events as consequential to the conditioning of an academic career as one’s graduate education” (p. 291). Similarly, Portnoi, Chlopecki, and Peregrina-Kretz (2012) argued, “one of the central functions of doctoral education is preparation for future career pathways, which has typically translated into academia” (p. 61). Through the doctoral process, one is expected to learn the norms, skills, and values of academia.

Although the research does acknowledge a doctoral education prepares individuals for a variety of career paths, one of the primary career paths of those earning doctoral degrees is the professoriate. In short, doctoral education plays a substantial role in the academic career development of individuals. Accordingly, it becomes instructive to explore current doctoral students’ academic career intentions, examining Black women’s commitment to pursuing an academic career. Similarly, it is important to identify factors central to Black women’s consideration of an academic position, identifying what factors influence their decisions to pursue or not to pursue a faculty position. Likewise, it is informative to explore Black female doctoral student’s academic career outcome expectations, investigating how Black female doctoral students perceive academic careers, foresee obstacles, and feel prepared to overcome barriers. By exploring how academic careers are perceived, understood, and pursued by doctoral students,
researchers develop a greater understanding of Black women’s entry, advancement, tenure, and leadership in academia.

**Doctoral Process**

Exploring Black women’s experiences during the doctoral process expands the understanding of Black women’s academic career development. The doctoral process and the experiences of doctoral students play a noteworthy role in perceptions of academic careers and academic career intentions (Emmioğlu, McAlpine, & Amundsen, 2017; Jazvac-Martek, 2009; Stewart & Dottolo, 2005). Research on the academic career choices of doctoral students has noted experiences during the doctoral process (e.g., socialization, faculty mentoring, sense of belonging, professional development) as well as sociocultural identities (e.g., gender, race, social class) as central to doctoral student career intentions (Haley et al., 2014; Levin, Jaeger, & Haley, 2013; Ostrove, Stewart, & Curtin, 2011; Stewart & Dottolo, 2005). For example, in a qualitative study exploring students of color’s (i.e., Hispanic, multicultural, Black, Asian, Native American) dilemmas, ambiguities, and decisions about choosing an academic career. Levin et al. (2013) found the norms and behavioral patterns of an institution significantly influenced doctoral students’ experiences and career choices. Further, for graduate students of color, congruence between professional and social identity functioned as a significant determining factor in decisions about academic career choices (Levin et al., 2013). Similarly, Haley et al. (2014) explored how students of color perceived the intersection of a faculty identity and their cultural social identities and confirmed cultural identities influence career choice beyond work–life balance. Specifically, students described wanting an integrated career environment that included values, beliefs, and perspectives
that represented their cultural communities. Such studies highlight the importance of understanding how doctoral students’ cultural identities impact their experiences during the doctoral process and how these experiences influence their perceptions and pursuit of an academic career.

The importance of students’ identities and values aligning with their perception of academia continues to emerge within research. Consequently, exploring Black female doctoral students’ perceptions regarding academic careers is important. For example, Ostrove et al. (2011) discussed the congruence between social identities and academia; they argued that, within higher education settings, there are material and destructive consequences for those whose social identities are least compatible with those of most institutions of higher education. A similar idea was also noted by Stewart and Dottolo (2005) in a study that looked at aspirations for a faculty position at a top research university. They concluded:

Everyone who enters the academy for socialization—that is, attends graduate school—comes with a history and social identities. But some of those who enter—perhaps most notably, white heterosexual sons of educated parents—bring identities that are deeply compatible with those of the institution. Others—children of poverty, daughters of all classes, and people with racial-ethnic and sexual-minority backgrounds and identities—bring with them identities that compete or conflict with the identity under construction. (p. 168)

These scholars draw attention to the isolation, marginalization, and othering experienced by Black women and other groups within academia. It highlights how academia uniquely challenges Black women, in ways not experienced by their White colleagues.
Statement of the Problem

In studying the academic careers of Black women, much of the extant literature has focused on women presently in faculty positions. Many studies have been retrospective in nature, as they have used retrospective interviews and other methods to explore how individuals currently in the professoriate experienced the doctoral process (Hermanowicz, 2016; Jairam & Kahl, 2012; Lewis, Ginsberg, Davies, & Smith, 2004). Although research has long recognized graduate school as the beginning of the socialization and career development process (Gasser & Shaffer, 2014; Haley et al., 2014; Shaw & Stanton, 2012), relatively little research has focused on development, looking specifically at academic career intentions and perceptions among Black women still engaged in the doctoral process. As such, there is a lack of understanding about the development of Black women’s academic career intentions and perceptions during the doctoral process.

Notably, there are gaps in the literature about how the doctoral experience impacts the development of academic career perceptions and intentions for Black female doctoral students. In seeking to explain the academic career intentions of doctoral students, research has looked heavily at graduate student socialization theory, how students acquire the norms and roles of academic careers, and how they build commitment and loyalty to the academy (Haley et al., 2014). In exploring the experiences of students of color, scholars have argued, however, that socialization theory only accounts for part of the picture and does not consider race, gender, and other cultural identities (Haley et al., 2014). Instead, they argued that it is best to understand the career development and career choice process for graduate students of color, taking into
consideration their cultural identities. Research on Black women’s academic career development should include the influence of contextual and background variables such as race and gender, considering how these factors impact academic career perceptions, intentions, and expectations.

**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of this study was to explore and give voice to the lived experiences of Black female doctoral students enrolled in education programs at PWIs with an emphasis on examining their academic career intentions. Using a qualitative research design and a Black Feminist Thought (BFT) conceptual framework, this study investigated how academic career intentions and perceptions develop during the doctoral process. This study also sought to deepen the understanding of what internal and external factors contribute to academic career intentions and perceptions during the doctoral process. It examined career development considering the intersectionality of Black women’s cultural identities as Black and female. This study was guided by the following research questions:

1. What perceptions do Black female doctoral students have of an academic career?
2. What factors shape Black female doctoral students’ academic career perceptions, during the doctoral process?
3. What are the academic career intentions of Black female doctoral students?
4. What factors influence the development of Black female doctoral students’ academic career intentions, during the doctoral process?
Significance of the Study

This study is meaningful as it contributes to literature on the doctoral process and academic career development. It aims to expand scholarship that gives voice to the experiences of Black women, as it illuminates the underexplored experiences of Black female doctoral students. This study seeks to deepen the understanding of factors that influence the development of Black female doctoral students’ academic career intentions and perceptions during the doctoral process. Understanding such factors offers counselors, faculty, advisors, education training programs, higher education administrators, and other staff information that can be incorporated into policies, institutional practices, and programming that support the recruitment, retention, and advancement of Black female faculty. Therefore, this study contributes to literature that aids in the development of interventions and career support for Black female education doctoral students in pursuit of the professoriate.

Definition of Key Terms

In examining the experiences of Black female doctoral students and their perceptions of academic careers during the doctoral process, it is important to outline key terms that frame this study. Key variables within this study include Black women as a specific cultural group and the doctoral process as it occurs within PWIs as the context through which this study explored academic career development. In looking at academic career development, attention is given to academic career perceptions and intentions. The following defines the use of the terms Black women, doctoral process, Predominantly White Institutions, career development, academic career, and career intentions within this study.
Black women. Within this study, Black women refers to females who ethnically identify as of African Diaspora descent (i.e., African, African American, African Caribbean, African Latina, Black, of African descent, or Multiracial). It includes the multiplicity of ethnicities that identify as Black and is not used synonymously with one ethnic group such as African American. This choice reflects the BFT assertion that Black women exist as a heterogeneous group and allows for voicing the experiences of women from various Black ethnicities. This categorization is consistent with the U. S. Census Bureau’s collection of information on race that classifies Blacks as referring “to a person having origins in any of the Black racial groups of Africa” (Rastogi et al., p. 2011). Within this study, the terms Black women and Black females are used interchangeably.

Doctoral process. Throughout this study, the term doctoral process refers to the various activities and milestones that encompass earning a doctoral degree. It incorporates both the formal curriculum as well as other events and social practices designed to facilitate the preparation of graduate students as intellectuals within their fields. It includes activities such as attending orientation, taking courses, conducting research, selecting advisers, taking examinations, writing a dissertation, defending proposals, holding internships and assistantships, teaching courses, presenting research, and publishing. Within this operational definition, the doctoral process is defined as spanning acceptance into a doctoral program until conference of the doctoral degree.

Predominantly White Institution. The term Predominantly White institutions (PWIs) is used within this study to denote colleges and universities where historically, traditionally, and predominantly the dominant race of students, faculty, administration, and staff are White (Willie, 2003).
Academic career. In general, the concept of career has been defined as the combination and sequence of paid and unpaid occupational positions constituting one’s work history (Super, 1975). Super (1975) defined a career as including: the pre-occupational, occupational, and post-occupational positions over one’s lifespan. Therefore, one’s career may include roles such as student, worker, citizen, parent, pensioner, etc. (Super, 1980).

In the context of this dissertation, academic career refers to full-time work in professional faculty positions within institutions of higher education; working within the role of the professoriate. An academic career is conceptualized as spanning one’s entry, persistence, and progression in the academic work-force associated with academic ranks such as professor, associate professor, assistant professor, instructor, lecturer, visiting professor, adjunct professor, and interim professor (National Center for Education Statistics, 2016b). It includes full-time faculty positions such as tenure-track faculty, non-tenure track faculty, clinical academic faculty, teaching faculty, and research faculty. Additionally, it encompasses limited term or contract positions associated with the academic rank of lecturer, instructor, or visiting professor.

It is important to note within this study, the distinction between academic career and career in higher education. While an academic career encompasses full-time work in the role of the professoriate, careers in higher education include work within the professoriate but also encompasses research positions, administrative positions, and clinical positions. Thus, the reference to careers in higher education encompasses the broader path of working in professional positions within institutions of higher education and academic career refers specifically to full-time work within the professoriate.
Career intentions. Career intentions, as used within this study, refers to one’s intent, desires, and plans to pursue and enter a specific career field or position.

Theoretical Framework

This study relied on Black Feminist Thought (BFT) and Social Cognitive Career Theory (SCCT) as the theoretical frameworks that grounded the study. In studying the experiences of Black female doctoral students, it is important to apply theoretical constructs that can appropriately capture the experiences of Black women. Both BFT and SCCT have been used in studying the experiences of Black women (Scheuermann, Tokar, & Hall, 2014; Shavers & Moore, 2014) and have been recommended by numerous scholars as appropriate frameworks for understanding the unique experiences of Black women (Collins, 2000; Dickinson, Abrams, & Tokar, 2017; Howard-Hamilton, 2003).

Black Feminist Thought. In its conceptualization, BFT takes into account the multiplicative influence of discrimination and oppression associated with race, gender, and class for Black women (Collins, 2000). BFT operates as a framework that focuses on the needs and strengths of Black women as an oppressed group, situating Black women as the primary subject of inquiry and investigating Black women from a standpoint that liberates, empowers, and gives voice to that group. BFT postulates Black women as a heterogenous group living in a context where they experience a multiplicity of intersecting oppressions. Although every Black Woman is considered to have a unique lived experience, BFT postulates that Black women have similar shared experiences that form a distinctive standpoint (Collins, 2000). Within this study, BFT informed both the methodological and interpretive framework, the interview protocol, and the analytical lens.
Social Cognitive Career Theory. SCCT provides a structure for understanding the career development processes highlighting the role of sociocognitive mechanisms, personal agency, and learning (Lent, Brown, & Hackett, 1994). SCCT explains career-related behaviors (career and academic interests, career-related choices and career-related performance outcomes) as a function of self-efficacy beliefs, outcome expectations, and personal goals. It includes contextual and background variables emphasizing how these factors enhance or constrain personal agency (Lent, Brown, & Hackett, 1994). As a career development model, SCCT reasons that personal, contextual, and experiential factors influence an individual’s self-efficacy beliefs and outcome expectations thereby affecting career-related interests, choices, and performance. According to SCCT, self-efficacy beliefs and outcome expectations influence the above outputs (i.e., career interests, choice goals, and performance), both directly and indirectly. The inclusion of personal and contextual variables in SCCT’s explanation of career development provides an apropos orientation for exploring the academic career intentions of Black female doctoral students.

Delimitations

This study has several delimitations that are important. First, the scope of this study is narrowed as it relates to the study’s participant sample. The sample selection criteria limited participants to current Black female doctoral students, attending PWIs in the United States, that have completed all doctoral coursework. Within this study, these criteria do not account for the experiences of Black female doctoral students attending Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs), where most students and faculty are Black. The decision to exclude HBCUs from the study is reflective of extant literature
that reports educational environments and experiences differ between HBCUs and PWIs (Jones, Castellanos & Cole, 2002; Lent et al., 2005; McGaskey, 2015).

In addition to criteria including attending a PWI, the sample was also limited to students in traditional on-site doctoral programs. Accordingly, the experiences of students enrolled in online doctoral programs or blended programs are not considered. The choice to exclude fully online doctoral students and students in blended programs reflects literature that has noted differences, based on learning environment type in doctoral students’ sense of community (Rovai & Jordan, 2004), persistence (Rockinson-Szapkiw, Spaulding, & Spaulding, 2016), and support networks (Berry, 2017).

It is important to note that this study explores the career aspirations of doctoral students currently enrolled and having completed all coursework, yet not having completed the remaining degree requirements. Including only input from current students provides an opportunity to explore academic intentions and current thought processes regarding academic career development. It does not, however, offer a reflective perspective on what decisions led to an academic career choice. Likewise, the study does not report on the lived experiences of the doctoral process for Black women who already have an academic position, but rather provides a better understanding of doctoral students during the process. The study did not consider academic career aspiration influences that may occur after degree completion. Likewise, it does not voice the experiences of Black female students who have just completed their doctoral degrees or women who have chosen an academic career. Although this study explores academic career intentions, it does not account for actual academic career choice and factors related to career choice (e.g., job market) at the time of their career decision. The study does, however, provide a
reflection of Black female doctoral student’s experiences with the doctoral process that impact their current academic career intentions and perceptions. It allows for an understanding of academic career development of Black women who do and do not have academic career aspirations.

Importantly, it is helpful to detail the choice of studying Black women’s experiences rather than African American women’s experiences. Within this study, Black women refers to females who ethnically identify as of African Diaspora descent (i.e., African, African American, African Caribbean, African Latina, Black, of African descent, or Multiracial). It includes the multiplicity of ethnicities that identify as Black and is not used synonymously with one ethnic group such as African American. This choice reflects the perspective of BFT scholars that espouse the understanding of Black women existing as a heterogeneous group within the United States (Collins, 2000). It allows for the voicing of female doctoral students’ experiences from various Black ethnicities recognizing that Black women who participate in doctoral education come from various ethnic backgrounds. It allows for the exploration of the experiences of doctoral students who have established residence in the United States as a result of their educational pursuits and identify as Black yet not African American. It argues that the higher education system impacts the experiences of Blacks in the United States despite one being native born or not.

It is premised that one’s academic status does not free Black women from the experiences of stereotypes, negative assumptions, prejudice, and oppression. It is argued that, once participating in the United States education system, Black women, despite ethnicity or nationality, may be exposed to and impacted by the racism, sexism, and
classism that exists within the higher education system (Allan, 2011). It is asserted that a Black female identity within the United States and the U.S. higher education system exposes one to common experiences such as racism, sexism, and classism, that may be experienced differently, due to ethnicity or nationality, yet still expressed as a common theme (Collins, 1986). In other words, Black women’s identity in the context of the U.S. higher education system emerges in common experiences of oppression and resilience despite their divergent personal experiences with age, class, region, sexual orientation, and nationality (Collins, 1986). As such, the use of the term Black women allows for the capturing of these divergent yet common experiences within the investigation of Black women’s academic career intentions.

Another assumption is the function of the researcher as both principal investigator as well as a participant contributor. As outlined by BFT, when seeking to understand the lives of Black women, the Black female researcher’s experience is relevant to the inquiry (Collins, 1986). Along these lines, it is assumed that the experiences of the researcher who identifies as a Black female doctoral student has relevance for the current study. Within this study, it was assumed that the use of semi-structured interviews and reflective journals to explore the experiences of the participants and researcher respectively, rendered responses that reflected participant’s open, honest, and accurate relaying of information. The information gained allowed for the emergence of data that were both important and relevant to career development counselors and higher education personnel.

**Organization of the study**

This study contains five chapters (Introduction, Review of Literature, Methodology, Results and Discussion) as well as references and appendices. Chapter One
introduces the research topic as it provides the reader with a statement of the problem, the purpose of the study, the significance of the study, assumptions and delimitations, and an outline of key terms. Chapter Two reviews literature related to academic career intentions and the doctoral process for Black women. It provides key literature for understanding the context and relevance of the study. Chapter Three outlines the methods employed within the study, detailing the research design, informed consent process, the data collection procedures, and the analysis methods. Chapter Four reports the results of the study providing a detailed description of the three overarching themes that emerged from the data. Chapter Five provides a discussion of implications and recommendations and offers suggestions for future research. The work concludes with a reference list and appendices of supplemental documents.

Summary

This chapter has highlighted the importance of studying Black female doctoral students’ academic career intentions. The importance of doctoral education in academic career development was discussed and attention was drawn to the paucity of research on factors that influence Black women’s intentions and perceptions of faculty careers during the doctoral process. The next chapter reviews literature that outlines the history and experiences of Black women in higher education. It discusses Black women’s sociohistorical participation in the United States higher education system, reviews literature on the doctoral process and details literature on factors that influence academic career choices.
Chapter Two

Literature Review

Historically, Blacks have not always had access to education. Within the United States, a chattel slavery system dominated the American South, as the enslavement of African people in the United States operated on a system of ideals that scorned and restricted the education of Blacks. Those in power maintained the slavery system with the establishment of an ideology that crystallized slavery as a condition that was both natural and appropriate for people of African descent. Blacks were regarded as “inherently alien, culturally degenerate, and biologically inferior” (Blauner, 2001, p. 66). Further, the denial of education and the forbidding of teaching slaves to read or write helped to maintain the enslavement of Blacks. Further, even after the abolition of slavery, racial oppression and discrimination continued (Blumberg, 1991). A system of racial apartheid dominated the United States, separating Blacks from Whites by law, maintaining coercive structures of punishment, and continuing economic disenfranchisement (hooks, 2002). For instance, the South passed Black Codes, or Jim Crow laws, which disenfranchised Black people (Blumberg, 1991). Such laws ordered the legal segregation of Blacks from Whites in all areas of life. By extension, education for Blacks was separate from Whites, if available at all.

In 1954, the segregated and unequal landscape of the U.S. education system began to undergo change. Notably, the ruling in the U.S. Supreme Court case of Brown v. Board of Education (1954) resulted in a court order to end the segregation of public schools. The case, filed by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), sought to overturn the "separate but equal" doctrine governing
education established by *Plessy v. Ferguson* (1896) (Cottrol, Diamond, & Ware, 2003). The case was a culmination of years of legal work by the NAACP and the unanimous decision rendered the “Separate but Equal Doctrine” as unconstitutional. It put forth that to separate children in public schools for no other reason than their race violated the 14th amendment (Cottrol et al., 2003). This ruling marked a monumental challenge to public education. It made viable the possibility of Black girls being educated alongside White girls and White boys. Also, it contributed to the legacy of Black females taking an active role in progressing the educational opportunities of Blacks. It ushered in the emergence of several young female trailblazers becoming the first to desegregate the public schools in their communities: for instance, Ruby Bridges, who desegregated William Frantz Elementary School in New Orleans, Louisiana, in 1960; Millicent E. Brown, who desegregated Rivers High School in Charleston, South Carolina, in 1963; and Josephine Boyd Bradley, who desegregated Greensboro High School in Greensboro, North Carolina, in 1957 (Meadows, 2011). Moreover, these Black female students not only made strides in school desegregation, but each made important contributions to the U.S. educational system as adults—e.g., Ruby Bridges Foundation, Associate Professor of History, Professor of African American Studies respectively (Meadows, 2011).

In discussing the changes that *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954) brought about in the education system, it should be noted that, although the ruling made integration a legal possibility, the actual accomplishment of integrated schools where Black students had adequate access to education was fraught with many challenges. For example, describing the education landscape in the United States, former U. S. president Lyndon B. Johnson (1967) argued:
Although we have made substantial progress in ending formal segregation of schools, racial isolation in the schools persists—both in the North and the South—because of housing patterns, school districting, economic stratification, and population movements. It has become apparent that such isolation presents serious barriers to quality education. The problems are more subtle and complex than those presented by segregation imposed by law. The remedies may be difficult. But as a first and vital step, the Nation needs to know the facts. (U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1967, p. v)

In short, the Brown v. Board of Education (1954) ruling did not end the struggle for Blacks’ access, participation, and representation in the U.S. education system but rather marked a notable moment in the continued struggle. Additionally, it influenced the establishment of other civil rights laws, statutes, and federal codes intended to end educational discrimination (e.g., Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964; Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972). Such policies have aided in facilitating Black women’s access to a broader range of educational opportunities.

Although Black women’s history with the U.S. education system is laden with racism and struggles for equal access, Black women have made important contributions to progressing the educational history and opportunities of Blacks. Of particular note is the role Black women played in education surrounding the early nineteenth century ideology of racial uplift. Racial uplift refers to the elevation, empowerment, and advancement of the Black race by Black people (Perkins, 1980). The idea of one having a duty and obligation to the Black race is a central theme of the ideology (Perkins, 1980). Commenting on the function of women in the advancement of Blacks during the
prominence of the *racial uplift* ideology, Mary Church Terrell (1902)—first president of the National Association of Colored Women—in an essay titled *What Role Is the Educated Negro Woman to Play in the Uplifting of Her Race?* wrote:

> Should any one ask what special phase of the Negro’s development makes me most hopeful of his ultimate triumph over present obstacles, I should answer unhesitatingly, it is the magnificent work the women are doing to regenerate and uplift the race….For years, either banding themselves into small companies or struggling alone, colored women have worked with might and main to improve the condition of their people. (p. 172)

As described by Terrell (1902), Black women played a pivotal and crucial role in uplifting the Black race. Further, one of the major “uplift” activities for Black women centered around educating herself as well as other Blacks.

As it related to the context of education, Perkins (1980) noted that the *racial uplift* ideology regarded education as important for the entire Black race. Education functioned to “assist in the economical, educational and social improvement of th[e] enslaved and later emancipated [Black] race” (Perkins, 1983, p. 18). Further, Perkins (1980) argued that “education serve[d] to dispel the myth of the inferiority of the Black race” (p. 2). Blacks adhering to the *racial uplift* ideology placed education in high regard as education was considered one of the foremost means for "uplift" and was viewed as a liberating force (Perkins, 1980). Describing the influence of the *racial uplift* ideology Perkins (1980) explained:

> As children, most Blacks grew up being ingrained with a strong sense of duty and obligation to the race. Yet, the greatest force in the development of this racial
concept would be through education.' Education would elevate and the recipients of education would "uplift" the others of the race. (p. 25)

For many Blacks, education was not purposed to solely produce scholars, but to develop Blacks who would be committed to activity that aided in the uplifting of the Black race.

The impact of the *racial uplift* ideology had several implications that are important to discuss. First, it espoused that education was essential for all Blacks, both men and women. This fact is particularly noteworthy given the wider culture’s *opposition* toward women’s higher learning (Allan, 2011). For instance, Allan (2011) explained:

> At its inception, the purpose of American higher education, with the founding of Harvard College in 1636, was to prepare young men to become ministers and government leaders. Because society did not view women as suitable to such roles and girls lacked access to collegiate preparatory schools, women were also not considered as potential students in the colonial and most antebellum colleges. (p. 5)

It follows then, that the dominant culture in the U.S. viewed higher education as only necessary for White men. Laws prohibited the education of enslaved Blacks and the educational opportunities for free Blacks were limited (Perkins, 1983). Additionally, White women were regarded as only needing limited educational opportunities and were socialized to ascribe to the *cult of true womanhood* philosophy. The *cult of true womanhood* ideal emphasized modesty, piety, submissiveness, and domesticity (Perkins, 1983). As it related to education, the ideology maintained that education for women was important only to the extent that it allowed them to read religious materials and engage in activities such as needlepoint, painting, music, and art (Perkins, 1983). This was in stark
contrast to the *racial uplift* ideology which saw the education of Black women as an essential necessity and put no limits on the type of educational content suitable for Black women (Perkins, 1983).

The *racial uplift* ideology notably impacted the manner in which Black women engaged with educational systems and even has implications for women’s presence and experiences in higher education today. Specifically, the *racial uplift* ideology became a motivating factor for many Black women to serve their community and dedicate their lives to educator-based roles (Berry 1982; Perkins, 1983). For instance, Berry (1982) explained:

Black women have focused primarily on the problems of educating black and poor people throughout our history. This has been a natural focus of their interest because of their personal backgrounds and the severe educational problems the black community has faced. In the primary and secondary schools, universities and colleges, governmental agencies, self-help and civil rights organizations, and in every type of educational organization, black women have played a major role in institutionalizing and transmitting knowledge. (p. 289)

Although the *racial uplift* ideology served to facilitate the work of Black women as educators, it has also been criticized for the manner in which it emphasized Black women’s’ service to the race and relegated Black women to teaching positions at the expense of leadership development and entry into other professional fields. For instance, in a 1956 study that looked at the higher education of Black women, Noble (1956) argued:
There are entirely too many fine Negro women in the teaching profession. There should be vocational guidance to encourage them into new fields. Around this part of the country middle-class women go into teaching because this is the highest type of position for them. (p, 87)

The large relegation of Black women to teaching positions reflected what Perkins (1983) described as a shift in the responsibility of education racial uplift activities. Perkins (1983) explained that after the Civil War many of the education responsibilities of the racial uplift ideology was placed primarily on Black women. The shifting attitude reflected the influence of sexism, patriarchy, and paternalism on the racial uplift ideology (Perkins, 1983). The focus of both men and women equally engaging in the education of the race shifted as the roles of Black women as “nurturer and helpmate” were elevated (Perkins, 1983). Describing the impact, Perkins (1983) argued, the shift for Black women resulted in education and leadership development focused on meeting the needs of the Black community, leadership within the Black community restricted to mainly youth and female organizations, and greater instances of experiencing racial uplift activities and leadership as a burden. Although the racial uplift ideology empowered Black women as educators and change makers in their community, it also burdened Black women with the responsibility of taking primary charge in serving the Black community through educating Black women and children. The empowerment and burden of the racial uplift ideology had implications for Black women’s advancement and leadership within administrative positions in higher education, participation in fields beyond education, and movement into predominantly White educational spaces.
Black Women’s Experiences at Predominantly White Institutions

The current study looked specifically at Black female doctoral students within Predominantly White Institutions (PWIs). Examining the experiences of Black women at PWIs is important for several reasons. First, research has documented that the majority of Black students earn their PhDs from PWIs (McGaskey, 2015) and that the largest proportion of Blacks who earn PhDs are women (Shavers & Moore, 2014). Accordingly, exploring academic career intentions within the context of PWIs is important as it reflects the academic settings where many Black women find themselves. Second, understanding the influence of PWIs on Black women’s experiences is meaningful as scholars have noted that institutional culture considerably impacts the doctoral experience for Black students (McGaskey, 2015). This is noteworthy as studies have documented that Black students often experience hostility and racial tension at PWIs (Shavers & Moore, 2014). For instance, researchers have indicated that Black students at PWIs face institutionally related challenges such as “campus-wide internalized oppression, negative classroom experiences, and underdeveloped support systems” (Hannon, Woodside, Pollard, & Roman, 2016, p. 652).

Within the collegiate environment, Black women have unique experiences shaped by the intersection of their race, gender, and class (Hannon et al., 2016; Shavers & Moore, 2014). Additionally, studying the experiences of Black women at PWIs contributes to expanding the literature that addresses the experiences of Black women in higher education. For instance, Shavers and Moore (2014) stated, “consequently, research literature focusing specifically on African American women attending PWIs is infrequent. This suggests that despite their ability to succeed academically, they are
facing a variety of obstacles that are often overlooked” (p. 15). Shavers and Moore’s (2014) assertion that Black women face a variety of obstacles within PWIs that go unnoticed suggests further research is needed to better understand Black female doctoral students’ experiences in PWIs. The following explores literature detailing the experiences of Blacks in PWIs.

Various studies have documented the experiences of Black students providing an understanding of the numerous challenges faced when attending PWIs. Studies have explored the experiences of undergraduate (Jones et al., 2002) and graduate students (McGaskey, 2015), students within education disciplines (Henfield, Woo, & Washington, 2013; Hunn, 2008; Lewis et al., 2004), and a limited amount of research has looked specifically at the experiences of Black women (Ellis, 2001; Shavers & Moore, 2014). Studies have evidenced findings related to students feeling social and academic isolation (Ellis, 2001; Hannon et al., 2016; Lewis et al., 2004), heightened awareness of surroundings and campus climate (Hannon et al., 2016; Shavers & Moore, 2014), and the importance of using coping strategies to overcome adversity (Hannon et al., 2016).

Henfield et al. (2013) explored the experiences of 11 African American counselor education doctoral students and found that students reported challenges related to feelings of isolation and peer disconnection. Within their study, participants attributed isolation to the lack of African American students on campus as well as in the surrounding local area (Henfield et al., 2013). Feelings of isolation have also been found in previous studies with Black doctoral students. For instance, Lewis et al. (2004), in a qualitative study exploring the experiences of currently enrolled and recently graduated African American education, Ph.D. students, found participants reported numerous bouts of social isolation,
often describing feelings of invisibility. Equally, in a study looking specifically at the experiences of Black female doctoral students, Ellis (2001) found that African American female students reported being the most isolated and dissatisfied at PWIs, compared to White students and African American male students.

Extending the understanding of students’ experiences of isolation, studies have also reported that Black students at PWIs note disconnection within peer relationships and faculty-student relationships. Henfield et al. (2013) reported that African American doctoral students identified a lack of cohesion within their program and among their cohort. Difficult cohesion was attributed to insufficient university and program orientations and disrespectful classroom interactions; both of these factors seemed to foster feelings of disconnection (Henfield et al., 2013). Students within the study also reported experiencing faculty misunderstandings and disrespect as a major challenge.

**Access and Representation in higher education**

In contextualizing the experiences of Black female doctoral students, it is important to understand data related to Black women’s access and representation in higher education. Such statistics provide a picture of the landscape Black women enter into and participate in as doctoral students and in making decisions about an academic career. Although the US higher education has historically had a long tradition of White male presence in professorial roles (Carter-Black, 2008; Henderson, 2005; Perkins, 1983), current trends show that more women are participating in graduate education and earning doctoral degrees (National Science Foundation [NSF], 2017). For instance, NSF (2017) noted that since 2002 women have earned the majority of doctorates conferred to U.S. citizens. Similarly, participation in doctoral education by all ethnic minorities has
increased. For instance, NSF (2017) documented a 31% increase in the number of doctorates awarded to Blacks from 2005 to 2015. Blacks accounted for 6.5% of all doctorates awarded in 2015 (NSF, 2017). These statistics highlight an increasingly more diversified student body participating in and completing the doctoral process.

Data related to the field of education also show sizable participation in doctoral work by women and Blacks. In 2015, women comprised 68.4% of all earned doctorates in the field of education—women comprised 3,502 of the education doctorate recipients and men comprised 1,614 of the education doctorate recipients (NSF, 2017). Important to note, however, is a decline in the number of education doctorates awarded. The National Science Foundation (2017) reported a steady drop in education doctorates between 2005 to 2015—from 14% in 2005 to 9% in 2015. The number of doctorates earned in the field of education has potential implications for the academic labor market within education and the competitiveness of education faculty positions.

Surveying the ethnic diversity in U.S. institutions of higher education, the National Center for Education Statistics (Kena et al., 2016) reported that, in the Fall of 2013 of all full-time faculty at degree-granting postsecondary institutions, Black women comprised only three percent of the nation’s professoriate. Although the number of women earning doctoral degrees has continued to increase since 2002 (NSF, 2017), Black female faculty remain underrepresented in presence, rank, and tenure (Kena et al., 2016). Research has shown disproportionate concentrations in where faculty of color work and their academic disciplines (García & Moses, 2000). Black faculty are disproportionately concentrated in historically Black colleges and universities and in the academic fields of education and social science (García & Moses, 2000). For instance, NSF (2017), in the
2015 survey of earned doctorates, found that Blacks were the largest U.S. minority population in psychology, social sciences, and education. These statistics alert attentions to the fact that Black women are increasingly earning doctoral degrees; however, there remains little increase in Black women choosing to enter full time academic careers. Surveying the career choices of doctoral students, NSF (2017) reported that, in 2015, approximately half of all doctorate recipients reported principal employment in academia. This highlights that for many doctoral students, academic careers remain a desirable career goal. Investigating Black women’s decisions to pursue the professoriate is important as the number of Black women in a position to pursue the professoriate continues to increase, yet Black women’s representation in faculty positions remains disproportional.

**Controlling Images in higher education**

Black Feminist Theory scholars (Collins, 1991; Howard-Hamilton, 2003; Wyatt, 1997) have long noted that the experiences of Black women are informed by controlling stereotypical images that pervade society. Historical stereotypes, such as the Mammy, Jezebel, and Sapphire (discussed in more detail later in this section) emerged from slavery and continue to mutate and inform the dominant society’s framing of Black women (Collins, 1991; Wyatt, 1997). Such images contain views of Black women that are erroneous, exaggerated, diminishing, and oppressive (Howard-Hamilton, 2003). When looking at Black women’s career development, it is important to understand the controlling images imposed on Black women as they exert direct and indirect influence (Johnson-Bailey & Tinsdell, 1998; Reynolds-Dobbs, Thomas, & Harrison, 2008). In other words, Black women’s lived experiences and career development are
contextualized by resisting and internalizing these views (Collins, 1991). Since these stereotypical images pervade society, Black women, whether consciously or unconsciously, must navigate these images as well as the discourse and practices erected around these images.

Although scholars differ on the specific terminology they ascribe to a stereotype (e.g., She-Devil compared to Jezebel), the images are collectively understood as socially constructed and exerting control to maintain Black women’s subordination (Collins, 1991). Johnson-Bailey and Tinsdell (1998) asserted that these stereotypical images serve a multiplicity of functions and can even impact the career development of Black women. Stereotypes unconsciously impact individual’s perceptions, reactions, and expectations of Black women (Johnson-Bailey & Tinsdell, 1998). Negative stereotypes can obstruct women’s professional lives, connections with colleagues, and overall institutional experiences (Johnson-Bailey & Tinsdell, 1998).

It is important to unpack the historical and contemporary stereotypes of Black women to better understand how the various characterizations impose influence and pressures on Black women’s doctoral experiences and realities within academic spaces. Equally, understanding these images becomes essential to the development of consciousness and the dismantling of their existence as a means to facilitate change and fostering a liberated career development experience for Black women. The following sections explore the three historical stereotypes—the Mammy, Jezebel, and Sapphire (Harris-Perry, 2011) as well as more contemporary stereotypes—the Superwoman, Crazy Black Bitch (CBB), Chattel, and Welfare Queen (Reynolds-Dobbs et al., 2008) to further contextualize Black women’s experiences in academia.
**Mammy.** The Mammy stereotype is a characterization that depicts Black women as faithful, obedient, nurturing, jolly, and domestic. The Mammy characterization emerged during slavery and functioned as an initial barometer to appraise all Black women’s behavior (Collins, 1991). It served to substantiate Black women’s forced domestic labor as it portrayed Black women as self-sacrificing and complacent in serving White families. Physically, the Mammy is portrayed as unattractive by Western standards. She is depicted as having strong African features, large breasts, a large grin, a dark skin tone, and overweight (Howard-Baptiste, 2014; Stephens & Phillips, 2003; West, 2008; Wyatt, 1997). Further, the stereotype informed a dominant understanding of Black women as being asexual and not caring for her body or health (Collins, 1991; Wyatt, 1997).

Describing the impact of the Mammy characterization on women’s careers and professional lives, Reynolds-Dobbs et al. (2008) argued that, when characterized by the Mammy stereotype, Black women are often placed in supportive positions with little opportunities for vertical mobility. Such positions often involve roles related to minority, diversity, or other support-typed positions (Reynolds-Dobbs et al., 2008). In short, the Mammy characterization reinforces ideologies that Black women desire to function in roles that are more supportive and that they have little ambitions for leadership or growth. Illustrating one impact of the Mammy characterization, Reynolds-Dobbs et al. (2008) described that, within work settings, “both White and Black coworkers may turn to these women for comfort and support of diversity needs, which can serve as a limitation to how others perceive them, especially in regard to their professional skills” (p. 139).
Research looking specifically at Black women in academia has supported the constraining influence of the Mammy characterization in Black women’s professional lives. For instance, Bryant et al. (2005) looked at the impact of the Mammy characterization on African American female counselor educators. Bryant et al. (2005) suggested that, within the academic setting, Black women’s behaviors are covertly and overtly measured using the Mammy characterization as a barometer. Implicit in the use of the Mammy characterization as a yardstick are standards for how Black women should relate to White male elites. It is expected that Black women act maternal, effectively handle multiple taxing situations, and possess no strong ambitions related to their own professional growth and achievement (Bryant et al., 2005).

Furthering literature exploring the pervasive characteristics and imagery of the Mammy stereotype in academia, Howard-Baptiste (2014) offered a critical commentary on the influence of the Mammy image on Black female faculty experiences. Specifically studying how the Mammy image has historically and contemporarily shaped the experiences of Black female professors and higher education in general, Howard-Baptiste (2014) explored Black female full professor’s encounters with “Mammy moments”. Howard-Baptiste (2014) operationalized Mammy moments as “the overt and covert behaviors, attitudes, preconceived notions, and stereotypes that are held on, over, and against Black female professors” (p. 764). Further, she argued that Mammy moments “are inescapable and exist throughout academic and non-academic spaces” (Howard-Baptiste, 2014, p. 764).

Through the study, three specific areas related to the Mammy characterization were identified: Mammy as unintelligent, Mammy as invisible, and Mammy as self-
sacrificing. Mammy as unintelligent described the idea that Black female faculty are depicted as lacking the intellectual capacity to be competent college professors. Mammy as invisible expressed the idea that Black female faculty members find it difficult to be acknowledged for their contributions and service to the profession as when others refuse to see their credentials, accomplishments, authority, etc. Mammy as self-sacrificing conveyed the notion that Black female faculty should sacrifice their own well-being for a socially just cause.

**Jezebel.** Reynolds-Dobbs et al. (2008) pointed out that “Black women who are viewed as the Jezebel are seen as being unqualified workers. Because they are viewed as women who have used their sexuality to move upward on the corporate ladder, they are not seen as real leaders” (p. 140). In other words, this characterization undermines the credibility, authority, and skills of a Black woman as it insinuates her professional achievements are due to her sexuality. Discussing the relational implications of this characterization, Reynolds-Dobbs et al., (2008) argued that, when depicted with this characterization, coworkers and organizational leaders may not respect her. This stereotypical image is thought to impact Black women’s relationships with males as women conscious of the stereotype may distance themselves from male co-workers and supervisors as a means to not appear as a Jezebel and reduce stereotype threat. Reynolds-Dobbs et al., (2008) noted that this may limit Black women’s networking and the establishment of relationships with potential male mentors.

**Sapphire.** This image depicts Black women as tough and having an attitude problem (Reynolds-Dobbs et al., 2008). Describing the Sapphire characterization, Bryant et al. (2005) recounted the stereotypical image as loud, animated, strong-willed,
irresponsible, and untrustworthy. Within the workplace, Black women may often be given tasks that other individuals do not want to do because they are expected to be hard and tough. Such may create a stressful work environment if coworkers and supervisors always expect Black women to do the dirty work. By extension, the stereotype can make it difficult for Black women to show their vulnerability within the workplace because they are not looked at as being soft or vulnerable. In seeking to avoid stereotype threat and reducing being viewed as threatening or confrontational, Black women may become soft-spoken, silenced, or downplay characteristics that could be perceived as militant (Bryant et al., 2005; Reynolds-Dobbs et al., 2008). For example, describing the impact of the internalization of the Sapphire image, Bryant et al. (2005) outlined that within academia women may screen, analyze, and modify thoughts and behaviors to avoid being perceived as a threat by students and colleagues. Such modification may include hairstyles, clothing, research endeavors, or office decor that may be perceived as militant (Bryant et al., 2005). Such constant monitoring and discriminatory stress can, however, have negative physical and mental ramifications (Bryant et al., 2005).

**Crazy Black Bitch (CBB).** An emerging, stereotypical characterization identified in the literature is that of the Crazy Black Bitch (CBB). This image depicts Black women as “crazy, unstable, angry, vindictive, aggressive, defensive, untrusting of others” (p. 136). The CBB is considered overly aggressive, not able to be trusted, and at times may be depicted as lazy, unprofessional, and extremely argumentative (Reynolds-Dobbs et al., 2008). From an employer standpoint, she is considered difficult to manage and especially lacking the ability to work well in a team environment (Reynolds-Dobbs et al., 2008). As it relates to leadership and relational abilities, the CBB is categorized as unable to
maintain relationships and that she will stop at nothing to achieve success (Reynolds-Dobbs et al., 2008).

Reynolds-Dobbs et al. (2008) argued that the negative image of the professional Black women as the CBB may have helped provide negative justifications for the glass ceiling by indirectly supporting myths that Black women are hard to work with, unprofessional, do not make good leaders, and should not move up in position, rank, and influence. Black women’s interpersonal skills may be classified as unfriendly, unstable, argumentative, and unable to work well on teams, resulting in a lack of career advancement assistance from others. In fact, Reynolds-Dobbs et al. (2008) asserted that colleagues may even choose to avoid Black women all together.

**Superwoman.** The Superwoman, also called the Strong Black Woman, is considered a high-potential employee who is a viable candidate for advancement. As an employee, the superwoman is depicted as having exceptional leadership characteristics, easy to work with, friendly, and a dedicated worker (Reynolds-Dobbs et al., 2008). As such, women classified by this characterization may be selected for various leadership positions, asked to serve on numerous committees and projects, and be viewed as uniquely exceptional (Reynolds-Dobbs et al., 2008).

Although the notion of the Strong Black Woman can increase resiliency and motivation for some Black women, attitudes derived from this belief system can devastate the mental and emotional health of Black women. These attitudes threaten to silence the stories, challenges, and pain of Black women because difficulties are ignored. For example, Bryant et al. (2005) noted that, for African American counselor educators, resources and support may be withheld as the Superwoman characterization deems her as
not necessitating support. Consequently, her subsequent requests for course reductions, graduate assistants, less advisees, or other means of support are considered unwarranted despite the fact that she may serve on a disproportionate number of committees, have more advisees, and engage in copious amounts of scholarly activity (Bryant et al., 2005).

Examining implications of the Superwoman stereotype, Reynolds-Dobbs et al. (2008) noted several ways the Superwoman image may affect Black women’s professional and career development. One major problem with the image is that the depiction often leaves Black women isolated and segregated from others because they are seen as being more competent in comparison to their peers and “separate” from others in the Black community (Reynolds-Dobbs et al., 2008). Second, Black professional women are viewed as being able to do it all, and unrealistic expectations are set and held by coworkers and supervisors. For example, oftentimes, Black women in leadership positions are asked to go above and beyond the call of duty in the workplace with very little support (Reynolds-Dobbs et al., 2008).

Although most literature examining the influence of racialized gendered stereotypes in academia has focused on Black faculty, it is conceptualized that these themes have application to the experiences of Black female doctoral students as the doctoral process takes place within the academy. Although articulation of the themes may differ due to doctoral students’ status as a student rather than faculty or administration, the themes are still present. The presence of these stereotypical images for students is consistent with literature on Black female graduate students that identify navigating stereotypes (Harris, 2014), negotiating self-presentation (Shavers & Moore, 2014), and enlisting self-management (Harris, 2014) as a part of the doctoral experience.
Comparatively, it is consistent with Henderson, Hunter, and Hildreth’s (2010) description of a distinctive standpoint as they acknowledge that race and gender ideologies that mark Black women faculty as “other” or as “inferior” also impact students. The conceptualization of the common themes of Black female’s experiences in academia having relevance to Black female doctoral students reflects academic career development models (Alfred, 2001a; Gasser & Shaffer, 2014) that theorize academic career development beginning in graduate school and traversing all academic career stages.

It is crucial to understand the gendered and stereotypical images that surround Black women’s experiences as they markedly shape the world Black women exist in and navigate. In describing the impact of stereotypes, Jones and Shorter-Gooden (2003) argued:

Myths and stereotypes do much of their damage subconsciously. They seep into the inner psyche and take up residence, affecting how one thinks, feels, and perceives others, even while one purports to be unbiased and tolerant…They’re insidious. They’re sneaky. They have had centuries to sink in. (p. 34)

Expounding on the long-term impact of stereotypes on Black women in the United States, Harris-Perry (2011) used the analogy of a *crooked room*. Harris-Perry’s (2011) *crooked room* analogy is based on field dependence research that investigated individuals’ ability to vertically align when placed in a crooked chair in a crooked room. The field studies found that some participants were able to align themselves upright, while others reported being upright when in fact they were tilted (Harris-Perry, 2011). Those who reported being aligned straight despite being tilted did so as a result of basing their alignment on
the tilted objects in the room (Harris-Perry, 2011). In other words, the pervasive nature of the crooked images impacted their ability to align straight.

Applying the crooked room concept to Black women’s experiences, Harris-Perry (2011) argued that Black women exist within a crooked space due to the pervasive and distorted stereotypes that surround their experiences. Ultimately, racial and gendered stereotypes create a crooked terrain that Black women must learn to navigate. In navigating such crooked terrain, Black women face tilting and bending to either fit the distortions, or resist the distortions by fighting to stand straight (Harris-Perry, 2011). Accordingly, Harris-Perry (2011) concluded that Black women at times conquer negative myths, at other times are defeated by such myths, and in some circumstances choose not to fight. Although stereotypes have a pervasive impact, Black women have historically found ways to transcend such myths and crooked images.

The prospect of conquering, being defeated, or simply not fighting against stereotypical images may change from situation to situation. Acknowledging the crooked room in which Black women contend gives light, however, to Black women’s experiences. In addition, Harris-Perry (2011) also argued that citizenship and recognition were central to the experiences of Black women and associated with distorted images. As Black women may often be misrecognized or alienated through the perpetuation of historical and contemporary stereotypes, Black women contend for a sense of belonging and recognition void of the influence of distorted images.

**Self-Altering Coping Strategies**

Although the coping strategies employed by Black women to deal with racism, sexism, and their marginalized position vary from woman to woman, certain coping
strategies have been identified in the literature as often practiced by women in higher education. Specifically, to navigate some of the barriers wrought in higher education such as stereotypical images, isolation, marginalization, microagressions, and more, Black women commonly use self-altering coping strategies such as biculturalism, code-switching, and shifting (Bell, 1990; Rice, 2010; Terhune, 2006). This section explores various self-altering coping strategies employed by Black women.

**Biculturalism.** Within literature focused on Black women’s coping strategies, *biculturalism* emerged as a common mechanism (Rice, 2010; Terhune, 2006).

Biculturalism for Black women provides a means for coping with dual cultural contexts. Describing the duality involved in women’s lived experiences, Bell (1990) explained that “(i)n response to living in a racially divided society, [Black] women have a bicultural life experience that informs the nature of the dialectical relationship between black women and the dominant white culture” (p. 462). Similarly, Thomas and Alderfer (1989) identified biculturalism as a coping strategy that provides a means for Blacks to deal with the demands associated with the physical, mental, and emotional navigation between two distinct cultural worlds—the dominant culture and Black culture. Addressing the notion of a dual existence, scholars have used the term bicultural identity as a lens for studying this dynamic (Terhune, 2006; Thomas & Alderfer, 1989). Bicultural identity draws on the work of DuBois (1903) and his concept of double consciousness. Double consciousness addressed Black Americans’ struggles with viewing the self from the vantage point of others (DuBois, 1903). Describing the concept of double consciousness, DuBois (1903) argued that
The Negro is a sort of seventh son, born with a veil, and gifted with second-sight in this American world—a world which yields him no true self-consciousness, but only lets him see himself through the revelation of the other world. It is a peculiar sensation, this double-consciousness, this sense of always looking at one's self through the eyes of others, of measuring one's soul by the tape of a world that looks on in amused contempt and pity. One ever feels his twoness—an American, a Negro; two souls, two thoughts, two unreconciled strivings; two warring ideals in one dark body, whose dogged strength alone keeps it from being torn asunder.

Addressing this “twoness”, biculturalism encompasses one having fluency in two cultures (Terhune, 2006). Bell (1990) argued that “(f)or black professional women, double-consciousness means being aware of two cultural contexts (one black, the other white), each of which is shaped by vastly different socio-historical conditions, including racism and sexism” (p. 462).

Black women are educated and socialized in both Eurocentric and Afrocentric cultures (Terhune, 2006). When thinking about the role of bicultural identity in the lives of Black women, it is important, however, to note that for Black women, a third component—gender—must also be considered. As such, Black women not only navigate Black culture and White culture, but must negotiate Eurocentric-American female and Afrocentric-American female cultures (Terhune, 2006). Summarizing the importance of a bicultural perspective, Alfred (2001a) argued that

(t)he bicultural perspective allows us to examine issues of biculturalism and the power dynamics that emerge from the contested terrain of difference. It also
allows us to examine issues of identity and community, inclusion and exclusion, voice and representation, power and subordination, in the study of bicultural groups. (p. 114)

Terhune (2006) identified biculturalism as a basic coping strategy that allows Black women to traverse predominately White contexts without alarming Whites of their temporary presence in such spaces. Biculturalism provides mobility, both within and between two cultural contexts (Bell, 1990). It involves one effectively communicating and coping with cross cultural interactions as well as the ability to determine appropriate behavior across cultural contexts (Byars-Winston, 2010). Therefore, it involves the ongoing process of identity definition, construction, and reconstruction, and occurs when a woman moves from one cultural context to another, requiring her to accept different cultural patterns and enact alternate roles (Bell, 1990). Hence, biculturalism not only means fluency in both cultures, but provides a means for individuals to retain their personal racial-ethnic identity while interacting with others outside of their racial-ethnic group (Byars-Winston, 2010). This psychosocial process requires that Black women be able to blend the adaptive values and roles of both their native culture and the culture that surrounds them (Byars-Winston, 2010). Biculturalism typically emerges when comfort with both cultures is essential for day-to-day living (Schwartz & Unger, 2010). The bicultural viewpoint provides a perspective that gives attention to the interplay between the two cultures and its effects on the lives of Black women (Thomas & Alderfer, 1989).

Schwartz and Unger (2010) argued that biculturalism also involves synthesizing the two cultures into a unique and distinctive culture that is not directly reducible to either culture. Byars-Winston (2010) noted that electing to function in both cultures
rather than selecting one has advantages. Additionally, Schwartz and Unger (2010) stated that the implications of this conceptualization mean a bicultural person would intermix the two cultures with regard to cultural practices, values, and identifications. The inclusion of this conceptualization provides two approaches to understanding biculturalism. For instance, Schwartz and Unger (2010) identified two biculturalism approaches to navigating the dual cultural context: blended biculturalism and alternating biculturalism. The blended biculturalism approach consists of behaving biculturally in all situations (Schwartz & Unger, 2010). Contrastingly, alternating biculturalism involves the shifting of behaviors in alignment with the cultural context of the situation (Schwartz & Unger, 2010). Despite the bicultural approach, the coping mechanism serves as a means for Black women to navigate predominately White contexts and redefine the meaning of their cultural identity within the forces of oppression and domination without losing one’s connection to her Black female identity (Byars-Winston, 2010; Terhune, 2006).

**Code-switching.** A second coping strategy identified in the literature as commonly used by Black women is code-switching (Terhune, 2006). In their introduction of a stigma management perspective, Cross and Strauss (1998) identified code switching as one of five identity functions of a Black identity (buffering, bonding, bridging, and individualism are the other functions). Defining code-switching, Cross and Strauss (1998) explained:

The code-switching function of Black identity involves the capacity to suspend, in a calculated but highly effective fashion, the “open” and “natural” expression of those behaviors, verbal styles, attitudes, and other forms of presentation, which in
the popular mainstream culture are labeled as “Black behavior”. Code switching can be defined as the turning off or switching on of one’s proclivity to present oneself in a “Black” way. Instead this “Black” manner is temporarily replaced with a persona that is more in accordance with the norms and expectations of a particular person or institution. (p. 272)

In short, code-switching allows women to intentionally and temporarily mask aspects of their identity through accommodation or assimilation to blend in or fit into an environment where they are marginalized (Cross & Strauss, 1998).

Chatman, Eccles, and Malanchuk (2005) explicated that code-switching operates more as an identity strategy rather than an identity function. In this case, the scholars made the distinction that identity strategies focus on goal-directed behaviors, emphasizing the ways individuals negotiate self and the context, whereas identity functions focus on identity end-states, emphasizing the self-relevant goals one is trying to achieve (Chatman et al., 2005). To that end, they highlighted that code-switching as a strategy involved the “conscious turning on and off of those attributes and behaviors associated with group membership in response to situational demands”, emphasizing a contextual motive (Chatman et al., 2005). They clarified that code-switching is a means by which individuals try to achieve identity fit to navigate a given context. The motive of “fit” or “passing” (Cross & Strauss, 1998) derives from Black women’s need to be treated fairly. Cross and Strauss (1998) noted that code-switching “becomes necessary when an organization or group, while not openly hostile to difference, show signs of discomfort with explicit expressions of difference” (p. 273). In response to this, in order to navigate spaces where distorted images of Black women create a crooked context,
Black women may code-switch. Code-switching may be employed for a few hours, prolonged over time, or become the norm for how one navigates an academic space making it a part of one’s everyday life (Cross & Strauss, 1998).

Accordingly, Cross and Strauss (1998) clarified that:

(s)ituations calling for code switching (school, workplace, neighborhood, shopping centers, etc.) require that Blacks dress, think, act, and express themselves in a way that will optimize the comfort of the person, group, or institution, such that, in turn, Blacks will receive fair treatment, quality services, needed protection, and employment. (p. 273)

In order to employ code-switching as a coping strategy, Black women must be proficient in the culture and norms of the “other” (Cross & Strauss, 1998, p. 273). Similar to biculturalism, it requires having fluency in two cultures. In summary, as expressed by Cross and Strauss (1998), “(c)ode switching makes it possible for a Black person not to be ‘seen’ as Black, but as just another customer, student, citizen, applicant, or employee” (p. 273).

**Shifting.** *Shifting* is another coping strategy identified in the literature as a common strategy adopted by Black women (Jones & Shorter-Gooden, 2003; Terhene 2006). Jones and Shorter-Gooden (2003) asserted that “Black women in America expend substantial psychic energy on managing the threats of racial and gender bias” (p. 60). *Shifting* provides a means whereby Black women manage feelings and alter behaviors to cope with the oppression, stereotypes, and biases they face (Jones & Shorter-Gooden, 2003). *Shifting* involves hiding one’s true self to placate and accommodate others such as White colleagues, Black men, and other groups (Jones & Shorter-Gooden, 2003).
Shifting includes an accommodation of differences that spans class, gender, and ethnicity and is both internal and external. Jones and Shorter-Gooden (2003) offered an illustration as they described that “(s)hifting is what she does when she speaks one way in the office, another way to her girlfriends, and still another way to her elderly relatives” (p. 7).

Externally shifting mirrors code switching as it involves the changing of oneself from one context to another. Namely, shifting involves altering and modifying appearance, speech, and behaviors (Jones & Shorter-Gooden, 2003). Shifting, however, is not only an external process as it can involve mental changes as well (Jones & Shorter-Gooden, 2003). Black women may shift how they think and the expectations they hold (Jones & Shorter-Gooden, 2003). Shifting may involve women denying their feelings of sadness, loneliness, anger, fear, etc. Also, it may take an inward direction as Black women internalize various painful experiences related to race and gender related obstacles (Jones & Shorter-Gooden, 2003). Providing an illustration of the internal and invisible aspects of shifting, Jones and Shorter-Gooden (2003) illustrated “(t)o shift is to work overtime when you are exhausted to prove that you are not lazy” (p. 7).

As shifting can involve both internal and external processes, Jones and Shorter-Gooden (2003) argued that shifting can encompass both a cognitive and behavioral component. Additionally, shifting can be understood as encompassing six basic strategies:

1. Battling the myths - altering behavior in order to disprove and transcend society’s misconceptions about them.

2. Scanning, surveying, and scrutinizing the environment - carefully monitoring how they are being perceived at every turn.
3. Walling off the impact of discrimination - downplaying, ignoring, or denying the role of sexism and racism in their lives, many Black women are able to transcend the pain and suffering they would otherwise express.

4. Seeking spiritual and emotional support through churches religious communities - finding a higher propose and building emotional connections in their lives in order to rise above the daily onslaught of sexism and racism.

5. Retreating to the Black community and abiding by the home codes – a return to the Black community for relief and solace, but then may be faced with pressure to abide by a different set of cultural conventions and codes.

6. Fighting back- individuals may directly challenge and work to overturn racism and sexism. (Jones & Shorter-Gooden, 2003, p. 66-67)

In the lives of Black women, shifting can function as a survival skill and yet in some circumstances can have a self-destructive impact (Jones & Shorter-Gooden, 2003). For example, the constant pressure and preoccupation with accommodating others and proving oneself can leave Black women feeling conflicted, weary, and alone (Jones & Shorter-Gooden, 2003). Jones and Shorter-Gooden (2003) made the distinction that shifting can be adaptive when Black women are “able to stay centered and keep their shifting within bounds, navigating the waters of adversity resourcefully” (p. 63). Contrastingly, it is self-destructive when Black women lose touch with their needs and experiences with an unyielding focus on generating an outer façade that is acceptable to others (Jones & Shorter-Gooden, 2003). Although one form of shifting may be an effective strategy for one woman, it may be impractical, counterproductive, or destructive for another (Jones & Shorter-Gooden, 2003).
As this study looks at the academic career development of Black women, it is important to consider research that speaks to shifting in the work environment. Describing shifting in the work space for Black women, Jones and Shorter-Gooden (2003) argued that:

The workplace is where Black women feel they must shift most often, engaging in a grown-up game of pretend as they change their voices, attitudes, and postures to meet the cultural codes of workday America as well as the broader societal codes of gender, race and class. Work is where they are most likely to confront all the myths about Black women head on, and the stage upon which they may utilize every shifting strategy in their arsenal. (p. 150)

Noting the role shifting plays in the lives of Black women in work spaces is important given this study investigates doctoral student’s academic career intentions. Academia is a workspace where Black women face a multitude of stereotypical images and myths. As such, doctoral students engage in doctoral training in this workspace and then must decide if they want to remain in such a work space and pursue a career in academia. Black women’s experiences with shifting have implications for how they navigate and experience the academic space.

**Academic Careers**

An academic career encompasses a variety of activities that are typically classified within four central domains: teaching, research, administration, and service (Poole & Bornholt, 1998). When considering a faculty position, Black women must consider the kind of position (e.g., full-time tenure track, full-time non-tenure track) as well as the type of institution in which they want to work. The institution type has
implications on the expectations and responsibilities related to teaching, research, administration, and service as well as important ramifications on one’s life (Vick, Furlong, & Lurie, 2016). Individuals may pursue a faculty career at institutions that may be classified as one or more of the following: public institution, private institution, nonprofit institution, for-profit institution, predominantly White institution, historically Black college and university, community college, liberal arts college, teaching university, or research university. In seeking a faculty appointment, Black female doctoral students may be facing substantial geographic relocation—another important consideration that impacts both their professional and personal life.

Understanding the patterns of faculty life at various institutions can provide pivotal information for Black women considering an academic career. For example, Garcia and Moses (2000) described faculty life at community colleges as having a teaching focus, a greater teaching load (e.g., four or five courses each semester), and expectations to work intensively with students (many of whom may lack a strong awareness of academic and career options). Similarly, Vick et al. (2016) described faculty at teaching-focused institutions as having few hours for research and other priorities as most of their time is consumed with teaching and service. Such institutions complement individuals who value a faculty career comprised highly of teaching and direct service to students. Contrastingly, research universities often hold expectations that faculty conduct research intensively with some faculty careers highly contingent upon obtaining grants and various research funding sources (Vick et al., 2016). At research universities, teaching and service, while important, are not the bulk of faculty workload as research agendas define faculty work. Faculty at research institutions may teach two to
four courses a year (Garcia & Moses, 2000). Likewise, faculty at research institutions work with graduate students, involving them in their research and preparing future scholars within their field (Garcia & Moses, 2000). An emphasis is placed on becoming well recognized in one’s field for advancing knowledge. Garcia and Moses (2000) contended that the aspirations of being a prominent scholar in one’s field yields to many faculty at research institutions having greater commitment to their disciplines than their institutions.

Between community colleges (also called associate’s colleges by the Carnegie Classification system) and research universities (called doctoral universities within the Carnegie classification system) are institutions with varying profiles and expectations for faculty teaching, research, and service. For example, the Carnegie Classification system makes three distinctions among doctoral universities: highest research activity (R1), higher research activity (R2), and moderate research activity (R3). Thus, while research demands for doctoral universities are high compared to associate colleges, faculty research expectations differ between R1, R2, and R3 universities. As such, when pursing academic careers, it becomes important that Black women have an understanding of the dynamics and expectations at various institution types, as well as an awareness of their desired engagement with the academic activities of teaching, research, administration, and service.

**Academic Career Pathways.** Literature varies in its conceptualization of academic career development. In categorizing the career path of the professoriate, several scholars have used the pipeline metaphor to describe pathways to a tenured faculty position (Shaw & Stanton, 2012; van Anders, 2004). Shaw and Stanton (2012) asserted
that an academic career is best conceptualized as a linear process that traverses one’s entry through exit in an academic career. Scholars generally acknowledge the start of the pipeline as commencing before entry into academia as a faculty member; however, the specific starting point of the pipeline differs. Some scholars (Shaw & Stanton, 2012; van Anders, 2004) point to undergraduate studies as the start of the pipeline, whereas others (Bryant, Hilton, & Green, 2016; Gasser & Shaffer, 2014) cite the graduate experience or doctoral studies as the first stage of entering an academic career. For instance, Shaw and Stanton (2012) outlined the conceptualization of the pipeline as comprised of five discrete stages: undergraduate studies, graduate studies, post-doctoral fellowships, assistant professorship (tenure track), and tenured professorship. Moreover, one is thought to move successively through each stage signifying access, entry, and success reflective of one’s career choice and merit. Conversely, Gasser and Shaffer (2014), in a model of women’s academic career development, conceived the pipeline as beginning in graduate school and continuing through all stages of a career in academia. Despite differences in the specific start point, when considering the pipeline conceptualization, it is clear that one’s academic experiences prior to a faculty position have implications for the development of one’s academic career.

In explaining academic career development, several scholars have criticized the “pipeline” model as simplistic (Heijstra, O’Connor, & Rafnsdóttir, 2013; Monroe & Chiu, 2010) and not accounting for varied and complex academic careers (Shaw & Stanton, 2012; The Snail-Like, 2009). For example, Ahmad (2017) described the pipeline model as dominated by “ideal worker” norms arguing it continues to impose rigid and sequential, time-bound requirements on aspiring academics. The pipeline model is
thought to not adequately account for current gender and racial patterns reflective of discrimination and systematic bias within academia (Monroe & Chiu, 2010; The Snail-Like, 2009). The pipeline model has traditionally put forth the lack of cultural diversity in individuals holding faculty positions within academia as a result of underrepresented groups not earning doctoral degrees (Monroe & Chiu, 2010; The Snail-Like, 2009).

Following the pipeline model, scholars believe that as more minorities enter higher education, gender and race gaps in full professorial positions will diminish.

Offering a critical analysis of the pipeline conceptualization, Monroe and Chiu (2010) argued that, by conceptualizing entrance to the pipeline as grounded solely on choice, the will of the individual is emphasized excluding the role of systematic bias. Further criticizing this model, scholars have pointed out that the model does not account for academic careers that do not follow a linear process. For example, in an article in the Journal of Blacks in higher education, it was noted that, “(a)nother flaw in the pipeline defense is the assumption that there is only one pipeline — the specific United States pipeline that carries newly minted Ph.D.s into tenure-track appointments” (The Snail-Like, 2009). In other words, the linear pipeline model does not account for academic careers where individuals are “teaching at colleges and universities in a part-time capacity or may teach a night course or a one-day-a-week seminar and may move into a full-time position from this route” (The Snail-Like, 2009). This is specifically important to note given the decrease in tenure-track jobs and increase in "contingent" positions in the academic workforce (American Federation of Teachers, 2009; Hurlburt & McGarrah, 2015).
Adding to the pipeline metaphor is the concept of the “leaky pipeline”. The leaky pipeline provides a model that takes into account the various dynamics that contribute to the attrition of female academics throughout different stages of the academic career process; it accounts for points of “leakage” (van Anders, 2004). Academia as a “leaky pipeline” provides two options: individuals progress through the academic stages or leave academia (Shaw & Stanton, 2012). While drawing upon the pipeline model, the leaky pipeline provides opportunities to account for factors that contribute to leaks. Although the “pipeline” metaphor has received criticism for its simplistic nature, Shaw and Stanton (2012) pointed out that, although academic career paths may be more complex and influenced by a variety of academic and non-academic events, the pipeline model provides a useful postulate to begin to identify broad patterns and trends. They argued the developments elucidated through the model can be more specifically examined to determine causes through more detailed studies (Shaw & Stanton, 2012).

The Current Landscape of the Academic Labor Market. A growing body of literature has criticized the preparation of doctoral students for academic careers (Gaff, 2002; Golde & Dore, 2001). For example, after surveying 4,114 doctoral students in a large national study, Golde and Dore (2001) concluded:

there is a three-way mismatch between student goals, training and actual careers. Despite a decade of attention, the mismatch between the purpose of doctoral education, aspirations of the students, and the realities of their careers within and outside academia continues. Doctoral students persist in pursuing careers as faculty members, and graduate programs persist in preparing them for careers at research universities, despite the well-publicized paucity of academic jobs and
efforts to diversify the options available for doctorate-holders. The result:
Students are not well prepared to assume the faculty positions that are available, nor do they have a clear concept of their suitability for work outside of research. (p. 5)

Of particular importance in this conclusion is the assertion that doctoral education has failed to train doctoral students, taking into account the noted changes in the academic workforce and the current academic workplace. Similarly, in a more recent study, Corbett (2016) argued that the demands of academia have increased expectations where faculty are expected to do more with less. Such expectations include using technology, providing more distance learning, actively participating in community initiatives, and participating in the university governance process (Corbett, 2016).

Lindholm (2004) found that the conditions of the academic labor market have pointed implications for academic career intentions, perceptions of academic careers, and that professional opportunities varied as a function of the academic labor market. Lindholm (2004) further noted that, in tight academic labor markets, some students psychologically distance themselves from engaging in proactive academic career planning. Vick et al. (2016) described the current higher education climate as subjugated by intense financial constraints, competition, accelerated technological transformations, increased political scrutiny, added assessments, intensely competitive research grants, growing research requirements, and a consumer-oriented model. All of these factors have an impact on individual careers and perceptions of an academic career. Vick et al. (2016) contended individuals with doctoral degrees face considerable uncertainty and that even with all the credentials for tenure track, individuals may question if an academic career
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offers a worthwhile return on the time, energy, and thought invested in obtaining a doctoral degree.

Within higher education, tenure track and full-time faculty positions are becoming increasingly difficult to obtain due to the reduced availability of full-time academic posts in many institutions (American Federation of Teachers, 2009; Antony, 2002; Helm et al., 2012; Hurlburt & McGarrah, 2015). As a result, the academic job market has become more competitive (Larson, Ghaffarzadegan, & Xue, 2014). Larson et al. (2014) noted that many PhD graduates are unemployed or underemployed. They argued that, across a wide range of fields, growth is minimal with most showing a steady pace, changing very slowly, or not changing at all. This lack of growth then results in new hires often being a replacement for individuals who are leaving. They contended that, in many fields, openings are closely tracking retirement and exit rates (Larson et al., 2014). Speaking to this trend and looking specifically at the field of counselor education, Woo et al. (2017) noted growth in the counselor education academic workforce due to retirement. Specifically, Woo et al. (2017) noted that, within the next five to 10 years, a large number of counselor educators will retire resulting in a plentiful number of openings for new doctoral graduates in the next decade. Additionally, Woo et al. (2017) cited the projected growth of counseling positions as faster than average between 2012 and 2020 as another impetus for needing more counselor education faculty. They argued there is a gap between the projected number of counselor educator job openings and counselor education doctoral graduates pursuing academic positions. The Woo et al. (2017) investigation indicated differences in faculty prospects by discipline. Although as a
whole, there are fewer full-time positions in academia, there are also differences by academic discipline whereby some disciplines may have more plentiful openings.

Another important factor to consider in the academic workforce involves academia’s increased reliance on contingent and adjunct faculty. Research has documented that, over the years, colleges and universities have relied more and more upon contingent faculty, adjuncts, visiting faculty, etc. (Hurlburt & McGarrah, 2015). Mazurek (2011) documented that nearly three fourths of faculty in higher education work in contingent positions (i.e., untenured and non-tenure track positions, both full-time non-tenure track and part-time non-tenure track position). This figure, however, does not distinguish between full-time and part-time non-tenure track positions. When considering only part-time employment, adjunct faculty comprise between 40 to 50% of the higher education instructional workforce (Magness, 2016). Magness (2016) contended distinguishing between full-time contingent faculty and part-time adjuncts is important as the two groups face differences in job security, wage gaps, and benefits. For instance, Magness (2016) explained that most full-time contingent faculty receive employee benefits not available to adjuncts. Further, adjuncts on average earned $2,700 to $3,200 per course, a wage substantially lower than tenured, tenure-track, and contract faculty (Magness, 2016). Reliance on contingent and adjunct faculty has been attributed to factors such as instructional budget reductions, the diminution of tenure, the failure to match growing student enrollments, and the impact of economic recessions (Magness, 2016). These realities highlight that, for many doctoral students, a non-academic career may be more appealing or viewed as simply more attainable due to the limited full-time and tenure-track opportunities in the postsecondary instructional workforce.
An additional factor important to highlight in discussing the academic labor market is diversity initiatives targeted to recruit underrepresented populations into faculty positions. Sgoutas-Emch, Baird, Myers, Camacho, and Lord (2016) argued that the traditional searches and diversity attempts have been ineffective in securing faculty of color and women. Outlining the traditional process they explained:

These traditional procedures generally entail: writing a narrow job description that focuses solely on disciplinary scholarship and teaching (to the exclusion of other elements that could more broadly appeal to a wider pool); publishing the position announcement in the leading journals in the fields (and neglecting specialty outlets); using networks that perpetuate typical hiring practices; and attending traditional disciplinary conferences to recruit, and sometimes interview, prospective candidates. (p.91)

Calling for alternative procedures, Sgoutas-Emch et al. (2016) contended there is a need to reconceptualize the traditional pathway to the professoriate for women and people of color. Further, they argued for practices that address three key elements: “1) structural factors and the social context of hiring; 2) personally held beliefs and values, including implicit biases of those in positions of leadership; and 3) the absence of policies and processes to address historically underrepresented faculty” (p. 91).

As universities continue to recognize the problems with traditional recruitment methods, innovative faculty hiring methods are continuing to be put forth. One growing diversity hiring initiative within higher education is cohort or cluster hiring. Discussing the use of cohort/cluster hiring to Sgoutas-Emch et al. (2016) explained the process of cluster hiring as the process where universities hire groups of faculty from different
disciplinary backgrounds who share interdisciplinary research interests. The approach has been viewed as a way to advance faculty diversity. Other methods being employed by universities include developing job descriptions that align more with the interest of underrepresented populations (Sgoutas-Emch et al., 2016). This includes integrating into faculty job descriptions institutional connections to social justice or community engagement, opportunities for cross-disciplinary initiatives or student mentorship, and the highlighting of university goals that evidence a commitment to diversity and inclusion (Sgoutas-Emch et al., 2016).

It should be acknowledged, however, although diversity initiatives have helped in attracting Black female faculty it can in some ways serve to complicate the journey towards tenure and promotion. Black female faculty who are recruited under diversity initiatives may experience tokenism and people questioning the legitimacy of their presence in higher education, expectations to complete lots of service work which may be at the expense of research, and an increased sense of pressure to please the employer. For example, in a report by the Urban Universities for HEALTH (2015) on a study that examined 10 U.S. universities that practiced cluster hiring, the authors noted several negative consequences of cluster hiring. Among these negative consequences included: faculty reporting being overworked, interdisciplinary work not being counted toward tenure, and other faculty members doubting their value (Urban Universities for HEALTH, 2015).

**Academic Career Models**

When conceptualizing the development of academic careers, several scholars have offered career development models to explain, predict, and describe academic
careers. Of particular use to this study is consideration of two models: the Career Process of Women in Academia Model (Gasser & Shaffer, 2014) and the Model of Career Development for Black Women in White-Dominated Academic Institutions (Alfred, 2001a). These models have been proposed as providing an understanding for women’s experiences in academic careers. The following explores the concepts associated with each model to help in the framing of the current study.

**Career Process of Women in Academia Model.** Drawing upon the usefulness of the pipeline metaphor to increase the understanding of women’s interest, entry, and success in academia, Gasser and Shaffer (2014) proposed the *Career Process of Women in Academia Model*. This model is offered as a framework for counselors and individuals working with women in academia to address (a) career development influences, (b) factors affecting entry into academia, and (c) the experiences and outcomes of a career in academia. The model reflects the metaphoric “pipeline” and “leaky pipeline” description of an academic career, which is a common academic career development model used in literature (Brown & Watson, 2010; Gasser & Shaffer, 2014; Shaw & Stanton, 2012).

In their Career Process of Women in Academia Model, Gasser and Shaffer (2014) conceived women’s academic career development beginning in graduate school and continuing through all stages of a career in academia. In contending for the conceptualization of the pipeline as starting in graduate school, Gasser and Shaffer (2014) argued that, although previous scholastic experiences affect enrollment into a graduate program, it is the actual experiences with graduate studies that mark the impetus for consideration of an academic career. Although not identifying the undergraduate process or other academic experiences as part of the pipeline, their model indirectly
accounts for the influences of past collegial experiences as it acknowledges that such experiences contribute to one’s progression to and through graduate school. The model encompasses both women’s experiences before the faculty position, as well as how women experience the academic career. As such, the model lays out heuristics for understanding how female faculty develop their career aspirations and expectations as well as their academic career progression and termination. The following outlines the model as it relates to predicting and explaining the development of academic career aspirations and expectations associated with experiences during the graduate and doctoral student process.

Gasser and Shaffer’s (2014) model organized women’s academic career development influences into five categories: cognitive, coping, environmental, personality, and relational. Within each of these five groupings are various career related factors that influence a woman’s academic career progression. For example, within the cognitive category, variables such as career aspirations, career choice, career expectations, intellectual abilities, and liberal gender role attitudes are considered. Respectively, the coping category includes variables such as career maturity, career self-efficacy, career adaptability, and self-esteem. In general, this category looks at the ways women navigate the career development process, focusing on their ability to make career decisions and the confidence they have in their ability to make good career decisions. The environmental cluster of the model looks at the various external factors shaping one’s surroundings as it relates to the career development process. It includes dynamics such as availability of resources, previous work experience, class and socioeconomic status, socialization influences, and reduced status and pay for jobs traditionally viewed as
female (Gasser & Shaffer, 2014). Another dimension accounted for in the model is the influence of personality variables. This category describes intrinsic factors such as career interests, achievement motivation, and the value placed on graduate education. The final category, relational, includes variables that are interpersonal in nature. It contains factors related to the influence of psychosocial needs, relationships with parents, presence of role models, marital and parental status, and the social exchange of career and parenthood (Gasser & Shaffer, 2014). The variables contained within each of the five categories (cognitive, coping, environmental, personality and relational) have notable implications for the development of an academic career for women and impact a woman’s access to a career in academia (Gasser & Shaffer, 2014).

In addition to the model outlining five categories that influence academic career development, the model also categorized factors affecting women’s experiences in academia: academic responsibilities, academic environment, academic culture of independence, institutional resources, and social relationships (Gasser & Shaffer, 2014). This second set of factors accounted for women’s experiences once in academia, as the theory sets forth to explain both entry into the pipeline and one’s experiences once in the pipeline. Likewise, the model offers an understanding of the myriad of psychosociocultural factors that influence both a woman’s entry into and maintenance of an academic career, beginning with a woman’s decision to pursue a graduate degree (Gasser & Shaffer, 2014). In addition to outlining the various factors that influence women’s entry and experiences in academia, the model offers a set of predictions related to how each of the categories impact one’s academic career development. As the current study looks at women’s academic career development related to entry, academic career
aspirations, and expectations, the following reviews the predictive nature of the model as it relates to entry into the pipeline.

In looking at the cognitive variables related to women’s academic career development, Gasser and Shaffer (2014) explained that one’s careertrajectory is heavily predicated upon the level of congruence between career aspirations, career choices, career expectations, and abilities and the values, norms, and culture of an academic career. They noted that one must have the necessary abilities and attitudes to both endure and succeed in graduate school and beyond. This explanation models previous research investigating the interaction of personal and environmental factors in structuring individuals’ decisions to pursue faculty careers (Lindholm, 2004). Such studies found that inherent attraction to academic work such as personal need for autonomy, independence, individual expression, and partiality to the university work environment supported academic career aspirations (Lindholm, 2004).

In regard to the influence of coping variables on academic career entry, Gasser and Shaffer’s (2014) model explained that in order to transition effectively from graduate training into academic careers, women must have solid career coping skills. Entry into academia requires both the ability and confidence to make good career decisions. For instance, Gasser and Shaffer (2014) contended that academic self-concept can be a facilitative variable for women’s futures as academics when it is consistent with an academic career.

Another prediction proposed by the model relates to the impact of socioeconomic and class status. It is proposed that decreases in class and socioeconomic status moderate the likelihood that a woman will enter an academic career (Gasser & Shaffer, 2014).
Addressing the role of environmental variables in women’s academic career development, this proposition is based on the idea that lower class and socioeconomic status is negatively correlated with access to structures and opportunities that bolster academic and resource attainment related to academic careers (Gasser & Shaffer, 2014). Several studies have examined influences on graduate student’s academic career development, looking at the influence of cultural social identity (Haley, Jaeger, & Levin, 2014), social class (Ostrove, Stewart, & Curtin, 2011), and family and work responsibilities (Quinn, 2011) on academic career choice. For example, Ostrove et al. (2011) found that graduate students from poor and working-class backgrounds are more likely to have financial struggles during graduate school which is correlated with a decreased sense of belonging within academia and having a lower academic self-concept. Progressively, a diminished sense of belonging and academic self-concept led to less interest in pursuing a career as a professor at a top research university (Ostrove et al., 2011)

Within the model, personality variables such as having high achievement motivation and instrumentality are conceptualized as facilitating an academic career (Gasser & Shaffer, 2014). Possessing career interests that complement an academic path and having a high value for graduate education further facilitates an academic career (Gasser & Shaffer, 2014). A final proposition laid out by the model is the idea that the presence of relationships (parents and role models) within a woman’s life that is perceived as offering encouragement, support, and role models facilitates an academic career path (Gasser & Shaffer, 2014). For example, Gasser and Shaffer (2014) detailed that, when women matriculate into graduate programs characterized by an environment
that is more gender balanced than male dominated, women’s development as academicians is further facilitated.

**Model of Career Development for Black Women.** Within the context of career development, Alfred (2001a) introduced a model for the career development of Black women in PWIs drawing upon the bicultural life structure theory. The model, developed from the experiences of tenured Black female professors, provides a means to examine the influence of both the personal and organizational dimensions of a developing career (Alfred, 2001a). Key to the model are the concepts of bicultural life structures (BLS), internal and external career, and psychological and structural dimensions. The model characterizes bicultural life structures as the central source where women of color navigate White dominant organizations; it promotes agency and individual power (Alfred, 2001a). Life structures are considered fluid and BLS encompasses the process by which one’s cultural identities shift and interact to negotiate boundaries and deal with marginal positions in organizations (Johnson-Bailey & Cervero, 2008). Further, consideration of BLS brings into the understanding of career development, individuals experiences with identify and community, inclusion and exclusion, voice and representation, power and subordination (Alfred, 2001b).

A second element of the model relates to developing careers being comprised of the internal and external career. The internal career includes psychological elements and personal behaviors (Alfred, 2001a). Aspects of the internal career include things such as positive self-definition, bi-cultural competence, and seeking safe places to affirm identity (Alfred, 2001a). Within the model, identity encompasses both personal identity and racial group identity. Additionally, the model is guided by the strategies, behaviors, and
interactions designed to meet the expectations of the external career (Johnson-Bailey & Cervero, 2008). The external career involves the structural dimensions of the career development process; it encompasses both the written and unwritten rules of academia (Alfred, 2001a). It includes components such as knowledge of academic culture, professional visibility, institutional cultures, institutional structures, and role expectations (Alfred, 2001a; Johnson-Bailey & Cervero, 2008).

Bicultural theory stresses the interrelationships of the individual and the environment as key determinants in the developmental process (Alfred, 2001a). Alfred’s (2001a) model provides a useful framework to explore how Black female doctoral students enter, develop cultural competence, and become successful in White-dominated institutions. It is an important lens in understanding the process by which women of color internalize their location within and their interactions with White-dominated institutional cultures. Further, it provides a means to understand the influence of race and gender on professional socialization.

Social Cognitive Career Theory. Doctoral students’ career aspirations and choices are influenced by a complex set of factors. Within this study, Social Cognitive Career Theory (SCCT) provides a framework for understanding the career development processes highlighting the role of sociocognitive mechanisms, personal agency, and learning (Lent, Brown, & Hackett, 1994). Originating from Bandura’s (1986) social cognitive theory, SCCT explains career related behaviors (career and academic interests, career-related choices, and career-related performance outcomes) as a function of self-efficacy beliefs, outcome expectations, and personal goals. In its conceptualization of career development, SCCT includes contextual and background variables emphasizing
how these factors enhance or constrain personal agency (Lent et al., 1994). As a career development model, SCCT argues that personal, contextual, and experiential factors influence an individual’s self-efficacy beliefs and outcome expectations, thereby affecting career-related interests, choices, and performance. It is conceived that these outputs (career interests, choice goals, and performance) are influenced directly and indirectly by self-efficacy beliefs and outcome expectations. The following provides a brief overview of the SCCT framework describing its primary tenets and propositions.

**Self-efficacy beliefs.** SCCT regards self-efficacy beliefs as the judgments individuals hold about their ability to perform a given task (Lent et al., 1994). It explains to what extent individuals believe they can or cannot do something. Within its conceptualization of career development, SCCT hoists self-efficacy beliefs as central to personal agency and primary in determining individuals’ efforts, persistence, thought patterns, choices, and responses to obstacles. Further, self-efficacy is an active and dynamic trait with various self-efficacy beliefs forming relative to various performance domains. For example, when looking at the doctoral process, one has domain specific (research, teaching, service, writing, etc.) self-efficacy beliefs. Additionally, one’s self-efficacy beliefs are influenced by its interaction with one’s personal and contextual factors (Lent et al., 1994).

**Outcome expectations.** Whereas self-efficacy beliefs explain one’s judgments about their ability to complete a task, outcome expectations explain how one judges the completion of a task’s expected results (Lent et al., 1994). For example, it looks at the degree to which one believes actions will produce desired consequences and to what extent the results will be positive or negative. Individuals are thought to choose courses
of action that are likely to produce positive results (Bandura, 2001). As such, outcome expectations can serve as a motivation for behavior as individuals may make decisions based on anticipated outcomes (Bandura, 2001). Lent et al. (1994) postulate that direct and vicarious experiences with educational and occupationally relevant activities generate outcome expectations. Similar to efficacy beliefs, outcome expectations can be characterized as area specific: physical, social, and self-evaluative outcomes (Bandura, 1986). Providing examples of outcome expectations related to career development, Lent et al., (1994) noted monetary expectations as an example of an anticipated physical outcome and approval and self-satisfaction as examples of social and self-evaluative outcomes respectively.

**Personal goals.** Goals play an important role in career development, as social cognitive theory outlines that goals organize, guide, and sustain behavior (Lent et al., 1994). Goals comprise an implicit element of career choice and decision making, incorporating concepts such as career plans, decisions, aspirations, and expressed choices. The degree to which a goal is categorized as a career plan compared to an aspiration or expressed choice relates to the level of specification and proximity to concrete choice enactment. In defining goals, Lent et al., (1994) delineate goals as the intent to undertake action to attain a specific future outcome. In other words, goals are based on one’s ability to emblematically consider sought after future outcomes; goals are premised on one’s ability to exercise forethought (Lent et al., 1994).

**Personal factors.** Another key variable in the SCCT model is personal factors. Personal factors are individual differences, such as race, gender, class, and sexual orientation and are complex and interactive in nature (Lent et al., 1994). In its inclusion
of personal factors, SCCT considers both the personal factor as well as the way the social and cultural environment interacts with the personal factor. For example, when considering its application to Black female doctoral students, it looks at both the intersectionality of one’s identity as Black female as well as the way that identity impacts the opportunities and networks available to one during the doctoral process. In other words, SCCT considers what response personal factors evoke looking at the ways personal factors impact access and availability of various opportunities (Lent et al., 1994).

**Contextual factors.** Contextual factors serve as another central component considered within SCCT. Contextual factors account for the environmental influences taking into consideration the ways various environments afford individuals with opportunities, obstacles, support and the like (Lent et al., 1994). In looking at environmental influences, SCCT considers both objective and perceptual influences recognizing that how one perceives an environment can dictate one’s experiences within that environment. Consequently, factors in an environment of which one may not be conscious still exert an influence on the individual. This is an important factor to consider when exploring the experiences of Black women who face various forms of oppression due to the intersectionality of their identities as Black and female. For example, although one may not acknowledge or perceive the oppression, the oppressive environmental factors may still exert influence on the individual. Through its inclusion of personal perception, SCCT not only accounts for objective features of the environment but highlights an individual’s interpretation of contextual factors (Lent et al., 1994).
In categorizing career development contextual factors, Lent et al., (1994) delineate that they can be conceived as two subgroups: distal background influences and proximal influences. Distal influences represent antecedent experiences in an individual’s life that shape interest and self-cognitions. Conversely, proximal influences involve the ways current contextual factors influence an individual during their choice point. Further, since the influential presence and nature of contextual factors vary over time, contextual factors are thought to shape learning experiences and inform the objective and perceived opportunity from where one plots and implements career plans (Lent et al., 1994).

Using SCCT to Explain Academic Career Intentions. In applying SCCT to academic career intentions, the pursuit of an academic career is framed as a developmental process where Black female doctoral students make career decisions informed by social and institutional context as well as personal characteristics (e.g., gender, race, social class) and learning experiences (e.g., access to role models, faculty encouragement, peer connections) (Lent et al., 1994). Contextual support and barriers play a role in shaping Black women’s career choice and development (Lent et al., 1994). In setting the context for this study, it has been emphasized that extant research has identified the earliest stage of a faculty career as doctoral education and classifies the doctoral process as a preparatory stage (Bryant et al., 2016; Curtin et al., 2016; Gasser & Shaffer, 2014). Within the doctoral process, students’ experiences are influenced by socialization, mentorship, professional development, and satisfaction. The current study views the doctoral education as a learning experience. Doctoral training provides the setting where Black female doctoral students access role models, experience faculty and
peer encouragement and/or discouragement, and learn the norms and skills of an academic career.

In examining Black women’s academic career intentions, the current study examined the development of Black women’s academic career intentions within the social and institutional context of the doctoral process. Additionally, in light of the various challenges and barriers Black women face in academia, this study investigated doctoral students’ academic career intentions examining how the perceived values of the academy and Black women’s learning experiences, cultural values, and identities play a role in the articulation of academic career decision making.

SCCT literature that has included the career development of Blacks has heavily focused on math and science occupations (Scheuermann et al., 2014). For example, recent scholarship has used a SCCT model to frame the career intentions of biomedical scientists (Gibbs & Griffin, 2013), graduate biological and behavioral science students (Byars-Winston, Gutierrez, Topp, & Carnes, 2011). Specifically, Gibbs and Griffin (2013) studied how biomedical sciences PhDs between 2006 and 2011 made decisions about their career paths noting differences by social identity. Similarly, Curtin et al. (2016) examined how different types of mentorship predict the development of career efficacy, and then academic career interest among students enrolled in PhD programs at a research-intensive public university in the Midwest. Few SCCT studies have focused specifically on Black women (Scheuermann et al., 2014). Existing SCCT literature on Black women’s career development has looked at the applicability of SCCT for African American college students looking at the role of specific learning experiences (performance accomplishments, vicarious learning, and verbal persuasion) in the
formation of corresponding self-efficacy and outcome expectations (Dickinson et al., 2017). Also, Scheuermann et al. (2014) investigated if the relationships implied by the SCCT career choice model held among a set of occupational prestige variables with a sample of African-American college women.

The Doctoral Process

In studying academic career development, numerous studies have explored what influences individuals’ academic career choice using retrospective accounts (Hermanowicz, 2016; Jairam & Kahl, 2012; Lewis et al., 2004; Lindhom, 2004). Retrospective research has identified how various internal, external, and background factors influence academic careers through the examination of individuals’ reflections on past experiences. Divergent from studies that take a retrospective approach, the current study examined the development of academic career intentions and expectations looking specifically at students currently enrolled in the doctoral process. By looking at students in the process, it is hoped to identify factors within doctoral training that facilitate intentions to pursue an academic career. Gaining an understanding of Black women’s perceptions of a career in academia provides insight into what perceptions negatively and positively impact intentions to pursue an academic career. Correspondingly, it gives opportunities to assess the accuracy of students’ perceptions of academic careers in light of the current academic landscape. Through its investigation of Black women’s academic career perceptions and intentions, this study seeks to offer suggestions for tailored interventions that encourage Black women to pursue the professoriate and not leave the academic system. Thus, to further contextualize this study, it is important to outline research on doctoral education and the doctoral process.
Earning a doctoral degree is a rigorous process that requires a considerable investment of energy, time, resources, commitment, and motivation. Within the United States, doctoral degree completion typically ranges from five to seven years with some fields requiring an additional two to four years for postdoctoral training (Devine & Hunter, 2016). The doctoral process, from enrollment to completion, has been conceptualized as best understood as taking place in stages. For example, Tinto (1993) advocated for a conceptualization of the doctoral process as spanning three stages: transition stage, development stage, and research stage. In this classification, the first stage, transition, is characterized by students taking doctoral level classes and adjusting to the demands and expectations of doctoral education (Ampaw & Jaeger, 2012). The second stage, development, involves students completing coursework, developing a research agenda, and acquiring the skills, knowledge, and experiences needed to be a doctoral candidate (Ampaw & Jaeger, 2012). The final stage, research, involves students engaging in self-motivated research as they complete and defend their dissertation.

Seeking to mirror a four-year degree completion timeline, Grover (2007) outlined a four-stage doctoral process: exploration, engagement, consolidation, and entry. The first stage, exploration, involves students recognizing the nature of doctoral study and assuming more responsibility for their program of study. Students in this phase are focused on understanding faculty, student, and institutional resources, the political and institutional landscape, and how to position themselves to be successful. During this phase students are introduced to many new concepts as they learn from more advanced students as well as faculty, the rigor required for doctoral studies, the realities of the job market, the pressures of comprehensive examinations, and the importance of working on
research outside the classroom (Grover, 2007). Grover (2007) suggested that during this phase it is essential that students be proactive, realize they champion their own program, realize faculty are resources at their disposal, create their value though the program, cultivate assets to leverage later, set up good faculty relationships, and be aware of political realities.

The second stage, engagement, can be viewed as “exploration with a purpose” (Grover, 2007). Namely, a student in the exploration stage seeks to realize the scope and landscape of doctoral studies, a student in the engagement phase more intentionally explores their program doing so with a sense of understanding about doctoral study, their position in their institution, and within their profession. They become more selective in their engagement with faculty members, research projects, and their own research ideas as they make selections from a more grounded and specified place. In this stage, students have a greater sense of the individuals (colleagues and faculty) with whom collaborations would be ideal and a sense of research areas and methods of particular interest. Also in this stage, students experience an increase in opportunities and must begin to prioritize as they find themselves straddling between a broad view of research and the development of their more narrowed personal research interest (Grover, 2007).

Consolidation, the third stage, involves students being more crystallized within their field and their personal research interests dominate the latter part of the stage (Grover, 2007). During the stage, students are more engaged and committed to their own research and have a strong sense of their field and its structure and the ability to position research within that structure. Also, during the consolidation stage, students complete their comprehensive examination, are admitted to candidacy, and dissertation ideas are
developed. Simultaneously, doctoral students begin to develop an increased level of engagement with their broader profession as they begin to think about and prepare for entering the job market.

The final phase, entry, spans students’ completion of the dissertation and classifies their final thrust before formally entering their profession as a peer (Grover, 2007). Students during this phase seek to both engage in deep research and establish ties with professionals in the field. During this phase, students begin to think more focused on career, research agenda, and tenure in light of family, location, and job satisfaction. As such, they are not only engaged in the demands of their own research, but are also preparing curriculum vitas, research and teaching statements, conference interviews, on-campus interviews and presentations, as well as managing the host of costs associated with such activities. Grover (2007) suggested that, within this stage, students must be proactive, establish priorities, and recognize opportunity costs as they must balance efforts between job search and dissertation completion. Grover (2007) depicted the process as students “hav[ing] one foot in the home institution and another foot trying to move outside it” (p. 15). Finding balance in this stage is further complicated as many students during this stage are also engaged in teaching and/or new course preparations (Grover, 2007).

Although Tinto (1993) and Grover (2007) differ in the number of stages used to categorize the doctoral process, central to both models is a conceptualization of doctoral education based on an apprenticeship model. Describing the apprenticeship model, Bieber and Worley (2006) put forth that a key assumption of the socialization/apprenticeship paradigm is that doctoral students (apprentices) will be
socialized into the profession by a mentor or advisor (master) during the doctoral process. It should be noted that, within the graduate education field, research has long recognized graduate school as the beginning of the socialization and career development process (Gasser & Shaffer, 2014; Haley et al., 2014; Shaw & Stanton, 2012) and the prevalent view of the relationship between master and apprentice is based on the apprentice becoming a master (Bieber & Worley, 2006).

An assumption of the apprentice model is that the doctoral student will become a scholar-teacher at a research university (Bieber & Worley, 2006). This is evident in both Tinto’s (1993) and Grover’s (2007) descriptions of the doctoral process, as each model relies on students going through the stages of doctoral education being socialized by both advanced students as well as faculty. Critiquing the prevalence of socialization as the investigative paradigm to understand doctoral student experiences, Bieber and Worley (2006) asserted that the apprenticeship model does not account for divergent paths continuing to emerge in research. For example, Bieber and Worley (2006) concluded that:

(when) we began our research, we assumed that a person planning to embark on a faculty career would systematically seek information regarding both professional and personal aspects of the chosen career. However, our research has made it clear that the apprenticeship model does not account for many of the patterns we discovered. We have come to understand that the role of the graduate mentor is neither as central nor as all encompassing and influential as commonly believed.

(p. 1010)
This argument has been further advanced by scholars, who noted that, in exploring the experiences of students of color, socialization theory only accounts for part of the picture and does not consider race, gender, and other cultural identities (Haley et al., 2014). Further criticizing reliance on socialization models in the doctoral context, scholars have appraised such frameworks as rarely taking into account intentions, motivations, or the variability of experiences and interactions that influence the development of an academic identity (Jazvac-Martek, 2009). Thus, in exploring the academic career intentions of Black female doctoral students, although it is important to consider the socialization/apprenticeship perspective, it is also necessary to explore several viewpoints in understanding Black women’s doctoral education experiences and academic career development. As such, within this study, Social Cultural Career Theory and Black Feminist Thought offer a core framework and vocabulary for understanding Black women’s academic career intentions and perceptions of academic careers.

The doctoral experience, which includes but goes beyond the socialization process, plays a major role in academic career development. Extant literature on doctoral education has examined several key factors that influence the doctoral persistence, completion, and career intentions of students. Studies have explored the influence of doctoral socialization (Austin, 2002; Corbett, 2016; Ellis, 2001; Gardner, 2008; Sallee, 2011a, 2011b; Turner & Thompson, 1993; Weidman & Stein, 2003), faculty-student mentorship (Bryant et al., 2016; Curtin et al., 2016; Grant & Ghee, 2015), advising (Bertrand Jones, Wilder, & Osborne-Lampkin, 2013), doctoral student satisfaction (Ellis, 2001), and professional development (Gardner & Barnes, 2007, Heflinger & Doykos, 2016; Helm et al., 2012; Schulze, 2015). Such factors have been noted as shaping the
doctoral experience and exerting influence on student’s persistence, degree completion, and career choice. The following explores literature on each of these factors (socialization, faculty-student mentorship, doctoral student satisfaction, and professional development) to provide further context on the doctoral process.

**Doctoral Student Socialization.** In exploring the doctoral process, doctoral student socialization has received much attention in the literature (Austin, 2002; Corbett, 2016; Ellis, 2001; Gardner, 2008; Sallee, 2011a, Turner & Thompson, 1993; Weidman & Stein, 2003; Weidman, Twale, & Stein, 2001). Broadly speaking, student socialization theories provide developmental stage models that describe the process of how students acquire the values, norms, attitudes, and skills for engaging in the activities of a given profession (Jazvac-Martek, 2009). Describing doctoral student socialization, Jazvac-Martek (2009) defined socialization as “doctoral students gleaning knowledge about the doctorate and academic life through observations, interactions, and emulating behaviours of advisors, faculty members and senior graduate students” (p. 254). As noted earlier, key to socialization theories is the assumption of an apprentice based model where an experienced professional socializes and mentors one into a profession.

Socialization in graduate education is important as it helps doctoral students develop their professional identities as they learn the norms and values of the academy. In seeking to explain the academic career aspirations of doctoral students, research has looked heavily at graduate student socialization theory (Haley et al., 2014). Thus, student socialization theory explains how students acquire the norms and roles of academic careers and how they build commitment and loyalty to the academy (Haley et al., 2014). According to Weidman et al. (2001), socialization is comprised of three core elements:
knowledge acquisition, investment, and involvement. These core elements facilitate identification with and commitment to the profession (Weidman et al., 2001). Knowledge acquisition encompasses one shifting from having general to more specialized and complex knowledge (Weidman et al., 2001). One gains not only the knowledge and skill for effective role performance but acquires awareness of the normative expectations associated with the profession, as well as an increased awareness of one’s ability to perform the role and an understanding of others perception of their abilities (Weidman et al., 2001). Investment involves the commitment of personal value (time, money, pride, reputation, etc.) to the professional role and preparation for the professional role (Weidman et al., 2001). Involvement looks at the extent of immersion in one’s academic department and field. Social participation is key as social participation provides the means through which students acquire and internalize an occupational identity and develop professional ideology (Weidman et al., 2001).

In exploring the experiences of students of color, scholars have contended that socialization theory only accounts for part of the picture and does not consider race, gender, and other cultural identities (Haley et al., 2014). Instead, they argued one must also consider students’ cultural identities, in order to more fully understand their career development. That is, research on Black women’s academic career development should include the influence of contextual and background variables, such as race and gender, considering how these factors impact the doctoral experience, academic career aspirations and expectations, and ultimately, academic career choices and performance.

Research on the socialization of Black women has shown that Black females experience a great deal of isolation, marginalization, and othering (Alfred, 2001; Bertrand...
Jones et al., 2013; Ellis, 2001; Hannon et al., 2016). In a qualitative study on the experiences of otherness among doctoral students, Pifer and Baker (2014) observed that, related to their social identity, doctoral students experienced otherness across a range of characteristics: professional, relational, and personal. Further, experiences of otherness influenced doctoral student’s perception of being accepted and supported within their department, discipline, and professional community (Pifer & Baker, 2014). The impact of marginalization can have a profound impact on students’ doctoral experiences.

A sense of belonging has important implications for academic career intentions. Research has identified a sense of belonging in one’s academic department as an important factor in the doctoral process. It impacts student persistence, satisfaction, and experience overall (Gay, 2004). Studying students’ sense of belonging, Ostrove, Stewart, and Curtin (2011) found that the degree to which students felt that they belonged in graduate school positively affected their sense of academic self-concept, or the degree to which they viewed themselves as competent and successful students, and in turn their commitment to an academic career. In a study exploring doctoral student disengagement, Vekkaila, Pyhältö, and Lonka (2013) found students disengaged because of overly controlling or alienating communities where they lacked a sense of belonging. In their study, Vekkaila et al. (2013) found that, along with experiences of not belonging, the sense of lacking the competence to conduct doctoral work and having little control over it were related to the experienced disengagement (Vekkaila et al., 2013).

Faculty-student mentorship and advising. A second influential factor key in the experiences and career development of doctoral students is mentoring (Bryant et al., 2016; Curtin et al., 2016). Mentoring is particularly important when one considers the
apprenticeship model of doctoral education that assumes that socialization into the profession will occur through a graduate school mentor (Bieber & Worley, 2006). Studies have examined the importance of faculty-student mentorship (Bryant et al., 2016; Curtin et al., 2016; Grant & Ghee, 2015) and advising (Bertrand Jones et al., 2013), demonstrating the importance of these influential relationship on doctoral student satisfaction (Curtin, Stewart, & Ostrove, 2013), sense of belonging (Curtin et al., 2013), orientation to academic fields and departments (Curtin et al., 2016), and confidence in one’s capability to make scholarly contributions (Bieber & Worley 2006; Curtin et al., 2013). While studies have consistently shown mentorship as an influential factor for doctoral students, studies have evidenced differences across race and gender as it relates to who provides the mentorship (Curtin et al., 2016; Smith, 1982), type of mentorship provided (Curtin et al., 2016), amount and type of mentorship received (Curtin et al., 2016). Recognizing mentorship as a contributing factor of the doctoral experience and academic career intentions, the following reviews literature dealing with mentorship and advising during the doctoral process.

**Types of faculty mentorship.** Classifying types of doctoral mentorship, Curtin et al. (2016) identified three kinds of mentoring: career/instrumental, expressive/psychosocial, and sponsorship. Career/instrumental mentoring pertains to mentoring that focuses on the development of knowledge and skills fundamental to work performance (Curtin et al., 2016). For example, it would include a mentor helping a doctoral student develop research and teaching skills. Curtin et al. (2016) described career/instrumental mentoring as encompassing explicit training in research methods and information about content, ethics, and procedures. Mentors facilitate the development of
student’s efficacy as students master the skills necessary in their given field. Connecting career/instrumental mentoring to social learning theory, Curtin et al. (2016) insisted that instrumental mentorship provides concrete information about the types of goals and opportunities available. Central to career mentoring are active and intentional efforts to make sure students learn what they need to know (Blake-Beard et al., 2011).

Expressive/psychosocial mentoring, on the other hand, refers to mentoring with a relational focus. Mentors address personal support, encouragement, work relationships, and factors that facilitate career satisfaction (Curtin et al., 2016). Distinctively, this type of mentoring may involve discussions about work life balance, the importance of self-care, and developing of academic and non-academic social support. Curtin et al. (2016) defined sponsorship mentoring as “active advocacy of the individual’s opportunities within the institution and the profession, and open access to the mentor’s own network of professional contacts” (p. 717).

Although many studies use the terms mentor and advisor interchangeably (Curtin et al., 2016), Bertrand Jones et al., (2013) argued that the two should be explored/understood separately. They argued that, although the functions of mentors and advisors overlap and intertwine, mentors distinctively provide role modeling and psychosocial and career support whereas advisors provide programmatic and academic support (Bertrand Jones et al., 2013). Subsequently, they characterized advising as “responsibilities that center around guidance about course work and programs, helping students resolve academic issues, and working closely with students in planning and conducting research” (Bertrand Jones et al., 2013, p. 329). Implied in their distinction between mentoring and advising is the idea that advisor may function as mentors;
however, advisors may not always take on a mentorship role with an advisee. This is particularly noteworthy as literature has documented differences in the identifying and receiving of mentorship for women and underrepresented racial minorities within higher education (Curtin et al., 2016). For example, Smith (1982) argued that discrimination for women is most crippling in the availability of a mentor or sponsor. As has been noted, within higher education there are few Black female mentors and it is rare for men to choose a female protégée (Smith, 1982). Underscoring this challenge in more recent literature, Corbett (2016) asserted that:

(m)ore often than not, race matters in the mentoring relationship between Black and White Americans. The internalization of the overwhelmingly negative stereotypes that are common in popular culture can hamper and prevent mentors in the initiation and maintenance of solid mentorship protégé relationships when the mentees are Black (p. 320).

In fact, for Black women, an implication of the lacking availability of Black female mentors is increased engagement in cross-racial and cross-gendered mentoring.

Corbett (2016) highlighted that cross-racial mentoring relationships have difficulty forming, developing, and maturing. Accordingly, Corbett (2016) pointed out that in these relationships, mentors and mentees must do the work to overcome possible stumbling blocks or complications in order to develop a strong mentorship relationship and personal connection. For instance, Corbett (2016) cited the challenge of dealing with “protective hesitation” to illustrate an example of potential barriers to address. Protective hesitation refers to individuals in the mentor/mentee relationship choosing to avoid addressing sensitive issues. Corbett (2016) further explained that the avoidance of talking
about difficult racial or gendered issues serves to sidestep any threat of being labeled as prejudice, racist, or sexist. Protective hesitation, however, impairs cross-racial mentoring from reaching its full potential (Corbett, 2016). For instance, Corbett (2016) suggested that mentorship relationships that address and overcome barriers such as negative myths and stereotypes and public scrutiny are better able to provide the mentee with the knowledge, skills, and motivation to alter the impact of negative images, stereotype threat, and aversive racism. Corbett’s (2016) claims about the benefits of cross-cultural mentorship relate to previous work by Grant and Simmons (2008) who identified the combination of cross-gender, cross-cultural, and same gender/race mentoring as effective in the doctoral preparation of Black women.

Another consideration important to understanding doctoral mentorship for Black women is the acknowledgement of more broadly defined mentorship relationships. Smith (1982) argued that in the lives of Black women, mentors may be any individual who inspires, encourages, or supports in any capacity one’s academic achievements. This designation denotes an important consideration in the academic career development of Black women as there may be a departure from the traditional conceptualization of mentorship in higher education. For Black women, mentors can be someone in the profession as well as a relative, friend, or any helpful person. For instance, Coker, Culver, Martin, and Johnson (2017), in their autoethnographic work, found that Black women get early messages and inspiration about leadership and academic development from family, mentors, and their community and acknowledge being impacted and mentored (formally or informally) by such role models.
Understanding the broader spectrum of mentors and academic role models for Black women is important as it may influence career aspirations. Further, it supports contemporary research that has emphasized the importance of mentorship programs that employ cultural strategies in advancing the academic careers of Black women (Davis, Chaney, Edwards, Thompson-Rogers, & Gines, 2012; Grant & Ghee, 2015; Howard-Baptiste, 2014; Patitu & Hinton, 2003). Moreover, given the documentation in literature of the importance of same race and same gender mentoring, coupled with the lack of Black female faculty in PWI, scholars have highlighted the importance of programming and mentorship outside one’s home institution (Davis et al., 2012; Grant & Ghee, 2015; Henry & Glenn, 2009). The strategy of reaching beyond one’s institution is not only noted in literature focused on mentorship, but has also been discussed in literature noting the importance of Black women identifying and establishing supportive communities.

Scholars have argued that Black women in academia should find or create “safe spaces” among other Black academics which may include reaching outside of one’s department, academic college, or institution (Alfred, 2001; Calafell, 2007; Henry & Glenn, 2009). This idea is consistent with the work of Coker et al. (2016) who identified the theme of community mentoring in their autoethnographic study on Black women’s leadership in higher education. Similarly, also using autoethnographic methodology, Grant and Ghee (2015) created a “safe space” by engaging in informal mentorship. Their study detailed their journey in establishing an informal mentor/mentee arrangement between an African-American woman tenure-track faculty member and a doctoral student in the same department. The study evidenced that, in the absence of formal mentoring, an informal mentoring relationship may assist Black women in PWIs in becoming better
adjusted, more productive, and aid in entry into the professoriate and tenure attainment (Grant & Ghee, 2015). In studying the experiences of Black women, it is important to investigate who Black women consider mentors contributing to their doctoral process and academic career intentions. This is important as, within their career development, their influence may come from sources not traditionally referenced in graduate research.

**Mentoring and academic career development.** Examining the influence of different types of mentoring on doctoral student’s academic intentions, Curtin et al. (2016) developed a path analysis model to determine the relationships between mentoring and academic career self-efficacy, interests, and goals. Participants included a sample of current PhD students enrolled in various programs at a research-intensive public university in the Midwest. The study revealed that instrumental, psychosocial, and sponsorship mentoring were associated with student’s increased confidence in their ability to pursue an academic career (self-efficacy) as well as increased interest in faculty careers (Curtin et al., 2016). In fact, the importance of mentorship remained constant even when controlling for variables such as gender, race, field, and candidacy (Curtin et al., 2016). In other words, each type of mentorship evidenced a direct effect on interest in an academic career (Curtin et al., 2016).

Another important finding in the study related to mentoring and academic career development dealt with gender and racial differences. Within the study, underrepresented minority women rated their interest in a faculty career lower than any of the other groups in the study, (i.e., underrepresented minority men, well represented men and well represented women). In addition to lower academic career interest, this group also evidenced less sponsorship and instrumental mentoring. In this instance, the study found
that female doctoral students were less likely than their male counterparts to report that their primary advisor mentored them engaging in instrumental support and sponsorship. The women in the study reported receiving less mentoring related to conducting research, professional development, being advocated for, or introduced to their mentor’s professional networks. Such findings point to grave implications for women’s entry into academia as Curtin et al. (2016) argued, “this gender difference in mentoring support, at this critical stage of professional development, may help account for the ‘leaky pipeline’ of women that has been observed in academia” (p. 731).

**Graduate student wellness and satisfaction.** Hunter and Devine (2016) explored the experiences of doctoral students examining factors that contribute to doctoral students’ emotional well-being and plans to leave academia. In their study, they surveyed students from nine countries across various academic disciplines (hard applied, hard pure, soft applied, and soft pure) with most of the sample reporting full time status (Devine & Hunter, 2016). Findings from the study indicated that student’s well-being was facilitated by supportive departmental and advisor relationships and more frequent meetings with advisors (Devine & Hunter, 2016). For doctoral students, feeling appreciated and cared about within one’s department and by university faculty reduced emotional exhaustion. Hunter and Devine (2016) found a negative relationship between perceived departmental and/or faculty support and intentions to leave academia. In their exploration of intentions to leave, Hunter and Devine (2016) included intentions both before and after graduation. Implied within their findings is the understanding that student’s perceptions of the current support they receive informed their perception of the types of relationships and support that would continue to find within academia (Devine & Hunter, 2016). Thus, when
experiencing a lack of support, doctoral students may self-select out of an academic career as a result of perceiving the department or faculty environment as unlikely to provide the type of support they anticipate wanting within their career.

In a qualitative study examining the persistence and overall well-being of African American women pursing doctoral degrees at PWIs, Shavers and Moore (2014) noted a “prove them wrong” mentality as impacting Black women’s well-being. Participants in the study showed an unrelenting determination to combat stereotypes which at times became an exhausting challenge. In a similar fashion, participants’ well-being was at times impeded through their valuing of overachievement. Black female doctoral students, aware of the barriers in academia, pushed themselves to work hard, stay focused, and hide vulnerabilities. Women often sought to present themselves as ideal professionals and learners. The continual striving for overachievement however, also manifested in women’s neglect of their emotional and mental needs (Shavers & Moore, 2014).

In exploring the satisfaction of doctoral students, Ellis (2001) found currently enrolled Black female doctoral students reporting the lowest level of satisfaction. This is compared to Black male graduates reporting the highest level of satisfaction and currently enrolled students reporting more satisfaction than students who have graduated (Ellis, 2001). As such, within the study, Black female doctoral students and recent graduates emerged as the most isolated group of doctoral students (Ellis, 2001). These findings are consistent with extant research that has highlighted that Black women experience extreme marginality in academia. For example, it parallels the conclusions of Shavers and Moore (2014) study who argued that, for many Black women attending doctoral programs at PWIs, academic success and overall well-being cannot coexist. Likewise,
they contended, that Black women often have to make a choice between the two resulting in the persistence of an either/or mentality (Shavers & Moore, 2014).

Highlighting a notable contributing factor to Black women’s low satisfaction, Ellis (2001) contended that faculty members often do not extend research team invitations to Black female doctoral students in their department. Limited participation on research teams impacts student’s exposure to and understanding of research. Davidson, Weismer, Alt, and Hogan (2013) denoted that research experience can help demystify the research process and students, when exposed to faculty engaging in research, have opportunities to observe and discuss with faculty career satisfaction and work life balance.

Offering suggestions to help reduce some of the difficulties/obstacles for Black female doctoral students, Ellis (2001) suggested that Black female doctoral students meet their academic advisor as promptly as possible and be introduced to faculty members within their departments early. Additionally, Ellis (2001) suggested that departments should be intentional to create opportunities for Black female doctoral students to work on research teams and in research assistant positions with faculty members in their departments where there is an expectation and opportunities for them to publish and present at conferences.

**Professional development.** Another key aspect of doctoral education is doctoral student’s engagement in various professional development activities. Professional development serves to further prepare students for both academic and nonacademic careers and help form student’s professional identity (Heflinger & Doykos, 2016). The
formation of a strong professional identity develops as students gain increased knowledge
and skill within their selected field.

Another area identified in the literature that fosters graduate students’ professional
development is participation in professional organizations (Richards, Eberline, &
Templine, 2016). For instance, in an exploratory study looking at the experiences of
education graduate students, Richards et al. (2016) found that students reported
involvement in professional organizations as important to their career development. Of
particular benefit to students were the opportunities professional organizations provided
for networking, professional learning, and presenting research. For example, graduate
students identified that professional organizations allowed for the building of
relationships with other students and faculty outside their home institution. Within
literature, such extended networks beyond one’s institution have been esteemed as
important for graduate student development and well-being (Richards et al., 2016).

In addition to building relationships with others outside their institution,
professional organizations also provided an opportunity to learn about research being
conducted through the field (Richards et al., 2016). An important point of discovery in
Richards et al.’s (2016) scholarship on graduate student’s involvement in professional
organizations is the role faculty play in encouraging participation. Within their study,
they found that graduate students became involved in professional organizations
primarily due to faculty encouragement (Richards et al., 2016). This is consequential as
students whose mentors do not encourage participation may miss professional
developmental opportunities. Given the usefulness of professional organizations in
professional development, it would be helpful for departments and institutions as a whole
to support and encourage participation. That is, not rely solely on mentors to encourage involvement.

A notable argument in the literature on doctoral student professional development involves differing perspectives on the entity most centrally responsible for doctoral students’ professional development (Heflinger & Doykos, 2016). The traditional apprentice model of doctoral education argues for doctoral student advisors and mentors to take the lead on professional development. By extension, this model views mentorship as the primary source of preparation and professional development (Heflinger & Doykos, 2016). On the other end, scholars have begun to contend that maybe institutions in general should take more responsibility (Walker, Golde, Jones, Bueschel, & Hutchings, 2009). In other words, scholars have argued for universities to provide a multiplicity of resources aimed at aiding student’s development of a more comprehensive professional skillset (Heflinger & Doykos, 2016). Emerging practices aimed at addressing this need include activities such as professional development workshops on topic such as academic writing, grant writing, teaching statements, as well as efforts to centralize career services for doctoral students, and provide interviewing and negotiation training (Heflinger & Doykos, 2016).

**Doctoral Students’ Academic Career Intentions**

Scholars have increasingly recognized academic careers as unfolding along a developmental continuum with the earliest stage being the doctoral process (Curtin et al., 2016). During the preparatory stage of doctoral education, students make decisions about pursuing academic work or non-academic work in their field, the type of academic work, full time or contingent work and teaching or research focused. Although such decisions
may also occur at other career stages, it is important to understand the academic career intentions and interest of individuals at the doctoral stage.

In looking at the developmental path of college and university professors, a growing body of literature has explored factors that influence doctoral students’ career choices (Lindholm, 2004; Portnoi et al., 2012). Several studies have examined elements that impact academic career development using retrospective accounts (Hermanowicz, 2016; Lewis et al., 2004; Lindhom, 2004; Jairam & Kahl, 2012), while a growing number of other studies have examined the career intentions of current doctoral students (Ostrove et al., 2011). Such studies provide pivotal insights into the factors that shape individuals’ decisions to pursue faculty careers and the developmental nature of academic career intentions.

**Doctoral students’ career choices.** Lindholm (2004) argued students face two distinct decisions: choice of an academic field and choice between an academic career and a non-academic career path. Focusing on the latter, Lindholm (2004) used retrospective interviews with current faculty to better understand the career development of faculty. Describing faculty careers as marked by varied academic career pathways, Lindholm (2004) used the term “accidental academics” to classify individuals who lacked definitive academic career aspirations during undergraduate or graduate studies. In making this distinction, Lindholm (2004) observed notable differences in the intentionality of participants’ career decision-making process. For instance, describing differences observed, Lindholm (2004) argued that, generally, accidental academics’ “professorial career decision-making processes were uniformly less linear” (p. 219). Lindholm (2004) elaborated that most accidental academics described the development of
their academic vocational pathway as resulting from refinement or redirection (Lindholm, 2004). Such refining and redirection often occurred as a result of a critical incident during graduate training or exposure to work in non-academic settings (Lindholm, 2004). On the other hand, the exposure to other types of work environments seemed to make clear to participants their preference for academic work and a sense of “lack of fit” in non-academic work environments.

Another important finding from Lindholm’s (2004) study was the observation that several accidental academics described their career decision making process as “totally random,” “incoherent,” or “fortuitous” (Lindholm, 2004, p. 619). Such happenstance descriptions of one’s career decision making process was however found solely among male participants, signaling a gender difference in accidental academics’ career decision making process (Lindholm, 2004). This finding can be interpreted to indicate that, although both males and females may identify as accidental academics, women must exert intentionality due to the unique barriers they face in academia.

**Factors that influence pursuing a faculty career.** Several studies have sought to identify influential factors in the decision to pursue a faculty career. Studies have examined factors across groups of PhDs (Layton et al., 2016), current faculty (Lindholm, 2004), and among current graduate or doctoral students (Curtin et al., 2016; Ostrove et al., 2011; Portnoi et al., 2012; Singer, Cassin, & Dobson, 2005). Such studies have provided pivotal insight into understanding how both personal and environmental factors shape individuals’ decisions to pursue faculty careers, highlighting the developmental nature of academic career intentions. For example, Lindholm (2004) explored the experiences of 36 full-time tenure track faculty and noted themes related to an inherent
attraction to academic work, career interest developing through a process, and the identification of varied individual pathways to a faculty appointment.

In exploring an inherent attraction to academic work, Lindholm (2004) identified factors such as a personal need for autonomy, independence, individual expression, and partiality to the university work environment. Consistent with Lindholm’s (2004) findings, Layton et al. (2016), in a national sample of PhD-trained scientists (life, physical, social, engineering, and computational sciences), found that, among all participants, working conditions, geographic location, intellectual challenge, and salary/benefits emerged as important career decisions factors. Additionally, in identifying sources of influence related to developing an attraction to academic work, three primary sources were identified: childhood experiences, undergraduate and graduate school training, and personal perceptions of competence (Lindholm, 2004). Further, these sources of influence remained consistent across gender, career stage, and disciplinary field.

Although the above studies provided insight into important factors students consider when developing academic career intentions, it did not widely address/identify factors that may impeded students’ academic career intentions. For example, Layton et al. (2016) noted students’ perceptions of academia lacking leadership opportunities as a potential barrier; however, fewer areas were explored that related to reasons students do not intend to pursue faculty careers. Equally important, although the study showed that the majority of participants had intentions to enter the professoriate, it gave no insight into how students arrived at their academic career decisions. Summarizing the need for future research, Woo et al. (2017) argued that future studies need to explore extrinsic
variables that might impact doctoral students’ preferences for working in academia, as well as the influence of demographic variables (e.g., gender, race, age) and academic factors (e.g., university setting and type) on the decision to go into the professoriate. Such studies are necessary as they have implications for the development of strategies to recruit and retain qualified faculty (Woo et al., 2017).

In a study looking specifically at the academic career intentions of counselor education doctoral students, Woo et al. (2017) found differences based on gender in the prioritizing of extrinsic variables when considering academic positions. Both men and women prioritized geographic location as central to faculty career choice; however, other variables such as salary, collegial relationships, family need, and working conditions varied by gender (Woo et al., 2017). Whereas men prioritized geographic location, salary, and collegial relationships as the most important factors, women ranked geographic location, family need, and work conditions as most important (Woo et al., 2017). Of particular contrast in the findings was the fact that women selected family need as the second most important factor whereas men ranked family need as the second least important factor (Woo et al., 2017). These finding support previous research that has shown that for female faculty work-family flexibility has a considerable influence on career choices (Quinn, 2011).

**Perception of academic work.** A relatively small number of studies have investigated graduate students’ perspectives on faculty careers. Seldomridge (2004) explored nursing student’s perceptions of faculty careers and evaluated the impact of a faculty shadowing experience on their views of academic teaching careers. Participants in the study viewed faculty as working hard incessantly and described the faculty workload
as “never finished” (Seldomridge, 2004). Other perspectives articulated by students included negative views about the complexity of the faculty role, the patience required in a faculty position, and the liability associated with supervising students (Seldomridge, 2004). Similarly, Davidson et al. (2013) also found that students viewed the faculty workload as potentially burdensome.

Quinn (2011) explored the opinions of graduate and professional students on the appropriateness of work-family flexibility in faculty careers and found that students differed by academic career aspiration on their agreement that faculty careers provided work-family flexibility. Specifically, Quinn (2011) found that participants pursuing an academic career were more likely to view academia as facilitating work and family balance through flexible policy options for faculty than individuals who were not pursuing academic careers. Quinn (2011) identified that, for some graduate students, faculty careers may not be seen as providing work-family flexibility as a result of students seeing faculty struggling to juggle their multiple roles. Quinn (2011) argued that many students do not have opportunities to witness their faculty benefiting from flexible policy options.

Davidson et al. (2013) studied faculty career perceptions among a sample of communication sciences and disorders graduate students and found that students did not view a faculty position as a rewarding career. Students perceived time and personal-professional balance as a challenge and also considered the research demands of a faculty position as challenging. Within their study, Davidson et al. (2013) compared student’s perceptions to current faculty’s views. In terms of perceptions about faculty life, students’ perspectives were rather accurate as they estimated faculty spent about a quarter of their
time teaching and faculty responded that they taught 25%–40% of their time (Davidson et al., 2013). Contrastingly, students had misperceptions about faculty salaries, with most students underestimating faculty salaries.

Investigating doctoral students’ expectations for an understanding of a faculty career provides useful insight into students’ academic career decision making. Little is known, however, about Black women’s perceptions of faculty careers and the ways in which their perceptions are shaped and altered during the doctoral training process.

**Summary**

This chapter highlighted some of the key concepts in understanding Black women’s academic career development. It detailed the historical struggle Black women have had with access and representation in education and documented Black female doctoral student’s lacking mentorship, satisfaction, and sense of belonging in PWIs. Additionally, it highlighted the various ways Black women cope and achieve success in academic settings through an exploration of related research. Literature on the doctoral process highlighted key elements central to doctoral education demonstrating current socialization models do not fully account for understanding doctoral student’s academic career intentions. Finally, literature on doctoral student’s academic career intentions demonstrated that career attentions change throughout the doctoral process and that perceptions of faculty careers impact career intent. The next chapter outlines the methodology for the study.
Chapter Three

Methodology

As a Black female doctoral student interested in understanding the experiences of other Black female doctoral students, the author of this study explored the ways Black female doctoral students perceive academic careers and navigate the doctoral process. The study employed a basic qualitative research design, as it sought to voice the experiences of Black female doctoral students, taking into account the intersectionality of race, gender, and class. Informed by a BFT framework (Collins, 1986), this study used methods that facilitate empowerment, with the aim of giving voice to the experiences of Black women. Seeking to contribute to scholarship on the experiences of Black doctoral students, this study was guided by the following research questions:

1. What perceptions do Black female doctoral students have of an academic career?

2. What factors shape Black female doctoral students academic career perceptions during the doctoral process?

3. What are the academic career intentions of Black female doctoral students?

4. What factors influences the development of Black female doctoral student’s academic career intentions during the doctoral process?

Using a basic qualitative design and grounded theory analysis techniques (Corbin & Strauss, 1990), a systematic set of procedures was used to collect and analyze data. This chapter provides a comprehensive explanation of the methods used within this study. It also details the rationale for the qualitative approach and describes the research procedures that steered this study. Additionally, it offers further description of the BFT interpretive lens that guided the study. The chapter includes a description of the research
design, the participant selection, data collection, data analysis procedures, and the strategies used to establish the trustworthiness that enhanced the rigor of the study.

**Research Design**

This study used qualitative research methods to study the experience of Black female doctoral students. Qualitative methods are the most appropriate approach for studying the experiences of Black female doctoral students. Since the study does not aim to provide generalizable findings about causation or test a set of hypotheses, a qualitative methodology does provide a fitting research design. According to Merriam (2009), a basic qualitative design is used when researchers want to examine “how people interpret their experiences, how they construct their worlds, and what meaning they attribute to their experiences” (p. 23). Further, qualitative research that uses a critical approach seeks to “raise consciousness and empower people to bring about change” (Merriam, 2009, p. 23). Therefore, this approach allows for the study to not simply provide understanding about the doctoral process for Black female students, but sought to uncover strategies that Black female doctoral students use to successfully navigate the power imbalances and systems of oppression within the doctoral process. Through its exploration, this study sought to empower Black women by bringing to light ways Black doctoral students have maintained resilience and resisted marginalization and oppression.

The use of a basic qualitative design was apropos to this study, as there is little research on the experiences of Black female doctoral students during the doctoral process. Despite the recognition of disproportional representation of Black women in academia, Black women’s perceptions of academic careers remain unexplored within the context of the doctoral process. Further, having implications for counselors, counselor
educators, and other higher education personnel, the use of a basic qualitative design is common in such applied fields (Merriam, 2009). Accordingly, a basic qualitative research design provides a fitting framework for expanding the field's understanding of the doctoral process for Black female students.

In addition to a basic qualitative research design, the study also used grounded theory data analysis methods. As explained by Corbin and Strauss (1990), “grounded theory aims to uncover relevant conditions while simultaneously examining how persons respond to changing conditions and to the consequences of their actions” (p. 5). Grounded theory analysis begins with the first set of data and remains ongoing, throughout data collection, providing space for constant comparison of raw data. The use of grounded theory analysis methods provides a systematic and rigorous manner to explore the responses of participants (Corbin & Strauss, 1990; Merriam, 2009). In brief, the selection of basic qualitative research methodology with grounded theory analysis provided a template for microscopic examination of data and allowed for categories to emerge from these data (Corbin & Strauss, 1990).

Unlike other deductive methodologies, such as thematic and content analyses, the inductive process of grounded theory analysis places importance on providing “space” for the data to “speak” and for concepts to emerge, rather than placing the data in pre-established categories (Corbin & Strauss, 1990; Merriam, 2009). Data driven meaning is important, as the study sought to understand the participant’s experiences, allowing the participants’ voices to be central. As such, grounded theory analysis provided a fitting tool for analyzing the data, as it offers a systematic, constant comparison approach that allowed for the emergence and conceptualization of the nuanced and latent processes that
characterizes the experiences of black female doctoral students during the doctoral process. The focus on both the nuanced and latent processes allows for a greater emergence of a critical approach. To further contextualize the research design, the following discusses, in more detail, the philosophical framework grounding the qualitative research design of this study.

**Theoretical Framework**

In electing to study Black women’s doctoral experiences and academic career development, it is essential to outline the philosophical constructs informing this study’s inquiry. As noted by Creswell (2009), it is important to identify the philosophical framework proposed and define its basic considerations and how it shapes the study’s approach to analysis. As such, in exploring the experiences of Black female doctoral students, the current study drew upon Collins’ (1986) Black Feminist Thought (BFT) and Lent, Brown, and Hackett’s (1994) Social-Cognitive Career Theory (SCCT) as the theoretical frameworks that ground this study. Both of these frameworks were used as the lens for analysis of the data. The following provides an overview of the two frameworks grounding this study detailing the implications and framing each brings to the current study.

**Black Feminist Thought.** BFT is purposed to empower and uphold Black women as central subjects. It postulates Black women as a heterogeneous group living in a context where they experience a multiplicity of intersecting oppressions: oppressions of race, class, gender, sexuality, and nation (Collins, 1991). The following outlines key proponents of BFT central to this study’s investigation.
**Intersectionality.** BFT is distinguished by its establishment of Black women as an oppressed group experiencing oppression because of an array of intersecting identities (Collins, 2000). Intersecting oppressions include, for example, race, gender, and class, and the intersections are not summative such that one aspect can be subtracted. BFT argues that, as a function of being an oppressed group in the United States, Black women experience differential group treatment (Collins, 2000). Consequently, the way they view the world may differ from groups that do not experience the intersection of oppression based on race, gender, and class (Collins, 2000). Thus, BFT argues that the unique and divergent experiences that categorize Black women’s lives results in a different lived reality. Thus, when studying Black women, BFT provides a means to uniquely account for the way Black women’s identities inherently interact to form the whole of their experience. It allows one to look at how the interaction of race, gender, and class inform Black women’s doctoral experiences rather than concurrently or successively looking at the influence of each cultural identity.

**Distinctive standpoint.** BFT premises that Black women own a distinctive standpoint of and perspective of their lived experiences (Collins, 1986). These experiences, although divergent, retain a level of communal perception that is held collectively by Black women as a distinct group (Collins, 1986). Of important note is that the perception is communal in that collectively it is held by all Black women, yet it is individual in that it may not be experienced by all or perceived by all. The divergence of experiences yet held by a collective group characterizes another key element of BFT, varied expressions of common themes. Central to BFT is the importance of giving
African American women a platform to be heard—a voice (Collins, 2000; Herbert, 2012; hooks, 1989)

**Expressions of common themes.** BFT outlines that Black women’s divergent experiences with age, class, region, sexual orientation, and nationality result in varied expressions of common themes. In other words, the intersectionality of Black women’s identity as Black and woman may foster a common outlook yet other life variables combine to manifest as different expressions of the common themes (Collins, 1986). Importantly, common themes in the lives of Black women should be studied from the understanding that different groups of Black women will experience and express them differently (Collins, 1986). Key to BFT is the acknowledgement and embracing of heterogeneous experiences and expressions of common themes.

**Research is interactional.** BFT premises that the history and conditions surrounding the producers of knowledge cannot be separated from the constructions and themes that form knowledge (Collins, 1986). Emphatically, since BFT is produced by and for Black women, the production of a Black women’s standpoint cannot be detached from the historical and material conditions of Black women. When seeking to understand the lives of Black women, BFT informs the Black female researcher that her experience is relevant to inquiry. In view of that, it does not call for an objective view or approach, but rather an examination of the interaction between the Black female researcher and the Black female subject. It therefore becomes a dialogue.

The above theoretical assumptions shape the application and appropriateness of BFT to the understanding of Black women’s lived experiences with the doctoral process. It lays clear that BFT aims to capture the varied yet common shared occurrences in the
lived experiences of Black women acknowledging the intersectionality of their identities. Decidedly, within this study, Black feminist thought informs both the methodology and interpretive framework. BFT supports the qualitative research design of the study as its aim of giving voice to Black women’s lived experiences provides a rationale for a qualitative research design which produces “inquiry that is richly descriptive” (Merriam, 2009, p. 16). BFT guided the development of the interview protocol, as questions were shaped considering the intersectionality of Black women’s identities. BFT informs the assumption that the intersection of race, gender, and class play a key role in the doctoral process and career aspirations of doctoral students and the formation of questions that seek to explore such experience. Further, a BFT interpretive lens was used to analyze the data to allow for meaning of Black women’s experience to emerge.

**Social Cognitive Career Theory.** Doctoral students’ career intentions and perceptions are influenced by a complex set of factors. Within this study, Social Cognitive Career Theory (SCCT) provides a framework for understanding the career development processes highlighting the role of sociocognitive mechanisms, personal agency, and learning (Lent et al., 1994). Originating from Bandura’s (1986) social cognitive theory, SCCT explains career related behaviors (career and academic interests, career-related choices and career-related performance outcomes) as a function of self-efficacy beliefs, outcome expectations, and personal goals. In its conceptualization of career development, SCCT includes contextual and background variables emphasizing how these factors enhance or constrain personal agency (Lent et al., 1994). As a career development model, SCCT argues that personal, contextual, and experiential factors influence an individual’s self-efficacy beliefs and outcome expectations, thereby
effecting career-related interests, choices, and performance. It is conceived that these outputs (career interests, choice goals, and performance) are influenced directly and indirectly by self-efficacy beliefs and outcome expectations. The following provides a brief overview of the SCCT framework describing its primary tenets and propositions. Further it outlines how the theory shaped the study.

SCCT provided an apropos orientation for exploring the academic career development of Black female doctoral students’ due to its inclusion of personal and contextual variables in explaining career development. Specifically, the incorporation of contextual and background variables in the model provides a means to study how Black women’s career-related interests, choices, and performance outcomes develop, taking into consideration their various intersecting identities and oppressed context. That is, since cultural identity factors are a key element in the model, rather than an *ex post facto* consideration, SCCT provides researchers with a means to consider the interaction of race, gender, and class synchronously with the other career development variables. This is particularly relevant to this study as it seeks to explore the doctoral process and academic career interests taking into account the influence of Black women’s cultural identities. Given the studies reliance on BFT, SCCT provides a fitting career development theory. For instance, researchers have applied the model to Black women and other women and ethnic minorities in empirical studies (Chronister & McWhirter, 2004, 2006; Dickinson, Abrams, & Tokar, 2017; Lent et al., 2005; Lent, Lopez, Sheu, & Lopez, 2011; Lent, Sheu, Gloster, & Wilkins, 2010; Scheuermann, Tokar, & Hall, 2014) and theoretical literature (Hackett & Byars, 1996), demonstrating its utility in understanding the career development of Black women (Scheuermann et al., 2014).
SCCT informed both the methodology and interpretive framework within the current study. As it relates to methodology, the interview protocol guiding this study is based on the tenets of SCCT. Interview questions are organized into five sections that correspond with SCCT concepts: (a) personal background questions, (b) questions about the factors influencing their career choices, (c) questions about their perceptions of academic career, (d) questions about their familiarity with academia careers, and (e) questions about the intention to pursue a faculty career. The purpose of using such an interview protocol allows for interviews to be “guided by the basic propositions of SCCT, but without restricting students' answers or their interpretation of these propositions” (Mueller, Flickinger, & Dorner, 2015). In addition to influencing the study methods, SCCT also informed the interpretive lens used to guide analysis. SCCT informed how this study defines, views, and understands career development and career related behaviors. Within this study, the academic career intentions of Black female doctoral students are analyzed, examining how career intentions (goals) develop as a function of self-efficacy beliefs, outcome expectations, and contextual and personal background variables.

**Data Collection**

Prior to the collection of any data for this study, IRB approval was obtained from the University of Missouri - St. Louis Institutional Review Board (IRB) following the Review of Human Subjects Research mandated by the National Research Act (PL 93-348) and implemented by Federal Regulations (45 CFR 46) (See www.umsl.edu/services/ora/Compliance/human-subjects-irb.html). The purpose of the IRB is to evaluate all university research proposals upholding the regulations concerning
research that includes human participants. All data collection followed approval and protocol.

Informed consent was obtained from all participants using the approved “Informed Consent for Participation in Research Activities” form (see Appendix A). The consent form outlined the terms for participants’ involvement in the research including the expected time commitment and self-disclosure involved in the study. Participants were informed of the completely voluntary nature of participation and that they can choose to withdraw from the study at any time without penalty. After the terms of participation were explained to participants and upon agreeing to the terms, the consent form was signed by both the researcher and participant. A copy of the consent form was given to the participant and the signed consent form was kept by the researcher in a secure location with all other materials related to the study.

The sample population for this study, was Black female doctoral students currently enrolled as doctorate degree-seeking students in an Education program within the United States. For the purpose of this study, a Black individual is an individual who ethnically identifies as of African Diaspora descent (i.e., African, African American, African Caribbean, African Latina, Black, of African descent, or Multiracial). Sample criterion for the study included students who are 18 years or older and have completed all doctoral coursework. This was done to ensure that the sample participants are heavily immersed in the doctoral process, thereby providing more information rich cases.

Due to the limited experience that first year doctoral students have with the doctoral process, they are potentially more limited in the richness they bring to the current research questions under investigation. Additionally, the participant had to be a
doctoral student enrolled in institutions located in the United States attending an onsite program. Individuals enrolled in an online or hybrid program were not eligible for participation. Likewise, American students earning a doctoral degree from an institution outside of the United States were not eligible for participation in the study. Last, participants had to be enrolled at research institutions that traditionally or historically been predominantly White institutions (PWI).

**Recruitment**

The study employed nonprobability sampling, using purposive sampling methods that included network, criteria, and snowball sampling. Recruitment for the study aimed to solicit participants across U.S. institutions. Using purposive sampling, the researcher contacted via face-to-face, phone, social media, and electronic mail communication, several graduate faculty and administrators from various universities, with whom she has a rapport, and informed them about the study, asking them to disseminate information regarding the study to participants of interest within their institution (see Appendix B). Additionally, recruitment consisted of identifying participants through the researcher’s various professional and social networks, as the researcher’s identity as a doctoral student provided access to other Black female doctoral students. Last, recruitment consisted of snowball sampling, as the researcher solicited participants through referrals from the interview participants. Thirteen women participated in this study.

The information disseminated about the study as a means of recruitment included an email that explains the study and a hyperlink for individuals to access the study’s demographic and screening questionnaire. The questionnaire assessed their eligibility, collected demographic information, and asked them to provide preferences for interview
times. The demographic portion asked questions related to their cultural identity (e.g., age, gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation) and doctoral experience (e.g., degree type, program type, institution type, year in program, degree milestones completed). Questions related to interview availability asked them to note preferences regarding time, location, day of week, and to provide an email address and phone number to be used for contact regarding participation in the study (see Appendix C). After completing the online screening questionnaire, participants were informed that they would be contacted by the researcher regarding participation in the study’s one-on-one interview and follow-up survey. The researcher contacted participants via e-mail who met the study criteria and scheduled a time to conduct the one-on-one semi-structured interview. Individuals who completed the interview were then later contacted by email to participate in the follow-up survey. Participants who did not meet the study’s criteria received an email notification informing them that their interest in the study was appreciated, but that they did not meet the criteria for the study at this time.

Individual semi-structured one-on-one interviews served as the primary source of data collection. The use of semi-structured interviews in this study allowed for the incorporation of questions, prepared by the researchers in advance, into a flexible conversation with the interviewee (Flick, 2014). It allowed for the interviewer to ask clarifying questions about the interviewee’s perspective as they arose (Flick, 2014). The interview protocol guiding the study was developed by the researcher, based on the review of literature. Within the study, interview questions included but were not limited to: 1) How has your identity (racial, gender, class, sexual orientation) affected your experience with the doctoral process; 2) How (in what ways) has your perception of an
academic career changed during your doctoral experience; 3) What is your understanding of a career in academia; 4) What has informed your understanding of an academic career. (For a complete listing of the interview protocol see Appendix D.)

Interviews lasted between 60 to 90 minutes and were audio recorded. Interviews took place within a comfortable, private, and convenient location of the participant’s choice. Interviews were conducted either in-person or over the telephone using the conference meeting platform Zoom. Prior to the beginning of each interview informed consent was reviewed and obtained as outlined above. For participating in the study, each participant received a $25 gift card. Following each interview, the researcher engaged in reflective journaling on the interview process.

The follow up survey was administered electronically via an online survey platform after completion of the one-on-one interviews and initial data analysis. The follow-up survey asked participants to review study results and provide feedback on the initial findings. Participants were provided with a copy of the research results and asked to respond to questions that included but were not limited to: 1) Do these themes reflect your experiences; 2) Are there any themes that surprised you; 3) In your perspective is there anything missing from the results; and 4) after reviewing the results is there anything additional that you would like to add. (For a complete listing of the interview protocol see Appendix E.) The survey took approximately 15-20 minutes.

Data Analysis

This study relied upon conventional practices in qualitative research to analyze the data gathered from the interviews. Specifically, qualitative techniques such as line by line open coding, constant comparison, and axial coding steered the data analysis process.
The use of grounded theory techniques provided an inductive method for identifying and categorizing the data and determining the various elements and explanations that connect the emergent categories (Glaser & Strauss, 1999; Strauss & Corbin, 1998). Such qualitative techniques enable the researcher to provide a description of the data as well as identify concepts that form larger categories that relate to one another considering the research question. Within this study, analysis was an ongoing process, as it began with the first interview and continued throughout the study (Merriam, 2009). To prepare data for analysis, all interview data were transcribed by either the researcher or a professional transcription service. To maintain confidentiality, the individual providing the transcription service was required to sign a nondisclosure agreement (see Appendix F). Additionally, to further prepare the data for analysis, each transcript was line numbered and labeled with a date, time of interview, interview location, interview length in minutes, and a pseudonym to represent the interviewee.

After each transcript was prepared for analysis, the researcher began the process of immersing herself in the data. To ensure accuracy and to gain familiarity with the data, the primary researcher read all the transcribed interviews, while listening to the original audio recording, to confirm the accuracy of the transcripts. After this initial listening and reading of the transcript, the researcher engaged in writing analytic memos to track emerging ideas and major issues as they came to mind. Analytic memos are notes about the researcher’s reactions and process. They included information about what the researcher learned while analyzing data and how the data are connecting during coding (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007; Merriam, 2009). Within this study, analytic memos were used throughout the process of data collection and analysis.
Once each transcript was read by the researcher for accuracy, the coding of the interview data began. In addition to the primary researcher coding each transcript, a research assistant aided in the creation of codes within the open coding process. Prior to the coding process, the research assistant received training conducted by the primary researcher on the data analysis procedures used in this study. Additionally, during the training process, the primary researcher and the research assistant discussed and recorded the biases and assumptions held about the doctoral process, academic careers, Black female doctoral students, what they expected to find in the interviews, and what information they expected to not see in the interviews. Based on the discussion, the researchers outlined methods for identifying and reducing the imposition of bias onto the data.

To begin the process of coding and to establish initial codes, both researchers independently coded the initial interview and discussed, compared, and contrasted codes to establish consensus on an initial set of codes (Goodell, Stage, & Cooke, 2016; Wilson, 2009). Additionally, as an evaluative checkpoint, inter-rater reliability was established using Cohen’s kappa to assess the level of agreement between the two researchers coding (Goodell et al., 2016). Once the researchers reached a consensus on codes and the coding structure was well defined, the primary researcher continued to code all transcripts and the research assistant coded every other transcript. Throughout the coding process it was important to check for coder drift, which is a change over time in the researcher’s coding interpretations that results in coding inconsistencies (Wilson, 2009). To account for coding inconsistencies, inter-rater reliability was assessed as an evaluative check-point and to monitor for coder drift (Goodell et al., 2016; Wilson, 2009). Concurrently, the
researchers met throughout the coding process to engage in continuous dialogue as a means to establish consistency across codes and the coding process. In analyzing the data, the researchers made use of the constant comparison process throughout open coding (Corbin & Strauss, 1990). Open coding is the process by which the researcher examines the transcripts to identify, name, categorize, and describe key pieces of data. To aid in systematically identifying key pieces of data, line-by-line coding was used to identify important meaning units (Chenail, 2012). Meaning units constitute analytical units demarcated by an undivided entity expressing a single qualitative description (Chenail, 2012). The process of line-by-line coding using meaning units provided a distinct focus on qualitatively meaningful data and helped the researcher avoid over-sizing and under-sizing meaning units within the line-by-line process (Chenail, 2012). Each meaning unit identified was labeled as a specific code and compiled in a code book. Additionally, a code list was generated.

In addition to open coding, the primary researcher used constant comparison, which consists of key pieces of data being compared against other key pieces of data looking for similarities or differences (Corbin & Strauss, 1990; Merriam, 2009). The way the data compared was noted and informed the emergence of meaningful concepts and categories. As the codes were compared and concepts formed, axial coding was used. Axial coding takes constant comparison a step further, as it seeks to analyze the ways in which the concepts within each category interact and relate (Corbin & Strauss, 1990). It looks at relationships between codes, categories, and properties. It uses both inductive and deductive thinking, as axial coding relates categories to their subcategories. For example, Strauss and Corbin (1998) noted that axial coding occurs around the “axis of a
category” (p. 123). It allowed for the emergence of meaningful categories identified through open and axial coding. The interview, coding, and constant comparison process continued until saturation was reached (i.e., repetition of categories occurs and there emerges no new major categories in the interviews). This ongoing interconnected process of simultaneous data collection and analysis allowed for a continual state of consistent reflection of the data against developing findings.

**Trustworthiness**

Within the qualitative research field, scholars have continued to stress the importance of qualitative researchers establishing trustworthiness (Amankwaa, 2016; Birt, Scott, Cavers, Campbell, & Walter, 2016; Connelly, 2016; Fusch & Ness, 2015; Goodell et al., 2016; Guba, 1981; Kornbluh, 2015; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Trustworthiness reflects the believability of one’s data, interpretations and findings. It establishes the precision in which the study’s findings reflect the lived experiences of participants (Goodell et al., 2016; Kornbluh, 2015). Accordingly, instituting protocols and procedures that cement the rigor and transparency of the study is vital to the integrity of the findings and the usefulness of the results (Amankwaa, 2016; Connelly, 2016). In establishing a study’s trustworthiness, researchers should address credibility, dependability, confirmability, and transferability (Amankwaa, 2016; Connelly, 2016; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Each of these aspects were addressed in this study and the procedures used to address each are outlined below.

**Credibility.** Within this study, the establishment of credibility was sought in several ways. The concept of credibility is comparable to internal validity in quantitative research (Connelly, 2016). It represents what Lincoln and Guba (1985), in their
discussion of naturalistic inquiry, referred to as the “true value” of the findings; the establishment of confidence in the truth of the findings. Credibility involves the outlining and use of protocols to establish confidence in the “truth” of the research finding (Amankwaa, 2016). As identified by several scholars, key activities for establishing credibility include peer debriefing, member checks, and journaling (Amankwaa, 2016; Connelly, 2016; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The following outlines the use of peer debriefing and member checks within this study to enhance trustworthiness.

Member checks provided a means for the researcher to gain feedback and insight on the data, interpretations, and conclusions from the participants themselves. It involves sharing tentative interpretations and findings with participants asking them to validate, verify, and assess the extent to which the results reflect their intended meanings and experiences (Birt et al., 2016; Kornbluh, 2015). Within this study, participants were asked to review the initial categories and concepts drawn from analysis of the data. Participants were presented with a copy of the findings with annotated categories and asked to provide input on whether the themes accurately reflect their own experiences (Kornbluh, 2015). That is, in confirming the truthfulness of the results, as noted by Brit et al. (2016), “the participant should be able to recognize their own experiences within the synthesized themes” (p. 1804). In addition to participants verifying if the initial findings resonate with their experiences, they were also given the opportunity to comment on each category and add key points they felt were missing. Information from the member checks were compared to initial data and translated into the analysis and final report.
Kornbluh (2015) argued that member checking enhances participant ownership over the findings, which further facilitates the utilization of the conclusions for social change. The usefulness of member checking in giving voice to participants supports the BFT framework grounding this study. BFT noted the importance of giving voice to Black women’s lived experiences and, through member checking, participants are provided a more active role in the process and the opportunity to ensure their experiences are voiced.

In addition to the participants receiving the initial categories using member checks, peer debriefing was used to provide feedback on the initial categories. Further, peer-debriefing was used throughout the data analysis process to enhance trustworthiness. Peer debriefing involves an outside person (independent investigator) providing an objective assessment of the project (Creswell, 2009). The peer debriefer takes on an auditor role, asking questions that dissect the various aspects of inquiry and data analysis process (Creswell, 2009; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Peer debriefing enhances the overall credibility of the study as it serves several functions: examining researcher’s biases, clarifying interpretations, exploring hypotheses, discussing methodological steps, and providing the researcher with a cathartic outlet.

**Dependability.** Within qualitative research, dependability depicts the stability of data and the extent to which findings are consistent with the data and could be repeated (Amankwaa, 2016; Connelly, 2016). Connelly (2016) noted that dependability compares to reliability in quantitative research. Within this study, dependability was addressed by maintaining an audit trail of process logs and having the audit trail reviewed and discussed in peer-debriefings. Maintaining an audit trail that is elaborate and rich in description provides a transparent way to document each step taken in the study. The
record spans procedures taken from the development of the study to the reporting of findings. Further, reviewing the notes in peer-debriefing helps prevent the influence of the researcher’s biases on the research (Amankwaa, 2016).

**Confirmability.** Confirmability gauges the neutrality of findings (Amankwaa, 2016; Connelly, 2016). It shows the extent to which findings reflect the participant’s perspectives rather than the researcher's bias, motivation, or agenda (Amankwaa, 2016; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). To establish confirmability within this study, a research assistant was employed in the data analysis process to help with the coding of data and identifying categories. The use of an additional coder provides investigator triangulation, which involves the use of two or more researchers in any part of the study’s investigation stages (Carter, Bryant-Lukosius, DiCenso, Blythe, & Neville, 2014). Investigator triangulation provides an approach that supplies multiple perspectives approaching the data and a cross-check for selective perception and monitoring of blind spots and researcher bias and assumptions (Amankwaa, 2016). It simultaneously allows for the calculation and establishment of interrater reliability.

**Transferability.** Transferability addresses the application of a study’s findings to other contexts (Amankwaa, 2016). Lincoln and Guba (1985) noted transferability involves the researcher providing “the thick description necessary to enable someone interested in making a transfer to reach a conclusion about whether transfer can be contemplated as a possibility” (p. 316). To aid in the study’s transferability, this study used thick description. Amankwaa (2016) highlighted that in providing thick description, the researcher first seeks to obtain rich responses from the participants. To that extent, one wants to elicit detailed, thick and robust responses from the participants that detail
the subject of investigation. Second, the researcher then seeks to convey through writing the richness of the participants responses (seeking to incorporate multiple participants) in a way that captures the richness of the subject as described by the participants (Amankwa, 2016).

Reflexivity

Within this study, semi-structured interviews served as the primary data collection source and I, as the researcher, functioned as the principal research instrument. As such, this section describes the role and person of the researcher, examining how my identities impacted the research process. Within this section, I outline my identities, explore my background with the topic of study, state my assumptions and biases, and detail the strategies that were exercised to enhance trustworthiness.

Background of researcher. This research project is reflective of my journey as a doctoral student. That is, as an African American female doctoral candidate in a Counselor Education Ph.D. program, I am currently navigating the doctoral process and forming a perspective about academic careers. This identity provides me, as a researcher, with an insider status. I can relate to the population being studied as I share common identities: both visible social identities (such as race and gender) as well as a shared student status. It is important to note the biases, predispositions, and attitudes that affected the interviewer-respondent interaction, as it is important to be sensitive to these issues and maintain awareness of their influence and interaction throughout the study (Merriam, 2009). The following outlines the influence of the BFT lens to my identity as a researcher and my approach to research, highlighting the predispositions and assumptions I bring to this work.
In noting my identities and insider status, it was important that I was continually aware of how they impacted the research process. It was important for me to be diligent about keeping in mind that, although my experiences may be similar to the participants, they are separate, and I needed to maintain enough distance, so their experiences could emerge. Specifically, it was important that I had enough distance so I could ask questions in a way that explored the participants’ experiences, rather than sharing assumptions (Merriam, 2009). To help with this, I engaged in processes that increased my awareness and allowed me to monitor my assumptions. As such, I continually reflected upon the research process and my perspective, through keeping analytic memos, an ongoing field-journal, and engaging in member-checking and peer-checks.

**Researcher assumptions and bias.** In approaching this study, there are several assumptions I held as a researcher that should be explored. Outlining these assumptions provided a means to bracket, keep track, and limit the influence exerted by my expectations as a researcher. The following provides a reflection on my assumptions and biases going into the study.

One assumption held by me was that Black female doctoral students would have experiences with oppression, stereotypes, discrimination, or prejudice within academia in response to their identities as Black females. In making this assumption, it is expected that not all Black women may perceive and/or acknowledge experiences of oppression, stereotyping, discrimination, or prejudice; however, it is assumed these experiences occur in academia due to the systematic inequalities found within society and institutions of higher education. Furthermore, it is assumed that the various stereotypical ideologies and experiences with oppression are not static, meaning that, at any point in time, a Black
woman’s endorsement of experiencing stereotyping or oppression may shift/change. There is, however, still a prevailing reality of stereotypical images and oppressions that Black Women must navigate and contend with despite their milieu or level of acknowledgement.

A second assumption held by me related to the expectation that most Black female doctoral students would have at least thought about an academic position due to their proximity to the profession. The proliferation of the apprentice model in doctoral programs positions students to engage in various activities, such as teaching, research, and relationships with faculty that expose students to various aspects of the academic career. As such, it is supposed that, even if a student does not intend to go into an academic career, they have considered the profession. I think that they have engaged, to some extent, in reflection on their thoughts about an academic career. At the same time, it is supposed that students may not have considered all elements of a faculty career. Although individuals may have considered the question—to pursue an academic position or not pursue an academic position, they may have not engaged in deeper thought about the type of position or type of institution. I have assumed that, being in an academic environment, doctoral students would be aware of the various academic posts and institutions that exists; however, it was important to be cognizant of women who may have not been exposed to this career related information.

A third assumption held by me is that students studying full-time in their program would have increased access to resources and exposure and participation in academic opportunities. Many students studying full-time have the opportunity to benefit from assistantships—teaching, research, clinical—that allow them to participate in activities
that get them closer to faculty, thereby providing more opportunities for mentorship and exposure to academia. Working class Black women, who are maintaining full-time employment while also engaging in doctoral work, however, may have a very different experience than the traditional full-time student.

As a doctoral student that studied for most of her program as a full-time student with a graduate research assistantship, my continued presence in the department facilitated various leadership, mentorship, and research opportunities. For instance, I have had opportunities to participate on several research teams, form mentorship relationships with several faculty, instruct courses, and present research at conferences both nationally and internationally. It was important for me to guard against my biases towards the benefits of full-time study. Further, I made sure to monitor against searching for such research, mentorship, and leadership experiences if they were not a part of a participant’s doctoral process.

A fourth assumption important to explore relates to my own intentions and perceptions regarding an academic career. The motivation for this current research project is informed by my personal experiences, observations, and conversations with colleagues, family, and faculty about academic positions. Of particular note is my current process related to making a decision about pursuing a faculty career. For me, shifts have taken place throughout the doctoral process regarding faculty career intentions. It is assumed that as doctoral students engage in the doctoral process intentions are influenced. Individuals may become more solidified in their intent to pursue a faculty position, or they may begin to pendulum between pursuing or not pursing an academic position.
Throughout my own journey, shifts have occurred at various points in the doctoral process. Shifts have been influenced by observations of faculty that lack work life balance, conversations about the rigor of obtaining tenure, and the obstacles Black women face during the tenure process, working in an adjunct faculty position, and questions about the ability of pre-tenured faculty to engage in meaningful work in their communities. Further, I have found encouragement from faculty mentors to pursue an academic career and has received encouragement from family to pursue academia. At the same time, I have also heard arguments such as “we do not want to lose you to academia” with those in the community suggesting academia is in many ways disconnected from the realities of the community. All of these factors, and more, have played a role in my academic career development. Although it is my intent is to pursue a faculty career, this decision has not come without major shifts and various points of hesitation. Thus, it was important for me to be aware of the influence of my own process and career intentions on the research project.

**Reflective journaling.** Within qualitative research, scholars have encouraged a reflective approach to investigations (Lamb, 2013; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Ortlipp, 2008; Watt, 2007). Reflexivity involves self-awareness, self-reflection, and the researcher giving careful consideration to how their thoughts, assumptions, behaviors, and lens (what they see and what inhibits their sight) impacts inquiry (Marrow, 2005; Wyatt, 2007). One means to engage in reflexivity is through reflective journaling. Outlined by Lincoln and Guba (1985) in a discussion on establishing trustworthiness, reflective journaling serves as a diary of sorts that allows the researcher to keep record of what is going on throughout the research process for the self of the researcher as well as about
the study’s methods. Given the role of the researcher as the principal research instrument, the reflexive journal provides data about “the human instrument”, paralleling how one would provide information for quantitative instruments and measures used within a given study (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

In relation to the methods of the study, the reflective journal serves to provide ongoing information about the reasoning behind methodological decisions made throughout the study. Reflective journaling allows one to record thoughts, observations, and steps taken in a systematic, reflective, and transparent fashion. Following the suggestions of Lincoln and Guba (1985), reflective journaling in this study consisted of journaling the following: (1) the schedule and logistics of the study; (2) personal reflections that allow for catharsis and consideration of the researcher’s values, interests, and speculatory insights; and (3) a log for methodological decisions and rationales.

Furthermore, as outlined by Amankwaa (2016) in suggesting a protocol for journaling, the reflective journaling process for this study began during the research proposal writing phase. Second, journaling occurred after each major activity in the study, which includes but is not limited to each interview, weekly during analysis, and after each peer debriefing and member checks. The journal was maintained electronically and each entry included dates, times, places and researchers involved (Amankwaa, 2016).

**Ethical Considerations**

Qualitative inquiry lends itself to direct personal contact between the researcher and interviewees (Patton, 2002). When engaging in qualitative interviewing, it is important to enlist procedures and protocols that address the unique ethical challenges that may arise throughout the research process. Informed by Patton’s (2002) ethical
issues checklist, the following details the steps that were employed within this study to address ethical issues with participants.

**Explaining purpose.** As a member of the group this study investigates, I provided full disclosure to participants of my identity as an African American counselor education doctoral candidate at a Midwestern public research university. Concurrently, participants were informed of my intent to gather and disseminate information on Black women’s career development within the context of their enrollment in education doctorate programs at Predominantly White Institutions (PWIs). All participants were provided with a description of the study that outlined the research procedures. Further information was provided on the anticipated use of the study’s data to contribute to literature on the experiences of Black female doctoral students and to inform the development of tailored interventions and career support for Black women’s academic career development.

**Informed consent.** Prior to the interview process, all participants received and were instructed to fully read the “Informed Consent for Participation in Research Activities” form (see Appendix A) associated with the study. The consent from outlined the terms for participants involvement and secured permission to audiotape participants responses. Additionally, before being asked to sign the consent form, participants were given an opportunity to ask clarifying questions about their participation.

**Data collection boundaries.** Prior to beginning the study, participants were informed that their involvement in the study is completely voluntary. All participants were informed that they can stop the interview or discontinue participation at any time, for any reason without penalty.
Risk assessment. It is assessed that involvement in the study has low potential risks. It may, however, be possible that talking about certain experiences around doctoral training and career development may bring up difficult feelings. Participants were informed about the potential for uncomfortable feelings through the informed consent form which outlines the associated risks.

Confidentiality. Several steps were taken to increase participant privacy and anonymity. All participant names and names of academic institution were protected through the use of pseudonyms. Interviews were transcribed by the researcher or through a professional transcription service who signed a non-disclosure agreement to keep all materials confidential. Further, before being analyzed, other potentially identifying information was masked and participants’ transcripts were labeled by their pseudonyms and a generated participant number.

Data access and ownership. The transcripts of the interviews were kept in a secure file on a password-protected computer in addition to the computer being stored in a locked location. Similarly, all demographic questionnaires, consent forms, and handwritten notes were kept in a locked file in my home office.

Chapter Summary

In seeking to understand the academic career intentions of Black female doctoral students enrolled in education doctoral programs, this study was intentionally designed to expand career development literature focused on Black women. The study used qualitative methods to examine students’ perceptions of academic careers and intentions to pursue an academic career. As outlined in this chapter, a critical qualitative perspective grounded this study and a BFT lens was used to interpret the data. That is, data
interpretation was based on generating findings that give voice to Black women’s experiences and that empower change. Data analysis within this study was guided by grounded theory techniques such as constant comparison, open coding, and axial coding to systematically discover the meaning within the data. Additionally, to enhance the trustworthiness and rigor of the study, various techniques such as reflective journaling, member checks, and an audit trail were used. In the next chapter, the findings and themes of the study are presented.
Chapter Four

Results

This study explored the experiences of Black female doctoral students to understand the ways Black women perceive academic careers and factors that influence their career development. Through engaging in semi-structured interviews, participants shared their academic career perceptions and intentions. Participants reflected on their personal backgrounds, learning experiences, accomplishments, and occupational choice goals. Four questions guided the study: (a) what perceptions do Black female doctoral students have of an academic career, (b) what factors shape Black female doctoral students’ academic career perceptions during the doctoral process, (c) what are the academic career intentions of Black female doctoral students, and (d) what factors influence the development of Black female doctoral students’ academic career intentions during the doctoral process?

This chapter reports the research findings derived from the analysis of the study’s data sources. Data sources included screening questionnaires, semi-structured interviews, member checking responses, and the researcher’s field journal. The chapter describes the participants and outlines the patterns and themes that emerged from the data. It includes participant quotations to allow for the conveying of participants’ voices in each identified theme. It should be noted that some quotations have been edited to protect participants’ identity; however, the meaning of participants’ statements were unaltered. As such, locations, job titles, and other identifying information have been removed or generalized to preserve confidentiality. Further, to protect the anonymity and confidentiality of the
participants, the researcher assigned a pseudonym to each participant. The pseudonyms are used throughout the reporting of the findings.

**Description of Participants**

A total of 13 individuals participated in the study. All participants self-identified as female, of African/African Diaspora descent, and enrolled in an education on-site/face-to-face doctoral program at a PWI. Participants largely identified as African American (n=12) and one participant identified as African. Participants ranged in age from 29 to 55.

The table below provides a summary of participants’ demographic information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Sexual Orientation</th>
<th>Class Status Family of Origin</th>
<th>Class Status Current</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Children</th>
<th>Employment Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ivy</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>Working poor</td>
<td>Middle class</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Yes (2)</td>
<td><strong>Part</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristy</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazel</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>Low income</td>
<td>Upper middle</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Yes (2)</td>
<td>Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Lower middle</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danielle</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>*Upper/Lower middle SES</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bianca</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liz</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leah</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Upper middle</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abigail</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justine</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>Lower middle</td>
<td>Upper middle</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Yes (2)</td>
<td><strong>Part</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gina</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>*Middle/Working Poverty</td>
<td>Upper middle</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frances</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>Lower middle</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mia</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>Lower middle</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Full</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates two separate class identities in family of origin   **Indicates work as graduate assistant

Note. Part (Part-time)   Full (Full-time)   S=Single   M=Married   P=Partnered   NR=Not Reported

---

PURSUING OF THE PROFESSORIATE
At the time of the interviews, all participants were at the doctoral candidacy phase. Two participants reported completion of coursework and comprehensive examinations and 11 participants reported completion of coursework, comprehensive examinations, and their dissertation proposals. The majority of the participants (n=12) were first generation doctoral students. Ten were enrolled in a PhD program and three were in an EdD program. Over half of the participants (n=8) reported attending public institutions. Six of the individuals at public institutions described their university as research-intensive. Table 2 provides a summary of participants’ doctoral backgrounds.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>First Gen</th>
<th>Student Status</th>
<th>Institution Location</th>
<th>Institution Type</th>
<th>Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ivy</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Part</td>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>PWI, Public</td>
<td>Theory &amp; Social Foundations of Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristy</td>
<td>EdD</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Part</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>PWI, Public, Research Intensive</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazel</td>
<td>EdD</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Part</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>PWI, Public, Research Intensive</td>
<td>Education/Higer Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>PWI Private</td>
<td>Counselor Ed &amp; Supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danielle</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>PWI</td>
<td>Higher Ed Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bianca</td>
<td>EdD</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Part</td>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>PWI, Public, Research Intensive</td>
<td>Adult &amp; Community College Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liz</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>Part</td>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>PWI, Public, Research Intensive</td>
<td>Higher Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leah</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>PWI, Private</td>
<td>Counselor Ed &amp; Supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abigail</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>PWI, Public, Research Intensive</td>
<td>Counselor Ed &amp; Supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justine</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Part</td>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>PWI</td>
<td>Counselor Ed &amp; Supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gina</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>Part</td>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>PWI, Public</td>
<td>Counselor Ed &amp; Supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frances</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Part</td>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>PWI, Public, Research Intensive</td>
<td>Counselor Ed &amp; Supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mia</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>PWI</td>
<td>Counselor Ed &amp; Supervision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Part (Part-time) Full (Full-time) *Extended family member (cousin, uncle, aunt) has a doctorate

Participants in the study varied as it related to academic career intentions with most intending to pursue an academic career. As noted previously, in the context of this
study, academic career referred to full-time work in professional faculty positions within institutions of higher education. It included participants who indicated interest in full-time faculty positions such as tenure-track faculty, non-tenure track faculty, clinical academic faculty, teaching faculty, and research faculty. Additionally, it encompassed limited term or contract positions associated with the academic rank of lecturer, instructor, or visiting professor. Seven participants (53.8%) indicated they intended to pursue an academic career. Academic career intentions ranged on three dimensions: long held to more recent intentions, exclusive to inclusive position seeking, and position type (research, teaching, clinical).

Four participants (30.8%) within the study noted uncertainty or delayed intentions about pursuing an academic career. Individuals categorized as uncertain were those who expressed being on the fence or intending to pursue an academic career in the distant future but not planning to currently pursue an academic career. All participants in this category, although they expressed uncertainty or delayed intent in pursuing an academic career, articulated an interest in remaining in higher education.

Two participants (15.4%) indicated no intent to pursue an academic career but plans to pursue a position in higher education. These participants denoted no interest in the professorate but rather intentions to pursue administrative positions. Table 3 below provides a detailed summary of participants’ academic career and higher education intentions as well as the type of position they described wanting to attain.
Table 3

**Summary of Participants Career Intentions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Intend to Pursue Professoriate</th>
<th>Description of Position Preference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hazel</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Transition into professorship within the next five to ten years Higher education master's program at public institution Undecided about research classification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Teaching online Adjunct and then Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristy</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Director of the Educational Opportunity Fund Program at a Public four-year Adjunct as “side hustle” at an HBCU Clinical position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danielle</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>Mixture of administrative and teaching responsibilities Mid-sized university. Minimal research requirements. Lead a mentorship program on a PWI campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bianca</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>“A position that works with underprivileged students, minority students, and first-generation students.” Assessment or institutional research evaluation position Regional institution/comprehensive institution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liz</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>Now or future, term or tenure track faculty position in higher education student affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leah</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Teaching institution. R2 or R3 institution with both a masters and a doctoral program. Open in regard to the type of institution, PWI, HBCU.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abigail</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>“On-site teaching with a sprinkle of online teaching; wouldn’t want to teach in a program that is strictly online” 3-3 load, some options for teaching in the summer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justine</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>“Someplace that really emphasizes teaching” Community college or small private liberal arts. Smaller institution somewhere in the Midwest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivy</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>50 % teaching, 25% research, and 25% service. “Heavy on the teaching load and not equally as heavy on research load”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gina</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Teaching institution or moderate research activity institution. Something within an urban or city environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frances</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>Master's only program Not a research focused university Research one institution or a teacher focused institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mia</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not located in the north</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data Analysis

Data collection spanned a three-month period, as it began in December 2017 and concluded in February of 2018. The survey screening questionnaire was distributed electronically using purposeful and snowballing techniques. A total of 51 individuals completed the online screening questionnaire and 13 interviews were successfully scheduled and completed. Of the 51 participants, 19 qualified to participate in the study and were contacted via e-mail by the principal researcher to schedule an interview. Six of the 19 individuals contacted did not participate in the study as four did not respond to the initial e-mails requesting an interview, one failed to follow-through on the interview time and one e-mail bounced back as undeliverable. The large amount of attrition between the completion of screening questionnaires and completed interviews related to individuals not meeting the eligibility criteria or failing to complete the full Participant Screening Questionnaire. Twenty-eight individuals did not qualify for the study due to ineligibility and three participants meet eligibility criteria but failed to provide contact information.

The first interview was conducted face-to-face and the remaining interviews were conducted via telephone using the Zoom video conferencing platform. The analysis of data began after the first interview and continued throughout the interview process. Additionally, data were collected via the researcher’s reflective journaling after the completion of each interview. By the end of the tenth interview, saturation had been reached in terms of the overarching ideas being shared by participants. After reaching a point of saturation, two additional interviews were conducted to ensure no new themes emerged. A third and final interview was conducted after saturation had been reached as
the individual represented a geographical location that had not been represented by the current participants. The final three interviews confirmed saturation as each of the three participants narratives provided unique individual details but did not reveal the emergence of new prominent themes.

Each of the narrative accounts from the interviews were transcribed and analyzed. The qualitative techniques of line-by-line open coding, constant comparison, and axial coding steered the data analysis process. The line-by-line open coding process involved the principal investigator and a research assistant independently reading the initial transcript line-by-line and assigning a code to each meaning unit. Within this study, the meaning unit was one conceptual idea. Once the initial transcript was coded by each researcher, codes were compared and discussed until a consensus was reached and a coding structure established.

After the initial phase of coding the first interview, the second interview was independently coded by each researcher and the codes further discussed. By means of mutual consensus between the two coders, the coding structure was further revised and refined. The final code list consisted of 22 codes. The finalized codes were then used by the principal investigator to independently code every transcript and the research assistant coded every two transcripts.

After each transcript was coded, the coded data were further analyzed by the principal investigator to identify relevant themes. This consisted of codes being compared and analyzed to identify links between codes and the patterns emerging from the codes. Three major themes emerged from the data: (1) higher education is a tough terrain, (2)
access makes a difference and (3) self-efficacy: I can do it! The following sections detail each theme (See Table 4 below for a summary of the coding structure and major themes).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Subthemes</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Definition of Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Higher education is a Tough Terrain</td>
<td>1. The academic environment is political</td>
<td>Participants’ Descriptions of an academic career as a challenging and demanding environment.</td>
<td>Large Workload</td>
<td>Perceptions of faculty workload as large.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. A continual struggle for balance</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male dominance</td>
<td>Perceptions of privilege, benefits, or access in academia because of male identity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Academia is still a boys’ club</td>
<td></td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>The perceived identities and characteristics of those that make up the professoriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. A student focus should be prioritized</td>
<td></td>
<td>Political</td>
<td>Descriptions of academia involving politics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Personal/professional conflicts</td>
<td>Conflicts between personal, family, and career.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Contribute to students</td>
<td>Perceptions of the function of academic work to contribute to student development and growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tasks associated with a faculty position.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Makes a Difference</td>
<td>1. Direct learning experiences</td>
<td>Participants’ references to the importance of activities that provide academic career information and preparation.</td>
<td>Hands on experience</td>
<td>Participating in academic career related tasks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Research, Teaching, Professional development, Mentorship)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Career action</td>
<td>Personal actions taken for the purpose of career development, exposure, or advancement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Vicarious learning experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td>Support (Faculty/ Peer)</td>
<td>Actions/resources that aided career development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Faculty observations, Shared stories, Career focused conversations)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lacking Experience</td>
<td>Opportunities students desired but lacked.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Observing Expectations</td>
<td>Observations of faculty preforming and reacting to academic career related tasks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conversations(Advisor/Mentor/Peer)</td>
<td>Conversations about academic career perceptions, intentions, and tasks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Identity Influence</td>
<td>Impact of cultural identity on experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy: I Can Do It!</td>
<td>1. I Can Do It</td>
<td>Participants’ beliefs about the ability to meet the expectations of an academic career and overcome academic career barriers.</td>
<td>Ability (Capable/Not Capable)</td>
<td>Beliefs about academic career tasks competence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Determined Resilience</td>
<td></td>
<td>Questioning Ability</td>
<td>Doubts/uncertainty about ability to complete academic career related tasks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Training Needed</td>
<td>Desire more experiences with academic tasks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Barrier</td>
<td>obstacle to academic career access or success.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Theme 1: Higher Education is a Tough Terrain

The first overarching theme that emerged from the data was participants’ perception of higher education as a tough terrain. This theme defined the ways participants within the study viewed an academic career as challenging and a demanding environment to navigate. As participants discussed the challenging nature of an academic career, four subthemes emerged: (a) the academic environment as political, (b) a continual struggle for balance, (c) academia is still a boys’ club, and (d) a student focus should be prioritized. Each of these subthemes identified the collective ways participants in the study described their perception of an academic career as a tough terrain. The following expands upon each of these four subthemes to provide a comprehensive understanding of the major theme higher education is a tough terrain.

The academic environment is political. Participants’ perception of the academic environment as political emerged as one subtheme in the narratives. This subtheme included participants’ views on the institutional, systematic, and/or organizational structures of power, influence, policy, hierarchy, and social networks within an academic career. For the participants within this study, the political nature of the professorate was perceived negatively and difficult to navigate. Participants perceived politics as occupying a basic and underlying position within an academic career. For many, the professoriate was viewed as moderately to highly political. Participants discussed the influence of politics related to elements such as tenure, teaching, student faculty dynamics, academic hazing, curriculum, and funding. For instance, in her description of an academic career, Hazel opened with the explanation, “Oh, my career perception of a career in academia, first and foremost, you have a basic layer of politics.” For Hazel, the
academic environment as political was prominent. Through her narrative she discussed how she viewed the political environment as most evident within the tenure process. Hazel described the tenure process as “heavily political” and “challenging” to navigate. For instance, she elaborated:

My perception, and like I said, I've never walked the shoes of a professor, but just being on the outside looking at the expectations of maybe tenure. Just watching a couple of the professors go through that process. That is, I feel it is heavily political. It might be because I've been in the public realm of things within public institutions and know that, their expectations, the workload, the amount of time that they spend with students, the committees that they join, their research, their interest, everything has to kind of go into this tenure process. … Not only do they have to make sure that their portfolio and everything is together, but they have to make sure that they're keeping up with everything that's expected of them. Just being within that public institution environment, it can be kind of challenging to watch. I don't know if it's challenging for those professors to go through, but I think [the] tenure process, just has an underlying political feel because it's tied to the people above you.

For many within the study the dynamic of one’s work, particularly research, being judged and assessed by peers was viewed as highly political. Many discussed a sense of politics being prominent above and beyond objective metrics. For example, taking into account the many roles of the professoriate, Leah explained:

Well, I mean, I just think the whole entire part about, obviously, you have to make sure that you have your teaching, service and scholarship areas covered and
make sure they’re robust. Balancing all that, even in the role that I’ve been in this year has been challenging. But I guess it’s just, I think there’s the social dynamics of it right. Like being judged and assessed by your peers. And while there might be some real concrete metrics associated with that, some of its political and social. And again, how they may value where you value devoting your time and your expertise, places that you might want to devote your time and your expertise.

Others also elaborated on the academic environment as political. For example, Abigail noted “there's a lot of politics, that kind of happen within academia” and discussed topics such as the misuse of power, academic hazing, the tenure process, and doctoral student and advisor power differentials. Similar to Hazel, Abigail in her comments on the tenure process discussed viewing whether a person receives tenure as involving politics. Further, she went on to detail her perception of academic hazing as encompassing part of the political nature of the academic environment. She shared:

So, one thing I will say, just as a student and having conversations with other students is that there is a lot of, I guess with the politics that I'm referring to, there's a lot that happens sort of behind closed doors that we don't really talk about as much I would say in academia. Specifically, with like doc students and advisors and the power differential that’s there. …I think a lot of times there are some misuse of power and some academic kind of hazing stuff that goes on that I don't know is particularly necessary for what we do. So, I would say that is kind of what I'm referring to with like the politics.

In identifying politics as a reality in an academic career, Abigail argued more attention should be given to the incorporation of curriculum within doctoral student training that
encompasses the political nature of an academic career. She argued for the inclusion of more discussions on the political nature of the professoriate and how to navigate such politics. She explained:

I think there are sometimes just a lot of those kinds of things in academia that definitely doesn't get talked about a whole lot, but it's there. I think in more kind of personal conversations they come up, but it's not like a real thing that we discuss as far as when we're talking about like training future counselor educators or future professors, but it's real.

Participants within the study also discussed their views of politics impacting curriculum, classroom dynamics, and faculty student interactions. For example, Kristy shared her view that “there’s a lot of politicking that happens in Higher Ed that you have to be a part of as an academic.” She discussed the impact of politics on academicians’ research as well as how it impacts their classroom instruction. Giving an example of the impact of politics on teaching, she shared:

In the classroom, I think students today are a little more sensitive than they may have been in the past or they’ve been given an opportunity to express that sensitivity. I'll say it that way, more so now than they have in the past. So, there’s a lot of negotiating around their feelings and you can’t just teach them to think critically about whatever is presented to them. I think they easily take offense to things that are presented to them without using it as a platform to think critically and perhaps counter an argument. And so, I think that creates a lot of problems too.
As participants discussed the political nature of the professorate, the political environment was perceived negatively. Many described the political environment as unappealing, frustrating, game playing, draining, and covert. For example, hesitantly describing her perception of the politics that encompass an academic career, Liz explained:

Then also, what I'm avoiding saying and I should probably just say, is that the politics of an institution of higher education can really get you down. Whether that's your office and interpersonal politics, who's closest to the boss and therefore gets money or get the extra attention, or what kinds of red tape you have to jump through in order to make things happen, to high level folks, the president's cabinet and that level or Board of Trustees and the state government making decisions that you have to implement. You're not part of the decisions, but the decisions they may affect how you're able to do your job or even the responsibilities that are included in your job. And I assume that happens in other places, but because I've only worked in higher education, I find that particularly frustrating.

Another participant, Danielle shared:

The further I get into my program and just learning the ins and outs of Higher Ed, just the politics around everything, that is very unappealing to me. I'm not good at playing games, I know how to if I need to, but I don't enjoy it. I feel like a lot of things in higher education and academia are just very political and it's about playing the right cards at the right time. And that might be in every industry, I don't know. But just that part of constantly having to be strategic about what you say, and what you do, and who you approach about something, and how you go
about something, and it's not what you know, it’s who you know when it comes to
getting certain things done and approved and all of that. That just seems very
emotionally and mentally draining to me. I think the job alone would be mentally
and emotionally draining, so I can't imagine adding all of those extra things to it
that would have to be incredibly difficult as well.

For Danielle, the politics that encompassed an academic career added to what she
perceived as an already mentally and emotionally draining job. Although she recognized
the need to navigate the political nature of an academic career by “playing games,” she
expressed disdain for having to do so as she summarized that she neither liked nor was
good at “playing games.” Gina, another participant, also discussed the political nature of
an academic career using the idea of “playing games.” Reflecting on what she learned
from her interactions with faculty she noted, “I think what I learned about this process
also, is learning how to play the game.” Participants continually referenced the need for
strategy, game playing, and being very careful, as tactics needed to navigate the political
environment of an academic career. For instance, Hazel who described the tenure process
as “heavily political” perceived the following as necessary to navigate the politics of
tenure:

You just want to make sure that you're on your P's and Q's. You dot all your I's
and cross your T's just to make sure that while you are going through that tenure
process that you are more respectful, you're watching what you say, etc., etc.

For several participants the political nature of an academic career was surprising.
Many discussed learning more about the politics as they progressed in their doctoral
program. For example, describing the professoriate, Justine expressed, “it's somewhat
political, that part surprised me. Being on different committees in our university and just seeing how some of the decisions are made that directly affects students was surprising.”

Similarly, discussing the development of her understanding of an academic career, Bianca explained:

I guess because it’s not all about teaching. It’s about so much more and you know, it’s so political. … And just like I said, over time just noticing some political stuff. What the attention is on and not really in my opinion, not being student led or student focused as I hoped. That’s how it’s kind of changed over time. So, I kind of guess being on the inside you kind of see, ‘well this is how this works’ versus before I was a student and I really didn’t know how it worked.

In their discussions on learning more about the political nature of the professoriate, several participants questioned the measure of politics within academia. Participants questioned how the politics of academia might compare to other fields. For example, participants made statements such as “That could be in any profession”, “I don’t know that it’s any different from working anywhere else,” “that might be in every industry, I don't know,” and “I assume that happens in other places”. This questioning noted participants tendency to assess the extent to which the academic workplace is political. Participants recognized that politics existed within all workplaces but were uncertain to how the academic field compared to others. Further, it illustrated participants’ view that institutions are a reflection of the values, beliefs, biases, and ambitions of the people that comprise them. For example, describing how she defines politics within academia, Justine explained:
I can't speak to specifics, but I can say, I guess we're all just the sum of our experiences. And so, the committees are shaped of people and people bring their views. And depending on the makeup of the room, we have a lot of people, a homogeneous group of people typically, that are making decisions for a group of people that they may not be able to identify with or relate to or fully understand their experiences.

**A continual struggle for balance.** A *continual struggle for balance* emerged as another subtheme from the data that described participants' perception of higher education as a tough terrain. This subtheme defined participants' descriptions of the roles, responsibilities, and expectations of an academic workload as demanding and a persistent struggle to balance. Capturing the essence of this theme one participant, Frances, in her reflection on the professorate noted:

> If you really enjoy teaching, you manage to balance the workload and do what you need to do and still accomplish what [you] want to do. You can have that academic career and still have a life if you balance it the right way. It’s always a struggle, and everyone is in agreement on that.

Although participants ranged in the level of confidence they expressed regarding the ability to successfully balance the various aspects of an academic career, all identified struggling with balance as characterizing an academic career. Participants’ perceptions of the workload as a struggle to balance emerged through their understanding of the workload, how they viewed current faculty managing the workload, their beliefs about the ability to balance the workload, and the impact of the workload on well-being. The following details each of these four areas: (a) understanding the large workload, (b)
observations of faculty managing the workload, (c) the perceived capacity to balance the workload, and (d) perceptions of the psychological impact of balancing the large workload.

**Understanding the large workload.** Throughout their narratives, individuals reflected on the ways they perceived the teaching, research, and service aspects of an academic career consistently referencing the many demands that comprised an academic workload. The academic workload was perceived as large, multifaceted, and demanding. Participants identified the many responsibilities as ongoing and involving various entities such as the academic institution, students, professional organizations, and research funders. Managing the workload and expectations of the various stakeholders was described as a dynamic and persistent struggle to balance.

Throughout their narratives, all participants described the professoriate as involving various levels of teaching, research, and service. For example, sharing her perception of an academic career, Leah began by explaining, “So, my understanding is that the professoriate has several responsibilities obviously teaching, research, and service.” Similar to Leah, but naming a fourth element, Danielle began explaining her understanding of the professorate describing “So, I guess my perceptions are obviously, the four aspects of it.” Danielle went on to list the four aspects as encompassing teaching, research, service, and “collegiality, kind of on the outskirts of it.” All participants included the elements of teaching, research, and service in their depiction of the professoriate, acknowledging the emphasis placed on each area differed by institution or individual. For example, describing her perception, Hazel explained:
You are able to serve your students in the area of your interests. At the same time, you have a lot of work upon you, especially dependent on the institution you are at. If you're at a research-based institution, you have the pressures of, one being a teacher to the students, but two, also making sure that you keep up on your research. Lots of reading and writing and giving feedback to your students. Also, just being visible with making sure that you are getting involved within the higher education institution, joining committees, and any other expectations that are expected of you as a professor.

Through her narrative, Hazel demonstrated her understanding of an academic career encompassing teaching, research, and service to the institution. Similarly, describing the various roles of the professoriate and emphasizing the large size of the workload, Justine described her perceptions stating:

So, I guess if I had to sum it up in one word, the thought of pursuing the professoriate it is exhausting. Because I see it as more of the same of what I'm doing now. You know, research, and teaching, and service, and scholarship.

Teaching and service, and that is a lot.

In short, participants had a well-defined view of the professorate encompassing teaching, research, and service and that the tasks and responsibilities within those roles was “a lot”.

Although all participants identified the areas of teaching, research, and service, several noted having developed this understanding during their doctoral process. For example, describing her perception of an academic career as a counselor educator, Gina explained:
Well, I would say previously I thought a counselor educator just taught and did supervising. Didn't think about them having to serve on university wide search committees or them having to serve as chairs and oversee dissertations. Didn't think about the demands of the faculty having to complete scholarship, like, in tier one journals. Also, I didn’t think about mainly the research. The writing, teaching, service, being able to secure external funding like grants or even being involved in professional leadership positions at the state level, the regional level, or the national level. Those are some things I’ve been thinking about definitely.

Gina’s perception of the professoriate moved beyond teaching and supervising as she gained an understanding of responsibilities such as publishing, securing grants, working on dissertation committees, and more. This expanded understanding shaped her perception of the workload size and the necessity of balancing the demands of the professoriate. For example, comparing her previous perception to her current understanding, Gina noted:

Initially I assumed I was going to function as a scholar practitioner, where I would be committed to teaching, developing this new knowledge and then teaching neophytes about what the counseling practice was and preparing them through research. And now, it’s making sure I'm able to balance the work and the school commitments while conducting research and supervising.

For Gina, the need to balance the demands of the academic workload did not surface as a negative. Her overall perception of the professoriate was positive. She explained, “how I perceive an academic career, I see it as something positive. I see it as being something where it may take a lot of strength, a lot of guidance, definitely a lot of prayer.” For Gina,
balancing the demands of the professorate is described as a necessary part of an academic career. She identified strength, guidance, and prayer as factors that aid in navigating the demands of the workload.

**Observations of faculty managing the workload.** Participants’ understanding of an academic career as struggling to balance a large workload also surfaced as they discussed their observations of and conversations with current faculty. Through their narratives of what they observed, participants expressed their perceptions of how managing the workload seemed to impact faculty as well as how it impacted work-life balance. Describing how her perspective of the professorate shifted, Danielle shared the impact observing current faculty had on her perceptions and consideration of an academic career:

I think the major shift just kind of happened when I saw a couple professors that I really, really liked as professionals and also as researchers and just as individuals as well, kind of struggling and being extremely stressed out because of the high demand of the work and all the pressures that come with trying to get tenure and all of that. Heavy teaching loads and all of that. Seeing them go from being cheerful and always happy to help, and not that they weren’t happy to help, but their moods kind of changed and you could tell. And they would try really hard to mask it…

Danielle continued, not only explaining what she observed, but also sharing the conversations that accompanied her observations:

I think just seeing that and then them telling me that, ‘oh, I’m working on five different projects and I’m teaching three classes and I have this deadline this week
and this deadline next week,’ it really made me take a step back and be like, ‘wait, is this the life that I want for myself.’ Just because, it just seems like really, really high stress work and it wasn’t just the happy interacting with students, teaching students in the classroom. There was a lot more to it that was more time consuming, than I had expected.

For Danielle, the perception of struggling to balance the demanding workload brought about some uncertainty. That is, she observed professionals she admired struggle and she then questioned if she too wanted to take on this struggle.

Tantamount to Danielle’s concerns, Bianca also expressed concerns about the academic career workload arising from her interactions with current faculty. Unlike Danielle, however, Bianca’s assessment of trying to balance the large workload produced certainty in her disinterest in managing such a lifestyle. Discussing her perceptions of the cost and rewards of the professoriate Bianca explained:

It doesn’t seem like financially rewarding. What I’ve seen and just professors I’ve interacted with, like I said, they have to do a lot and sometimes they have to have additional income sources just like the rest of us. So, it gets things more stressful. I guess because it’s not all about teaching. It’s about so much more.

From her observations of faculty, Danielle not only perceived the faculty workload as large, but also lacking adequate compensation. Thus, she not only understood a need to balance the demands of the professorate but also an added level of stress in having to seek outside employment to gain sufficient income.
Hazel also discussed perceptions informed by observing faculty. She described balancing the workload as challenging based on the observations of a few faculty mentors. She relayed:

Early on in my process, after being mentored by a couple of professors and just looking at them in the classroom and outside of the classroom, it seems like a lot of work. Definitely very challenging. Like I said before with balancing maybe the politics part of it. Also, the workload, the number of classes that they have to teach. Especially if they have any students that they’re mentoring or advising or they're teaching within a doctoral program. Then you have your students who are working on their dissertation, which you have to kind of be a part of their process. If anything, the workload seems like it's a lot.

In addition to observing faculty, participants also discussed conversations that informed their perspective. Cynthia described various conversations she had with both her advisor and her mentor. Recalling conversations she had with her advisor, she shared:

She had mentioned being on a dissertation committee and things of that nature. Being able to balance that with your students and being an advisor and being on some type of committee and things of that nature. She was like, those are things outside of just teaching a class and doing lesson plans and stuff like that, that a lot of people don’t talk about. She was just like “be aware that you may have to takes some of that on. Think about how to balance your life outside of that because you don't want to have so much on your plate you're not taking care of yourself.” So, that was definitely helpful from my advisor.
Comparably, she explained that in conversations with her mentor, “(w)e do talk a lot about just how to have that balance when it comes to working, especially being in that type of environment.”

Balancing the workload not only encompassed managing the demands of the job but also balancing the personal and professional. For example, describing her observations of faculty, Justine pointed out:

It was very eye opening. It showed me a different side of them. That they’re human and some of the struggles that doctoral students go through, they still go through [as] faculty trying to balance different things in their lives. So only one of the professors in our department, that happens to be female, has children, none of the rest of them do. But even with them not having children, they still had a hard time sometimes balancing the work life balance or work and life. So just seeing that more human side of them. Like, oh my goodness. So even when I’m finished with this or complete my degree, if I’m in the faculty position it just doesn’t end. Like, it’s a continual battle.

Related to Justine, Liz also discussed observing female faculty with and without children. As a single female without children, Liz shared her thoughts on an academic career and desiring marriage and children. She expressed, “(t)here was also a point when I was like, ‘is anybody in the field, administrator or faculty member who's like married with children.’ That's something that matters to me.” She went on to describe organizing a panel during her master’s program of “women at different points in their careers, different areas of administration and different family structures [to] talk about their
experiences in higher ed.” In comparing her observations from the panel to her perceptions of the professoriate she detailed:

It all started from I want to be married with children, I don't see any examples of that. Same thing for faculty. I haven't done anything to hear anybody’s experience in a structured way, but I definitely note it when I see people who are quote, unquote successful professionally and I don't see the things that I would feel would make me successful personally as part of their life. Someone, she was a faculty member in my program and then she took a deanship somewhere else. But as the dean in that institution she actually ended up close to where I live, where my family lives. So anyway, I ended up talking to her when I was on break one time. I mentioned some of the things I've just said here, and her response was something along the lines of like, “Yeah, you need to choose. If you want to be a young faculty member, you're not going to be going on a lot of dates.” That, in some ways, I think is realistic. In like there's only so much time. In some ways I think—as a dean she was a dean for the College of Education, she's been in the field for a while. I think it might also be a little bit of like “this is how it's always been and so this is the only way I can imagine it.” But at the time, I was like, “well, if I'm choosing between going on dates so I can get married or being a faculty member, I’d rather have a personal life that I found fulfilling.” Though I am not married nor am I a faculty member at this point so maybe I should have pursued the other option.

In Liz’s account, she questioned the ability to balance work and family life. Both observations of faculty and conversations with faculty informed her perspective.
Ultimately, she is questioning, if she can pursue the professorate as a single young faculty member and have a successful professional career while simultaneously meeting her personal goals of marriage and children.

Paralleling Liz’s concerns about family, Mia, a married student without children, also questioned the challenge of balancing the professoriate with personal family goals. Discussing teaching schedules and family responsibilities, Mia explained managing the evening teaching schedule as unappealing. She detailed:

The schedule. I think I alluded to that earlier. I am married, I don’t have any kids, that is something that I definitely want to remedy in the future, about not having kids. What that would look like in the future when I actually do have kids and I have classes that I have to teach that are from like five to eight…So, you’re not in the traditional eight to five classes and you are not teaching the traditional eight to five schedules. So how that will particularly look in the future? Now, myself and my husband will manage that in the future as it relates to family time, dinner, helping with homework, after school activities, those types of things. That’s probably the least appealing about that. That particular part of being in academia at this point.

Concerns about balancing professional and family responsibilities were not only voiced by those with and wanting children but also those who did not plan on having children. Speculating on the impact of children on managing the academic workload, Leah contemplated:
I don't have children and I probably will not be having children, but I do wonder how it could even be possible for me. I know other women may do it, but how would it even be possible for me if I were a parent.

Across a number of participants, the struggle of balancing the large workload included both managing the various professoriate roles as well as personal family commitment such as parent and partner.

**Perceived capacity to balance the workload.** Several participants discussed their self-efficacy beliefs about balancing the academic career workload in general and as it related to family obligations and hopes. Equally they discussed their perspective of the psychological impact of such workload demands. Akin to Liz, Hazel described her belief in not currently being able to balance both family and the responsibilities of the professoriate. She explained that with having a 16-year-old daughter she wanted to be able to be present for the many life moments. She voiced:

> Definitely personal, professional balance. It’s something that I know I want to do, but I know I can't do right now… I know right now, if I were to take a position within the next couple of years in academia or as a professor, I don't think I can mentally be there for her, as well as delving into a career. A new challenge for me as a professor. That's one of the factors, just making sure that I'm there for my family at this point. Just thinking like I said, about the workload and the things that I do want to do, like get into my research, etc., etc. I know that I'm going to need some time on my hands just to kind of be a mother, be a wife at this moment. Then once I feel like I have a good balance on my personal life and
personal factors then I can. I’ll feel like I'll have that energy and that mind space to kind of pursue the professorship.

Hazel on the other hand asserted confidence in her ability to find balance, she just feels she is unable to manage balance now. This is further seen as she clarifies where she feels she is now because of her current family structure and where she sees herself in the future. She asserted:

That's where I'm at right now. At one point I thought maybe I wasn't interested in it, but I think that I've come back around to feel like it could be done. Just the matter of the institution that you’re at, the expectations, just creating some type of balance.

In her accounts, Hazel not only discussed the perception of the workload she gained from observing faculty, but also expressed her own self-efficacy beliefs about balancing the workload. Hazel noted a sense of confidence that creating balance is possible.

Also alluding to the possibility of balance, Leah discussed research as the area where she believed the issue of balance would be most central. Leah explained, “What I'm trying to make sure I have a handle on, moving into this job is carving out time for research and not being overwhelmed by the committee responsibilities and things like that.” Further describing her uncertainty in her ability to balance particularly the research aspect of things, Leah also shared, “I think one of the real challenges and really still mystery for me is how the research part is going to work. “

*Perceptions of the psychological impact of balancing the large workload.* Several participants discussed their perspective of the psychological impact of the large faculty workload. Common psychological effects described by the participants were stress,
anxiety, and pressure. Several individuals expressed feeling pressure as it related to their understanding of the research expectations. Others described the demands of research production and publishing as anxiety provoking. For instance, Hazel described the demands of balancing scholarship expectations as “it could be like a pressure cooker.” Similarly, Danielle discussed enjoying research but despising the demands to produce a certain amount of research. She explained:

The research part, I really do enjoy research. And with that, I will have to add a little disclaimer. I enjoy research, but I don't enjoy being pressured to research, if that makes sense. And I feel like there is that pressure as a professor and all that, there is that pressure to produce a certain amount of manuscripts and publications each year.

In addition to publishing expectations creating a sense of pressure, anxiety was also identified by participants as a concern. Leah discussed being judged by peers as anxiety provoking. She specified, “So again, having people who might not get me or get kind of where I'm coming from assessing my worthiness to be promoted is kind of anxiety provoking.” Also commenting on anxiety, Gina discussed her plans to work on strategies to deal with the anxiety that accompanies demands to produce scholarship. She revealed “Now what I'm working on is having more realistic expectations about scholarship and not being so anxious.” Further, she discussed keeping in mind the aspects she can manage over those she cannot. She prioritized:

I don't know how a program is going to weight the number of materials produce[d], but I do know now how to discuss authorship with my research team
members. Then also to consider how authorship order number and the nature of the journal can impact me being selected for an institution.

Although Gina perceived parts of the publishing aspects of the professorate as anxiety provoking, she also identified perspective taking as helpful in managing such anxiety.

**Academia is still a boys’ club.** *Academia is still a boys’ club* surfaced as a third subtheme that summarized participants’ perceptions of an academic career as a tough terrain. This subtheme included participants’ descriptions of who they conceived as embodying an academic career and how their own racialized and gendered cultural identities related to their conceived embodiment of the professoriate. Participants within this study articulated views classified in three ways: (a) whiteness and maleness embody the professoriate, (b) it is difficult not to see a lot of people that look like me, and (c) Black female representation is important.

**Whiteness and maleness embody the professoriate.** As participants discussed their perceptions of academic careers, they described the characteristics of who they viewed as personifying the professoriate. In general, participants classified the professoriate as characterized by White and male individuals. Individuals used descriptive phrase such as “geared towards a male,” “boys’ club,” and “male dominated.” For example, Hazel depicted her current perception of the professoriate and explained:

> At this point, I see professors as the majority, not being people of color. Men, lots of men. It depends on the field as well, because you do see women coming in, in certain areas. But, I still think the field, the professorship field, is still dominated by men.
For Hazel, the maleness of the professoriate was prominent. She viewed males as not only occupying the majority of full-time faculty lines, but also benefiting from privilege, access, and assumed competency and merit within the faculty role. For instance, describing her perception of the professorate as a “boys club” she contended:

Being a woman also, because some days you feel like it's a Boys Club. Depending on the setting, I think, you may or may not have to always prove that you belong there at that table. I think, if I look back too, that’s probably one of the reasons why I knew that I had to go through this process in order to be a professor. Some people are adjuncts and some people make it to professorship with their master's degree. Me being a woman and sitting around making decisions for programs and for research, I knew that being a woman, I would have to have my doctorate because I still think it is a Boys Club. You as a woman, I don't know if this will happen, but sometimes I think we still have to prove ourselves. Well, I should say, I think I come into a boardroom sometimes or conference rooms and I still feel like I have to prove that I belong there. One, because I'm a woman, but also because I'm a Black woman. So that's my perception still. I still think it's a boys’ club so it's male dominated, so what can I say.

Several other participants also discussed perceptions of leadership advantages and academic career privileges that White males benefit from in academia. Commenting on the culture and institutionalized structures of higher education, Justine described how she perceived an academic career as advantaging men. She shared:

I just felt like the way that it's set up it's still geared towards a male. And I hate to say that because it sounds sexist because men can also have concerns about trying
to manage work, (trying to manage home and trying to manage a family) but traditionally, that wasn't the case. It was someone who was typically a younger male, traditionally a white male, and they had the time to be able to dedicate to research, to dedicate to all the things that it would take to actually make yourself marketable when you're trying to apply for faculty positions and go on interviews.

Analogously, Mia discussed the implications of such privileges as it related to men’s access to leadership positions within academia. Speaking to the field of counselor education, she detailed:

I guess I had a perception of what a counselor educator looked like. From my master's degree at another university as well as when I came back to my current university for my EdS program, all of my professors in that role, all had been practitioners. All of them were white, I had both male and female. But in most situations the males were the program coordinators, the department heads, the concentration coordinators.

Also discussing the ways she viewed academia as privileging White males, Kristy described:

I have seen, I won’t say several, I’ll say a few Black women, have to battle their way through their academic career. One of them was a professor I had in undergrad who was phenomenal. This woman was, she was amazing. Every stretch of the imagination and every point of reality, she was amazing. She was fired because she wasn’t publishing enough. Now, I don’t have any statistics to back this, but I do want to say that if she had been a White man, I don’t think she would’ve been fired. I think there would’ve been people who rallied around her
and who supported her and who made sure that she stayed in place because even though she may have not been contributing enough in her body of research. … I’ve seen it happen in my career as an advisor, where I’ve seen other Black women who are professors that students appreciate who then get fired because maybe they’re not publishing enough or who are publishing, but then the students give them negative reviews because their style is not something that the students like. … So, it’s just been a little bit of a weird dynamic that I think for Black women, if they don’t want you, they’re going to find a way to get rid of you. I know that could happen to anybody, but I think it happens more with Black women.

Participants within the study not only discussed the perception of academia benefiting White males, but males in general. For example, discussing her perspective that women, and Black woman particularly, have it hard in academe, Gina shared a conversation she had with her advisor. She relayed:

I remember initially, because he’s actually an African American male, he pointed out to me a lot of his opportunities were afforded to him just with him being male, and he’s awesome too. And I remember he kept it real with me…. At first, I was offended with one of his conversations, when he was telling me that as a Black woman how I was going to have it hard in academe. I get it now, but early on I was like, “wait, so you trying to tell me I’m gonna get you know.” He was like, “yeah.” Because I think I was like in fantasy La La Land, thinking everything was going to be kumbaya and we were all going to love each other because we were
counselors. I quickly learned that wasn’t the case. But in the beginning, I was like, oh yeah, this is how things are going to be.

The idea of the professorate as embodied by a White male was common among participants. Individuals referenced the lack of Black female professors within their programs, circle of influence, and field. Speaking to the normality of the professoriate lacking diversity, and Black female representation specifically, Liz pointed out, “I’m a Black woman, and they’re not a lot of us around. I just sort of accept that that's how Higher Ed works.”

**It is difficult not to see a lot of people that look like me.** As participants identified the professorate as occupied preponderantly by Whites and males, they also discussed the impact of Black women being underrepresented in full-time academic careers. Participants described their struggles getting through training, concerns related to entry, tenure, promotion, and questioning the fit of an academic career. Participants identified frustration, discouragement, questioning fit, and annoyance as some of the difficulties of being underrepresented and not seeing a lot of people that look like them. For example, describing underrepresentation, Gina expressed, “(s)omething that concerns me is that as an African American female, we still tend to be underrepresented in Counselor Ed, but we're overrepresented when we come to like the junior level faculty.” Similarly, Liz shared, “I didn't really think about this before, because it's just part of my life but I don't see a lot of people who look like me and that can be annoying.”

Expanding on the implications of underrepresentation, Leah outlined her perceptions and stated:
I think in terms of seeing very few people who look like me, [it] has impacted my perception of the professoriate. Yeah, I think just, again, wondering if this is an atmosphere and a place where I can survive and thrive.

For Leah, the impact of underrepresentation brought about questions of career fit.

While Leah discussed the impact underrepresentation had on career perceptions related to fit and endurance, Bianca discussed the role underrepresentation played related to her doctoral process and training. Discussing opportunities for graduate assistantships and to publish with advisors, she explained:

I think just me being a minority by itself, I think has limited those experiences. Not sure about the female part because most of the students that I’ve run into are female. So, I’m thinking if anything, it would just be the African American part and not having...Not having...People who look like me I guess, to take me under their wing in that so to speak situation. I think it’s just the minority part at a PWI.

Cynthia explained the impact she saw within the training of counselor educators. She shared:

I feel like there aren’t enough Black faculty members in the program. And when they are, they don’t stay long, they leave. Like the mentor I had, she’s leaving. I asked her to be on my dissertation committee and she said yes. Then next thing I know, school started last semester and she like “yeah I want to let you know I’m going to be leaving in the spring.” I’m just like, “well shit, who the hell is here. The lack of what these liberals want to call diversity, that shit doesn’t exist.” So, I just know that there are going to be some moments where I’m going to be by myself and my thoughts in order for me to have a decent academic career. But I
definitely think it’s worth it because I know that I have something to give. Those are the things I don’t like about the whole idea of an academic career.

The lack of Black women in the professoriate for the participants within this study was both perceived and felt. It was viewed as unappealing, at time discouraging, and creating an additional layer of stress and challenge. Summarizing the various impacts of Black female underrepresentation, Ivy explained:

For me as a Black woman, there’s not a lot of people of color in my field that are full or tenured faculty members. And that’s a bit discouraging, because at a certain point in time I get tired of being the only or the first person to do this somewhere. And so not seeing a lot of people that look like me is sometimes difficult. It’s not that it just adds on another layer stress, I mean, there’s microaggressions. But additionally, when you are one of the few people of color in a department, then you’re asked to do all the multicultural stuff, all the women of color stuff, all the specialty programs, all the specialty university committee, and so it adds on to your workload too. So as a person of color, specifically a woman of color, I feel like it’s a big deterrent because I know that I’m going to be tapped more than my White counterparts and I won’t make more money for that stuff. So, I think that’s a negative aspect of it.

**Black female representation is important.** In addition to identifying the underrepresentation of Black female faculty and the impact of such underrepresentation, participants also articulated value for Black women occupying academic careers. Participants discussed the importance of Black women pursuing the professorate, and the positive impacts more Black women in academic careers can have on higher education
and the community at large. For example, Kristy who did not intend to pursue the professoriate, discussed the importance of Black women occupying full-time faculty positions. She discussed this importance in juxtaposition to her own experience of having no interaction with Black faculty during the span of her doctoral training. She described:

The one thing I’d like to say, and I don’t know how this aligns with your research goals, but I know you’re talking about Black women. Even though I’m not a Black woman who is pursuing the professoriate, I just think we need so many more of us who are at institutions that have the money to do the research that needs to be done by and about Black folk or people of color and to support the students who are coming through. I’m thinking about my doctoral program; seventy-two credits and I do not believe I had one course with a Black woman as the instructor. Not as an adjunct. Not as a full professor, none of it.

Expanding upon the perspective that Black female representation is important within full-time faculty positions, Mia discussed the importance of Black women occupying leadership roles and positions of power. Discussing the field of counselor education, she explained:

I'm very aware of the lack of diversity that’s currently in the professoriate. For a very long time in my interactions with not only professional or professors on my campus, but in other networks that I've been involved in, it’s been very White. I can’t necessarily say it’s been very male, but it been definitely very White. There are a lot of some of the major names in counselor education, they are White males, but you also see a lot of White female. Particularly in my program, I'm trying to even remember the first time I ever saw… the very first time that I met a
person of color that was actually in my program I want to say that I already completed my EdS and was entering into my first year of the doc program. That was the first time that I recall a person of color being in my program. I can remember being really excited about seeing someone, a person of color. But that was very short lived for a number of reasons related to that particular professor. I do feel that in order for the field of counseling to be more diverse, it needs to start from top down. So, that needs to be not only the Counselor Educators, but also those who are in our governing bodies.

Another way Black female representation as important emerged from the data was in participants’ articulations of occupying full-time faculty positions as a means to give back and set an example for others. For instance, Hazel shared:

I noticed that there’s not a lot of me, Black women or African American women. That was one of the reasons why I wanted to become a professor at some point in my life on this journey. … Just thinking about being a Black woman and being a professor. Going through undergrad, going through my master's program, there were not a lot of Black women that were professors. I maybe can go into like a handful that I can think of. One day it clicked for me like, I think I want to be one of those women that keeps going, because I am Black, so little girls can see, oh, Black women are professors. So just that little trying to give back to the Black community, type idea.

Similarly, advocating for the need for Black women within the professoriate, Justine emphasized, “We do belong here. And yes, it’s daunting and taxing but if we don’t do the
type of research that focuses specifically on people of color, African American women, then who else will do it.”

**A student focus should be prioritized.** As participants discussed the professorate, *a student focus should be prioritized* emerged as another subtheme that encompassed participants’ perceptions of an academic career as a tough terrain. This evidenced through individuals’ narratives about the importance of contributing to the learning, development, and enhancement of students. Similarly, it encompassed participants’ emphasis on teaching, their discussions on student development being appealing and rewarding, and their criticism of institutions valuing research over teaching and student needs. The classifications that catalogued this subtheme were seeing students learn and develop as motivating and perceived conflicts between a stated prioritizing of students and institutional practices.

**Seeing students learn and develop is motivating.** In discussing the appealing aspects of an academic career, numerous participants described the facilitation of student learning and development. Providing her perception of what is alluring about an academic career, Danielle outlined:

> Teaching students and seeing them when they get a concept, or they have these ideas, and they're really proud of their work. I think that, that to me is extremely appealing. To think that maybe you have some part in that, some part in them understanding something, some part in them putting together an idea and putting together some work that they're really proud of. That is really appealing to me.

For several participants, the rewards and appeal of the teaching aspect of an academic career outweighed the unappealing aspects. For example, Cynthia talked about her elation
in helping students get it. She also described having to remember the significance of the role she plays in students’ lives when she was frustrated and disillusioned by other aspects of an academic career. Similarly, Justine shared, “(s)tudents, seeing the students face when they get it. Like when you’re teaching on a topic and they’re like, oh, wow. Just seeing people's minds expand, that's the best part.”

Ivy also voiced the importance of the motivation/focus being about students as she talked about the opportunities for faculty to give voice to students that are traditionally silenced. She explained that, in the role of the professoriate, “one of the things that people in the professoriate have the opportunity to do is give students a voice who may not have a voice otherwise and write from a perspective that kind of joins theory and practice together.” She also highlighted her holistic approach to students as a meaningful skill that puts students as the central focus:

There's a good amount of I would say, social work skills and people skills and genuinely just caring about students that I have. And so, for some reason, as I'm on the academic side, those traits stand out way more. Because the majority of faculty members are not ingrained in the holistic aspect of the student, it's just the academic component of their courses. And so, I feel like there's something to be said about faculty members who can look at a student holistically and that's one of the things that I want to do.

Several participants talked about the importance of quality educators within their specific fields. For instance, Frances discussed her value as a counselor educator for being present to see students move from a space of anxiety to confidence. Abigail also
discussed counselor education commenting on the importance of teaching. She explained the importance of teaching as she shared:

> Teaching being the primary focus because of what teaching kind of does not only for me, but what it does for our profession in helping to train quality counselors. I was speaking a little bit about this the other day with another doc student in saying that I think we have some really good counselors out there, but we also have some really bad ones too. So, if I can help just train some more qualified great counselors that would be amazing for me. Because of the nature of what we’re doing. It’s not only sensitive, but it’s very much like a lot of people come into counseling, it’s their first time and it can kind of make or break whether or not they continue with it. So that’s what is appealing to me in going into academia.

The role of teaching was not only viewed as appealing because of what it provided for students and the field, but participants also discussed how they perceived teaching as personally benefiting and fulfilling. For instance, Mia expressed both her joy for learning and helping others learn. She noted:

> Actually, being in the classroom scene is something that I really enjoy. Like I said, I feel like I’m a lifelong learner. I feel like as a counselor educator helping others to learn, and then also learning from them and their experiences are some things that I definitely enjoy.

Similarly, Ivy expressed how teaching as a faculty member benefited her as it fulfills her by giving her an opportunity to be an expert on a topic. She shared:

> I would say that one, people pay to listen to you talk. I feel like that’s amazing.
Two, to be able to be an expert. I’m one of those people who is good at a whole bunch of things and so, it’s always hard for me to choose something. But when I’m teaching, I can be an expert at one thing, one subject. And it makes me feel really, really good to know that I’m an expert at what I’m teaching.

**Perceived conflicts between prioritizing students and institutional practices.** The perception that the professoriate should prioritize a student focus was also evidenced in participants’ views and criticisms of higher education policies and practices conflicting with a student first emphasis. Participants perceived contradictory practices within academic departments, specific institutions, and the culture of higher education in general. Within their narratives, participants described the impetus of such conflicts as lodged within the formal and informal values, expectations, procedures, and political environment of academia. Participants identified a mismatch in practices that created difficulties for faculty to advocate for students, that rewarded research and publications over teaching, and that focused on the monetary advancement of the institution over teaching and student development. For example, discussing her perception of the value conflict between research and serving students through teaching, Abigail communicated:

> What I was referring to with that is the whole reason why colleges or universities are open is to help to educate people and get people educated in particular fields. So, sometimes I think because of the importance and also the significance of research, sometimes the teaching aspect of it gets muddled. And I think that kind of takes away from what we're primarily there for and that's to help educate students. So that piece, like I said, it's just really important to me. But I think sometimes, depending on where you're at, it can
become very much focused on research first and teaching second. And I don't know if that is completely fair to the students we’re serving.

Likewise commenting on the culture of education within the United States generally and higher education specifically, Danielle summarized:

Yeah, so it's just interesting how we want to improve. I think just in education in general, especially Higher Ed, there’s this idea that we're all there to improve the students and teach students and help them grow and learn as people and as professional. But when it comes down to implementing things that will actually do that, there's always this hesitancy of well we've always done it this way, and nobody's ever complained. But you know maybe people don't complain because they don't know that they can approach certain people. But once they find that person they can approach with their ideas and their complaints, they call that person, but then that person I guess receives some pushback.

Elaborating on the concept of pushback, Danielle recalled her experiences observing a junior faculty member that was praised by students and criticized by faculty colleagues. She recounted that the faculty member, upon accepting the position, shared during the interview ideas about ways to improve the department, and the ideas were perceived as well received by her colleagues. She went on to say:

A year or two into their time I think they started wanting to implement some of these things and got a lot of pushback from the senior faculty members in their department. And that just kind of created a really tense atmosphere in the department. And then I think it just started going around that this person was
difficult to work with. But on the other hand of it, all the students loved this person. Every student wanted to do some research with this person, wanted to be in their classes because they’re such a great professor. And so, it was kind of this, I don't know what the right word is, but it was, you're getting mixed messages. It's like on one side, your colleagues don't like you because you're trying to change things that would better the students’ experience, but I guess it would change everything that the colleagues have worked towards. But on the other hand, your students are telling you that these are the things that they want to see, this is what's going to bring in more people, this is what's going to keep them in the program. And so, it is kind of you are stuck between a rock and a hard place. And so that's the experience that person shared with me. And then just hearing that person had other friends that were experiencing the same things.

Liz, a higher education PhD student, also discussed the mismatch between higher education practices and a student first emphasis. She discussed perceiving an academic culture where many faculty were in pursuit of prestige. She explained:

It's sort of like everyone's trying to be [at] this top tier place. Top tier typically means focused on research and not so much on the teaching and the development. There are times when I feel like my interest and goals are not congruent with the direction I see higher education moving.

Providing further details of how she noticed incongruences, she gave the example of her perception of the college ranking system. She found little value in college ranks as she argued, “We know the rankings don't actually really tell us anything, but you want to stay
at the top of them.” Detailing why she saw the information provided in college rankings as lacking value, she elaborated:

It measures things like the amount of money you have—you, meaning your endowment at your institution—publications that your faculty members have put out, or things like whether or not your colleagues actually are familiar with you. But the number of publications a faculty member puts out does not mean that they're [a] good instructor. They might really be terrible in the classroom or they might not spend time in the classroom at all. You're bringing people to this institution, into a program, because of the accomplishments of someone they're never going to interact with. So that's frustrating, almost like a bait and switch. On the administrative side, sometimes it feels like we're just moving students along without really being accountable to if they're benefiting from college. This is sort of the argument around is the purpose of college for knowledge or is the purpose of college for jobs and careers. I don't think it's that simple, but I do think that you should be different when you come in and when you leave. That is not just a matter of if you now know information about your major but you as a person should have had exposure to things and increased knowledge, some skill building. You should have developed some and I don't see that in ways that I think are actually healthy.

Offering a summary of her perception of the mismatch in academia, Liz concluded:

I guess I'd say I've seen examples of what we say we value, but what it appears to be valuing or what we value as an institution or as a field, there being a mismatch there. So we value folks who develop students, but we reward folks who publish
16 journal articles their third year out and haven't taught a real class in a couple years.

Discussing conflicting values from an institution specific focus, some participants shared how their own experience or observations of others informed their position. For instance, Bianca outlined:

So, my institution is a research one institution. What it has meant from myself and some of the other students that I know, is that a lot of the attention is paid to research because I guess, that’s how some professors keep their jobs. But on the back end of that, there’s little attention paid to students. So, it makes for a longer and harder process because the focus is on the research. The professors are caught up in researching for grants and I guess, bringing money to the school. We’ve had some discussions about it, some forums about it, but that’s not what I would want to do. I would want to be able to focus on my students and mentor my students. I think by and large [that is] a lot of what you end up doing, what you need to do to keep your job, and a lot of times it doesn’t have to do as much with taking care of a student. That’s just my opinion.

Reflecting on her conclusions from these experiences, Bianca connected the political environment of academia as impacting the student prioritized focus. She summarized:

And just like I said, over time just noticing some political stuff and what the attention is on and not really in my opinion, not being a student led or student focused as I hoped. That’s how it’s kind of changed over time. So, I kind of guess being on the inside you kind of see well this is how this works versus before I was a student. I really didn’t know how it worked. So, I think it’s just being in there
and being in situations where I just thought maybe more attention I guess could have been paid to like student outcomes. So, I guess as far as a career in that, I didn’t see myself being caught up in that kind of system and not being able to effectively focus on students because that’s what I would want to do, but then at the same time I understand you do what you have to do to keep your job. Once I figured out the politics in that, that you could be that type of professor and that was kind of the norm, I didn’t want to be caught up in that type of system.

Bianca’s summary highlights the many ways the various higher education dynamics (politics, a large workload, difficulties maintaining a student focus, privileging males and whiteness) overlap and influence each other. Each of these aspects contribute to an academic environment that participants viewed as challenging and tough.

**Theme Summary.** The theme *higher education is a tough terrain* conveyed participants’ overall characterization of academia as a challenging and demanding system. This finding illustrated participants’ perceptions of an academic environment as a rigorous, dynamic and multifaceted system that one must navigate. Participants viewed the challenges within the academic environment as the norm describing innate characteristics such as politics, a large workload, and privileging males and whiteness as factors that typify the tough terrain. Participants discussed how their identities as Black females impacted their view of the professorate and identified underrepresentation as a concerning challenge. Participants identified contributing to students’ growth and development as an academic career motivation and argued that within the professorate a student focus should be prioritized. Further, participants articulated that the tough terrain of higher education demanded skill, strategy, and tactics to navigate. Navigating the
tough terrain was perceived by participants as a challenge that was at times unappealing, frustrating, draining, and ambiguous.

**Theme 2: Access Makes a Difference**

The second overarching theme identified within this study was *access makes a difference*. This theme defined participants’ references to the importance of gaining information about academic life through participation in various learning and professional development activities. As participants discussed the various information and resources they did or did not have access to during their doctoral process, they described the various ways it altered or solidifying their perceptions, expectations, and views of an academic career.

The theme “access makes a difference” was further classified by two subthemes: direct learning experiences and vicarious learning experiences. The two subthemes identified the overarching ways participants described accessing information. Direct learning experiences encompassed the development of perceptions and the gaining of information which occurred through experiential learning processes such as engagement in course curriculum and hands on participation in activities such as internships, research, and teaching. On the other hand, vicarious learning experiences classified participants’ development of perceptions through indirect processes such as observing the behaviors and consequences of others and hearing about the experiences of others.

**Direct learning experiences.** Direct learning experiences encompassed participants’ descriptions of activities such as research, conference attendance, class engagement, and teaching that confirmed, altered, or added to their understanding of an academic career. Common among experiences participants discussed as aiding in the
development of their perspectives were participation on research teams, writing and publishing with faculty, co-teaching and teaching as instructor of record, and conference presentations. Four experiences emerged as the main means of direct learning experiences identified by participants: (a) research experiences, (b) teaching experiences, (c) professional development experiences and (d) mentoring experiences. The following expands upon each of these to provide a comprehensive understanding of participants’ direct learning experiences.

*Research experiences.* Participating in research was a key influence for many participants. The research experiences discussed by participants encompassed activities such as conducting interviews, observing local schools, coding data, working on research teams, writing literature reviews, and more. Research experiences influenced participants’ understanding of the research process, research expectations and the role of research within academic careers.

In discussing her hands-on experiences with research, Abigail shared the learning she gained in working directly with a faculty member. She shared:

> Working on research with that particular professor, it helped me to get more understanding of what the research process was like. I do think that I would have liked more experience actually doing the research and in things like writing the manuscripts and doing stuff like that. Also, understanding that when someone has a research project they have complete control over what can happen. So, while there was work on a manuscript, there were decisions that were made that I particularly didn’t agree with in regard to publishing that manuscript.
Similar to Abigail, Hazel shared the opportunity she had to work on a research project with two female faculty members dealing with advertisements. Describing the impact of the experience, Hazel explained:

I would take a picture, one of them would take a picture, we would discuss it. We’re having fun. We were laughing. That just made me feel like, one we’re outside the classroom and they’re actually normal human being, which I appreciated. I felt like I was connecting with them in a different way, I still respected them obviously, but I felt at that point they were human, and they were flexible. They allowed me to bring my daughter with me. Also, just going up and down the highways and driving with them and taking pictures, that just showed me how passionate they were about what it is that they were interested in and what it is that they were doing, and that they believed in their own research. Out of just taking pictures and stuff, this is going to become research. It was going to become an article, it was going to become a presentation; some way, somehow, because they believe in it. I think that is one experience, I can speak to that kind of shaped my perception of what it means to have the expectations. Also, to have that drive for your own research and believe in it and stand behind it when someone might challenge you on it that it might not be important. I can see that as one experience.

Cynthia also discussed how her experiences helped her understand more about the research process and further developed her interest in quantitative research. She noted:

Yeah, actually, when I first started my doc program I did a graduate assistantship. I did research it was quant for a research study with a particular agency in a
community. I did a lot of the coding, I did a lot of the scoring assessments, I did a lot of the analyzing data. I think that was the best shit that ever happened to my life because I love quant work, like that’s my shit. I’ve always liked math too, so, somehow it just all came full circle. And the research, I think was like three or four years or something. They really helped me see a lot of different ways on how to analyze the data.

For several participants, participating in research with faculty not only shaped their understanding of research expectations and the research process, but also demystified the inflexible and ridged characterization of the professoriate. For example, similar to Hazel, Justine referenced understanding, through participation in research, more of the human side of faculty. She noted:

The opportunity to do research and write with my professors. It was very eye opening. It showed me a different side of them. That they’re human and some of the struggles that doctoral students go through, they still go through as faculty and trying to balance different things in their lives.

Similarly, discussing her experiences with research, Gina shared, “For me, with me doing the research teams and even working with professors on presentations or working with them on a manuscript, I got to also see the dual roles of mentoring.” For Gina, participation on research teams expanded her perspective of what mentoring looked like in the faculty role.

For most individuals, research participation not only informed their perspective on the research process but also other aspects of academic life. For example, summarizing her research experiences, Danielle explained:
Yeah, so I’ve had one article published with two professors and one of my classmates that we worked on. And that was a historical piece so there wasn’t a lot of us getting together per say and working on it. It was more so just passing out sections and doing that. But it was still a really good experience in terms of just learning how to work with three really intelligent people and being able to pull our specific skills and talents together to put out a piece that I know we’re all really proud of.

For participants, opportunities to engage in research experiences emerged as a key direct learning experience. Participants discussed the various learning they gained from the opportunities with some discussing a desire for more research opportunities. For instance, Bianca discussed limited opportunities to engage in research during her doctoral program. She noted:

So, probably throughout the years I’ve been in the doctoral program, I’ve only had one opportunity. My advisor was doing some research over the summer on transfer students and she selected two of us, two of her advisees to assist with that because it’s a paid position over the summer. Did some interviews over the phone with some transfer faculty at state supported institutions and I think that’s about it. Just recently, my new advisor chose me to do a poster with her, but that was something like a collaboration on a poster about the effectiveness of group advising and how ours had worked in particular, but yes limited.

Bianca talked further about the benefits of the one research experience she had. She explained:

It was exciting…. It gave me a look, and up-close look at how research is done.. I
think there was probably you know, first time I done anything like that. I mean, I knew I would have to eventually do it for myself, but it was the first time that I was able to kind of put some of the things that I’ve learned into place. Being able to call, reach out to the institutions, speak to faculty members about programming and do some research on my own about each institution in there. So, I actually, I appreciated the opportunity. Wish I had more like that, but yeah I appreciated the opportunity.

Although participants varied in terms of the amount and type of research opportunities they were able to engage in during their doctoral process, consistent across participants was the benefit of research experiences. Engaging in research provided participants with hands-on learning that directly shaped how they understood the professoriate. Research experiences served as a key influential factor for participants.

**Teaching experiences.** Teaching experiences emerged as another important direct learning experience identified by participants. Numerous participants discussed the influence of co-teaching and/or teaching as instructor of record on their perceptions of an academic career. For example, Leah discussed the influential role of her teaching internship experience. She noted:

I had a pretty phenomenal teaching internship actually, that was led by my dissertation advisor. And again, being that he identifies as a person of color really helped me a lot with understanding what it’s like to occupy that teaching role as a person of color with students who are predominantly white and, in many ways, uninformed about certain cultures, even their own cultural dynamics and how that shows up in the classroom. So that has been very formative, I would say, my
teaching internship. And all the courses that I had that were related to pedagogy in counselor education.

Similarly, Abigail discussed her first time being an instructor of record for a course, describing it as “my first-time kind of getting my feet wet as part of the faculty and being a faculty member.” Detailing what she learned from the experience, she shared:

It helped me to kind of understand it from a different point of view. Being a member of faculty and then also being an instructor, it helped me to sort of have a seat in the other chair if that makes sense. Working with students and also working through some of the challenges that comes with it and being in the classroom too. That helped me develop a new appreciation for professors and some of the things that they have to address. Then it also helped to teach me ways to handle certain situation or just different teaching methods. Just a wide array of things kind of thinking about like what that process looks like from the very beginning when you’re like prepping your class, to being in the class and trying to make sure students are engaged and, assessing if they know material. All of those things were very new for me. So that piece was one that I learned more about in ways that kind of helped to shape my perception of what it is to be a professor.

As with research experiences, participants teaching experiences varied in type and amount. Some served as a co-instructor, others as instructor of record, and others had opportunities to teach both ways as well as through face-to-face, online, and hybrid platforms. For example, discussing the influence of numerous types of teaching opportunities Ivy shared:

I think that my current advisor, one of the things that she’s done is she’s pulled
me in on a lot of her research project and pretty much all of her courses, even the online courses. So, even though I understand that she was definitely benefiting from me doing work, like I have taught undergraduate courses with her, graduate courses with her, online courses with her, I have a lot of various experiences that way. And I think, additionally, being able to volunteer at the two universities I work at now with their research and assessment, curriculum development, and on a couple other university committees, I feel like that’s really prepared me to go into any full-time job and be able to thrive there.

**Professional development experiences.** In addition to research and teaching, conference attendance and participation was noted among participants as a direct learning experience that was influential in the development of their academic career perspective. For example, Kristy described:

As a student attending conferences, being able to have access to other academics who can talk about their work and how that aligns with what I’m studying and allowing me the opportunity to talk about what I see in their work and how it relates to what I’m doing. So, that’s been really positive, and I don’t think I was really aware that that would come about.

Liz discussed the role of conferences in exposing her to information and ideas she had not gotten from her own institution. Of particular importance for her was the knowledge she gained about being able to selectively put things together to cater to her interest. She shared:

It wasn’t necessarily exposure from my institution. I would just say encouragement from faculty or other graduate students to try different thing. But
then exposure, at a conference or reading online, like, “oh, you can put these things together.”

Leah also mentioned the importance of conferences. Recognizing her need to interact with other counselor educators, she discussed her intentionality in seeking out counselor educator examples. She explained:

I’ve had to intentionally, because of the dynamics that I explained in my program, I’ve had to intentionally get out there and make sure that I could network and see other counselor educators functioning, be it at conferences or other opportunities to network. And so that has been really illuminating for me and just very useful is further refining my understanding of what it was that I was getting myself into, so to speak.

*Mentorship experiences.* Another key direct learning factor that emerged from the data was experiences with mentorship. Throughout their narratives participants discussed the importance of mentorship and being able to engage in a mentorship relationship. Participants identified the usefulness of both cross-cultural mentorship as well as Black female mentors. Discussions on mentorship experiences included formal and informal mentors as well as faculty and peer mentors. Participants described mentorship experiences as influencing both their perspectives and intentions. It informed their understanding of the professoriate, their readiness to engage in a faculty career and served as a space for participants to process their learning experiences.

For example, discussing the influence of formal mentorship experiences, Kristy shared:

I think one thing that has kind of given me insight into the world of academia was
being in the [Minority Scholars Program] where I was aligned with a professor who was my mentor pretty much for my undergrad and my master’s degree and whom I remain in a mentorship relationship til this day. So, I’ve been able to probably have access to certain things that other people might not have. So, not that I have seen or discovered everything, I’m sure I haven’t, but I think I just been given a pretty candid view of that world.

As noted by Kristy, mentorship experiences served as a key factor in providing insight into the world of academia. Participants described that mentorship relationships served as a space for participants to get feedback, engage in candid conversations, receive encouragement, and obtain resources.

Summarizing her overall thoughts about the role and importance of mentorship, Gina shared:

I’m able to say, as a doc candidate, what has benefited me and has altered my perceptions is having discussions with my program faculty and with my professional mentor at various points in my doctoral journey about the professoriate.

Gina later expanded on the learning she gained from her mentorship experiences as she outlined:

I think what else helped me was that I was part of a mentoring program and part of two different research team. So that was something and help me out. What else I learned through the process, was to create a mentoring team. Initially, I had first, just one and only mentor. That became toxic and what I learned was having a mentor team. I had individuals that had various expertise. For example, I had a
career mentor, I had another mentor I can talk about personal stuff, then I had someone else that was more professional. And then I had another mentor that I could talk to them about the politics within the programs, and they would talk to me about some of the politics at their institution. Now, because there was a differential, it wouldn’t go in-depth because I’m still a doctoral student not a faculty yet.

Gina’s initial experience with a toxic mentoring relationship shaped her understanding of having multiple mentors and tailoring mentorship for different purposes. Similar to Gina, several other participants identified negative mentoring experiences or lacking mentorship. For example, contrasting her experiences with formal and informal mentorship relationships, Ivy explained:

Formally, I've had some crazy bad experiences with mentorship. I think informally, I've had a lot of mentorship from women of color who have seen me on my journey and just kind of pulled me under their wing for the duration of time that they were there. I haven't had any long-term mentors like I guess formally or informally.

Participants that discussed lacking and negative mentoring relationships articulated a greater reliance on informal mentors, peer mentors, and other support. For example, discussing the role of informal mentors in her doctoral journey, Bianca explained:

I just kind of have informal ones. You know, people that have been through the program, but its more or less like, how in the world you going to get through this dissertation. It’s not a lot about what to do after. It’s just more or less like how to
survive this process. Similarly, Leah also discussed limited mentorship and relying more on informal mentors. She detailed:

Probably a little bit more limited with mentors. I think at this point, as I mentioned, I’m more recently connected with somebody as a formal mentor. But just kind of informal folks have more kind of been like, you got this, and I will be there for you as you move forward. So, I think that’s kind of mostly been the extent of it up till now.

Discussing her experiences with peer mentoring Liz shared:

I would say, I would use the term that she’s my mentor, but I think we’re close enough in age and experience that she doesn’t ever want to be considered my mentor. But a friend who, when I was in my first year of the master’s program she was I guess in her second year the doc program. I kind of like made her my friend. I got to watch her become a professor at the same time that she watched me go through the master’s program, get another job, come back to the doctoral program. So, she’s always been a couple of steps ahead. So like I said, the faculty members who talk about an experience, you know, they were on the market 30 years ago, is different from someone who can tell you in the moment like “this is what it’s like for me.” And then, a year later, after they’ve had some time to reflect can talk about it again. So I say those folks. I guess that may be peer mentoring.

**Vicarious learning experiences.** Vicarious learning experiences emerged as a second subtheme that classified the major theme *access makes a difference*. Vicarious learning experiences defined participants’ references to participating in indirect academic
career related activities that provided information and preparation for the professoriate. Participants shared a wide range of unique accounts about the conversations, observations and shared stories that influenced their perspectives and intentions. Although no two narratives were identical, several elements of the conversations, stories, and observations emerged as a commonality. Shared among participants’ narratives was the manner in which observations, shared stories, and career focused conversations illustrated unknown possibilities, confirmed or abated prior held assumptions, or generated new areas of inquiry.

**Faculty observations.** As participants discussed their views on an academic career, observations of faculty surfaced as a highly influential factor. Participants detailed the manner in which seeing faculty perform or not perform various aspects of academic career tasks shaped how they viewed the professoriate. Participants discussed observing faculty within their own programs and institutions as well as observing faculty outside of their institution. When it came to observations outside of their institution, conferences and minority doctoral student programs surfaced as the two common opportunities referenced that provided spaces to interact with and observe faculty. For some, observing faculty directly informed their perspectives of an academic career. It shaped how they approached tasks, viewed the professoriate, and how they wanted to occupy a faculty career. For example, describing the influence of faculty observations, Hazel relayed:

The two females that I’m speaking of, I feel like one, just working with her and just seeing her drive for research and just how she approaches research in general, especially qualitative research. That has kind of shaped the way that I have collected, the way that I had operated, and the way that I look at things. Then I
have another one, who has become my chair and she has definitely been able to shape my ideas of what it means to be a researcher, what it means to be a professor, what it means to have academic career.

Similarly, Frances described seeing faculty members valuing doctoral students and shared:

I’ve seen how hard some of them really work to do what’s in the best interest of their doctoral students. Some are definitely more dedicated to including doc students in their research, inviting doc students to co-teach and doing so in a way that promotes the growth of the doctoral student and not just saying okay, well you’re co-teaching. Let me give you all of the grunt work. They typically don’t do that. They are very intentional about making the experience a beneficial experience for the doc student. So, that really intrigues me being able to have that kind of impact on doctoral students as well as master students.

For others, faculty observations served to challenge or abate prior held assumptions about the professoriate. As participants described how they viewed an academic career, they shared views of what the professoriate was and was not. Several mentioned observing various faculty actions, accomplishments, or consequences that conflicted with previously held beliefs. These observations then functioned to change assumptions or create dissonance in their view of the professoriate. For example, discussing collaboration and collegiality, Kristy described how her perspective on the collaborative nature of the professorate changed through observing faculty. She shared:

One thing that I’ve seen, that I didn’t think I would see, was researchers or professors supporting one another. With my advisor, I’d see that she’s very
supportive of people who are new to the field. That has been pretty refreshing to see.

For Kristy, observing faculty challenged her perspective of the competitive nature of an academic career. It helped her develop an understanding of collaboration as a part of an academic career. For others, faculty observations seemed to bring about dissonance within the formation of their perspectives. For example, Danielle explained:

Right now, I don’t necessarily have the most positive view of it. Just based on things I’m observing at my current institution and just talking to other people that I know that are in the profession as well. I think it’s mostly the collegiality aspect of it. It’s such a vague term. It’s always so difficult to pinpoint what that means and [knowing] am I meeting the expectations that my department has and that kind of stuff on that. So, I guess I don’t know, I’m kind of in between in terms of perceptions and what I think of an academic career just because like I said observations and other people’s experiences.

Also discussing faculty observations, Liz discussed the manner in which observations informed her views beyond the formal conversations and curriculum. Several participants discussed hearing or reading one thing but observing another. The observed behaviors and consequences emerged more influential than some of the messages and information given verbally about the professoriate. Describing her experience with verbal and behavioral conflicts, Liz detailed:

I would say their verbalized messages are always “anybody, everybody, we’re welcoming.” Then you see who they work with and that’s the message that to me is more important. One of the faculty members who said that everyone, essentially
[saying], we’re developing all of you to do this kind of work if you’re interested. Then they wrote with only White students or international students, that was big at my institution. It wasn’t clear how you were supposed to gain the experience that they said you should have in order to become a faculty member. They gave those opportunities to gain the experience to people who looked more like them or matched more with them than you.

For Liz, the behavioral message had more precedence than the verbal message. It served to evidence who was really thought to embody the professoriate.

Other participants shared the manner in which observing faculty illustrated unknown possibilities. Frances discussed the opportunities she had to observe faculty in a minority doctoral student program. The program served to promote the development of Black scholars and provided its participants with access to a range of current Black scholars. Discussing the role of observing faculty outside of her university, Frances shared:

I don’t know that on a conscious level that it influenced me seeing them as examples, but I wouldn’t doubt that it has. You know, that this is normal. That you can aspire to this. You can start on this journey and get tenured. You can be a full professor and all of that. Knowing that it’s possible because I don’t see those examples within our particular university. To know that exist at other universities.

In addition to minority doctoral student programs serving as a space that facilitated access to observe faculty outside of one’s institution, conferences also emerged as a space where influential faculty observations take place. For example, discussing what she learned from a faculty member, Hazel shared:
Before I met one of my professors in my program, I met him at a professional conference the year prior. I was able to see him present on what he was passionate about. He is an African American man and he is passionate about his underrepresented students and making sure that they have the leadership skills that they need to get out of undergraduate. That’s one experience that definitely stands out to me, just because he was the only Black man in the program. He was the Chair at one point and the adversity that he faced and how he was just so polished and just so well spoken and just, he was too cool for school. Nothing that anyone said to him or about him, and I’m saying his own colleagues behind closed doors, nothing could stop that man from doing what he did. He was a servant of his students and he definitely was an advocate through his research for his students.

*Shared stories.* Shared stories emerged as another vicarious learning experience that informed participants’ perspectives of a career in academia. Participants discussed career advisors, mentors, and peers who shared with them stories about their experiences in an academic career. Further, participants detailed that people also related to them stories of friends and colleague’s experiences in faculty positions. The stories and perspectives shared with participants in the study emerged as important information to gain and seek out. For example, discussing the influential nature of her mentor’s shared stories, Cynthia detailed:

Being able to get her perspective as a Black woman. She been in the program working for, I think she was working three or four years. Seeing how over the course of those years, what has changed about her, what has been different, what
things she’s learned about herself that she wants to add into her life personally and professionally and then what things about her does she know, I’m not changing, this is who I am, and this is what it is. So, being able to get that has definitely helped out a lot.

Similarly, Danielle also discussed stories shared by her advisor as she noted, “he’s been very willing to share his experiences as well. Particularly because he came in pretty young as well, and so we’ve had some very honest conversations about what his experiences have been like.” In addition to her advisor, Danielle also recounted the story she learned of a faculty member struggling with advocating for students. After telling the story, she concluded with:

I think, it is really just that and hearing that, you know, expressing concern for students can be seen as not being a team player and not being easy to get along with. I think that kind of makes it really difficult to consider a career in academia. You spend so much time doing that work. I personally believe that you don’t want to be miserable at a job and if a job is making you miserable, you don’t need to be doing it.

The influence of hearing such stories influenced her perspective on job satisfaction within an academic career.

**Career focused conversations.** Career focused conversations encompassed the discussions participants had with advisors, mentors, and peers related to academic career goals and planning. Within this study, the idea of career focused conversations was defined as intentional conversations related to career goals, planning, and considerations. It involved participants making known their academic career intentions and plans and
engaging in conversations around those intentions. Career focused conversations ranged in frequency from never to very often. Further, given the recommendation in literature that mentors and advisors should be explored/understood separately (Bertrand Jones et al., 2013), the entity (advisor, mentor, peer support) is delineated in reporting participants’ comments around career focused conversations.

Participants ranged with regard to the entities (advisor, mentor, peer support) they noted as engaging them in career focused conversations. The majority of participants (n=12) reported having career focused conversation with at least one of the three entities. One participant, Liz, reported having career focused conversations with all three—advisor, mentor, and peer supports. Five participants (Cynthia, Danielle, Leah, Justine, and Gina) reported engaging in career focused conversations with both an advisor and mentor. Conversely, Hazel reported not having engaged in career focused conversations with any of the entities—advisor, mentor, or peer support.

In detailing the role of career focused conversations, participants discussed the impact they had on shaping their academic career plans and pursuits. They identified these conversations as a meaningful part of their career development and influential in shaping how they approached their pursuit of an academic career. For example, commenting on her advisor’s role in facilitating her career development, Leah explained, “my advisor is a man of color and he’s invested in me tremendously to make sure that I’m prepared to be an academic, a Black academic.” In addition to conversations with advisors, participants also discussed the influential role of career focused conversations with mentors and peers supports. For example, Danielle discussed the various career focused conversations she has been able to have with faculty mentors and administrative
mentors. She noted:

One of my mentors, she’s always been on the administration side but just done some adjunct teaching. And so, with her, I think our conversations have really just been about that balance and what that looks like. And how to go about pursuing that kind of role. And our conversations have really been just mostly on just balancing that and figuring out if that’s what you really want, or do you just want to focus on just the administration side of things. And then with others, there was one other faculty member in particular, who she’s on my committee as well. And she’s one of those, she loves her job and she’s always trying to tell me the positive side of things for her, which is great. With her, the conversations I’ve had to kind of push them in a different direction, a little bit, just so I can get her complete story. So yeah, I think I’ve been fortunate in terms of having people that I can talk to that are on the faculty side and a person that is on the other side, in the administration, just to kind of get the best of both worlds, I guess. Obviously, their experiences are not going to be my experience, but just to get an understanding of what kind of thoughts went into their decision making. Just maybe thinking about some other things that maybe I haven’t thought to think about in terms of my career goals and what kind of position I want to pursue once I complete my degree.

Illustrating the influential nature of peer mentors as well as faculty, Liz discussed what she called “friendtours” and the differences in career focused conversations with “friendtours” and other mentors. Liz shared:

So with the people who’d go under the category of peer mentor or friendtour kind
of thing, these are regular conversations. [Sandy] has been a reference for me, she's connecting me to a job that she thinks will be helpful because she knows I want to get out of my current job and that I need to finish my dissertation. With the people who are very close, who are both close to me in experience but also close to me personally, these are regular conversations. Other people who are peer mentors—depends on where we are—[we discuss] the struggles we were having with our dissertation (now most of them have finished their dissertations) to what kind of jobs would let us finish our dissertation, or what kind of jobs we want after this because of our frustration with the field in general. Then those more traditional mentorship so the faculty members. We have these conversations usually around the time that I'm submitting something for my dissertation or talking about job interview. So I guess where they would naturally fall.

Several participants indicated lacking, irregular or delayed conversations with advisors or mentors. For example, discussing having conversations about her career intentions with her advisor, Frances explained:

I haven’t really spoken with them about it simply because my advisors are also my committee members. …So, I’ve been so far from the finish line that just talking about what I’m going to do after that is not really the focus for me. We talked a little bit this past semester as I was making progress on my proposal about when they thought I might be done and we’re all in agreement that it’s sometime towards the end of next year and so, it’s really beyond the window of opportunity for applying for full time tenure track position. So, that actually starts now for next fall. So, it wasn’t something that we discussed, and I don’t imagine
it’s a topic that will come up until sometime next year.

Similarly, Bianca shared:

I would say, I probably have shied away from it because of the difficulties of just trying to get through the program. So, a lot of times up until this advisor, the conversations were so few and far between

Common among participants in the study who had infrequent career focused conversations was the notion that conversations with mentors and advisors were more focused on surviving the doctoral process and that little time and attention was paid to preparing for life after earning the doctoral degree. This sharply contrasted individuals who discussed having frequent and early conversations. Such participants mentioned doctoral education decisions being discussed and made through the filter: how does this action prepare you for your career goal? For example, Ivy discussed career focused conversations with her advisor describing them as frequent and having commenced early in her program. She shared:

So, we started fairly early on in my program, second year of my program, because I started going part time, so we talked about what I wanted to do. And from that point on, one of her questions always is, “how is this going to help you get your next job.” And so it’s been an ongoing conversation with us.

Hazel discussed having no conversations with either her advisors or mentors. For example, she shared:

I feel like I have not had that conversation with my mentors. And, I think I mentioned earlier, like I feel like I keep things to myself just because I’m a little unsure about it initially. And, I mean, if you have your mentor that’s supposed to
be someone that you're comfortable with, but I don't think I've ever been comfortable enough to say that. And that may have been my own insecurities with if I'm ready, if I'm prepared yet to this. So yeah, I haven't had that conversation yet.

Similarly, commenting on her lack of career focused conversations with her advisor, she continued, “I have not had any conversations with my advisor about my intentions of being a professor. And I feel like now after this conversation with you I may have to kind of reveal that to her.” Taking more time to further reflect on why she had not had any career focused conversations with her advisor or mentors, Hazel revealed:

So I think that I've never said anything to her and I've talked about her so much in this interview, and it’s just like, that’s one thing I have not shared with this woman. So I think now is the time that I may have to share that with her. But for a while I was not interested, about a couple of years, pursuing the professorship.

She went on to further expand on her lack of comfort as she relayed:

I think if they would have asked me, like, “hey, what are you think about doing” or kind of encouraging me and pulling me in like hey, would you be interested in being a professor, one day? Like what are your goals. We always talk about research; we always talk about just making sure you get a position somewhere so that you can get a job to support you during this dissertation process. I don’t necessarily remember any moments of them asking me, would I be interested in being a professor, one day. And I don't know if that's because they thought I was only interested in more administrative roles. But I think if I would have been asked, that dialogue probably led by them, because they're in that role as a
professor within a higher education setting, and they’re a woman. I think if they would have asked me that would have encouraged me to feel a little more comfortable to have that dialogue with them.

Comfort arose for several participants as key factors in helping set a space where they could share their career intentions. For example, Frances who, also identified limited career focused conversations, mentioned her initial interest in a clinical position and the department’s focus on developing counselor educators as a cause for her hesitancy to have career focused conversations. She explained, “I’m much more comfortable with it now than I used to be and I say that because it was very clear early on that our faculty wanted doc students to pursue a position in counselor education.”

Contrasting Hazel’s experience where she lacked career focused conversations, Mia discussed the career conversations she has been able to have with mentors and peers through a minority doctoral student program she has been a part of during her doctoral education. She noted:

In length, we’ve had conversations from the very beginning about this is my goal is to be in the professoriate. Even when it came down to conversations about when I was looking at options as it relates to what my dissertation topic was going be.

Contrasting the opportunities to engage in career focused conversations through the minority doctoral student support program compared to conversations within her own academic program, Mia described:

So, even though I’m not getting that in my program, that’s what I’m getting from the other support. Having conversations about, “hey, so I know we’re both
working full time, it may be helpful that we both kind of co-present together.”

That’s how that happens. Or looking at opportunities to say, “hey, my state counselor association is looking at this particular topic area, they want someone to write an article about this, are you interested?” I wouldn’t be aware of it because I’m not in that state, those types of things. So, those conversations are helpful to help me hit the mark in some areas that I probably wouldn’t have that ability to participate in those activities if I didn’t have those connections.

Frances also participated in a minority doctoral student program that provided her with access to mentors. Reflecting on the conversations she was able to have with mentors from the program she explained:

They shared with us kind of those conversations that happen behind closed doors that we may not be invited to, but now because they’re behind the closed door, they can come out and say, okay let me tell you about this. This is what you need to take a look at. They offer kind of that perspective of how decisions we make are perceived. What we should be involved in. We actually have a resume workshop where they told us to bring our vita and they will critique it. I remember having mine and she ripped it to shreds, but it was great feedback. As a Dean, pointing out what she looks at first on the vita of an applicant and she’s like, well I would take a look at this and my first question is, where is your teaching experience? You said you been teaching for two years. So, just being able to get that feedback from someone who has that experience, who’s also of color, has been very instrumental.
Participants discussed a variety of career focused conversations with mentors, advisors, and peers that have been helpful. They explained the various topics covered and aspect of the conversation. Common among participants was the identifying of features such as providing resources, preparing for interviews, reviewing resumes, and being honest about the positive and negative as helpful components of career focused conversations. For example, discussing conversations with her mentors, Abigail explained:

I've had conversations about, kind of before and after interviews. And factors that might be considered in regard to like accepting positions, whether that’s salary, whether that’s tenure, non-tenure track position. I've had conversations about how to negotiate. I've had conversations about going into the interview, things to do, things to not do. Different questions that might be worth asking, that sort of thing. So, I've had several sessions about that, and that's just based on their experiences and then also based on what they know about me and sort of what I am looking for in an academic position.

Also discussing career related conversations, Cynthia noted:

Actually, one of the professors, the professor that I worked with who was very structured and I really enjoyed my time with him. He actually asked me did I want some books. He bought me some books on apply for teaching positions, being an adjunct professor, what is that like. So, I’m starting to get into that, just so I can be aware of what to expect.

Commenting on the career focused conversations that have been helpful held with her advisor, Cynthia commented:
When it comes to my advisor the biggest thing is her just kind of telling me, “be aware of what type of program you’re applying to, be aware not everybody’s gonna like what you do, what you’re going to write about. So, if you do go into an academic setting where there is research just be ready for that. Just be okay and comfortable with that.”

Liz discussed how helpful it is to talk about job postings with her advisor. She shared:

Before I even started my dissertation I took him some job ads and I was like “these are the types of jobs I think I want.” He was supportive in like making sense of what the job ad is saying that isn’t clear. Like, “what does it mean if you end up in this kind of role at this institution?” This was around the time that I realized I didn’t want to be at a Tier One school because of the kinds of things I wanted to do….And he’s like, “yes, there isn’t anything wrong with either option, but if you want to do some developmental pieces—.” I don’t remember what it was. I know the institution was [Name of University]. He’s like “for what you say you want that role and position seems best suited for you.” We talked about it then. Then during the dissertation stages of like “what is this project going to do for you? Is it setting you up so that you can get a bunch of articles after it so you’re not working as hard your first year. Is it just a credential so that you can get administrative jobs? Is it just for your personal satisfaction?” So we’ve had lots of conversations about that because I list him as a reference. So we talk about the different types of jobs I’m looking at and how this process and eventual credential fits into that.
In addition to identifying the meaningful/helpful career conversations, participants also discussed conversations they desired to have with mentors and advisors. Common among participants’ desired conversations were negotiating salary, dealing with racial issues in the classroom, tenure and promotion. For example, Ivy shared:

I wish I was having conversations on negotiation skills because I feel like that’s very, very important. I wish I was having conversations on ways to deal with microaggressions inside the classroom because sometimes it’s hard when all of your students don’t look like you. I like to create a very open environment in my classes because I teach in sociology, so we’re always talking about the stuff nobody wants to talk about like race, politics, sexuality, economic, like all of those things. And the social perception of those, right. And so I create a very welcoming environment. But one of the things that I don’t think I’ve talked about enough is how to respond when my student’s views hurt my feelings, or they attack a positionality that I hold. I feel like I do a great job of like no selling it, like I don’t show my emotions or anything. But being able to deal with those after I leave the classroom, is something, a conversation I feel like needs to be had.

In Ivy’s description of desired career focused conversations, she highlighted the importance of conversations that are strategic and practical. Conversations that incorporate situations she may face as it related to the intersectionality of her race and gender. For participants, career focused conversations needed to include a space to process academic career related factors as it related to being Black and female.

**Theme Summary.** The theme *access makes a difference* characterized participants’ references to the importance of participating in direct and indirect academic
career related activities as a means to gain information and preparation for the professoriate. This finding emerged as participants referenced two primary ways of accessing information and career preparation: access through direct learning experiences and access through vicarious learning experiences. Common learning experiences among participants included: research, teaching, professional development, mentorship, faculty observations, shared stories, and career focused conversations. Participants described these factors as facilitating knowledge and insights that altered or solidifying their perceptions, intentions, and expectations of an academic career.

Participants discussed a variety of career focused conversations with mentors, advisors, and peers that have been helpful. Supportive aspects of these conversations included providing resources, preparing for interviews, reviewing resumes, and being candid about the positive and negative aspects of an academic career. Having ample opportunities to engage in both direct and vicarious learning experiences emerged as an important factor in having a solid understanding of an academic career and feeling prepared for an academic position. Contrastingly, a lack of learning experiences such as research opportunities, formal mentorship, and career focused conversations emerged as learning experiences participants at times struggled to access.

**Theme 3: Self-Efficacy: I Can Do It!**

The third major theme identified within the study was *self-efficacy: I can do it!* This theme encompassed participants’ beliefs about the ability to meet the expectations of an academic career and overcome the barriers associated with an academic career. The category ranged from a weak sense of self efficacy to a strong sense of self-efficacy. Most participants within the study reported an overall strong sense of self-efficacy as
they identified feeling prepared for an academic career and confident in navigating the barriers they perceived associated with an academic career. Participants within the study had a strong sense of self and the ability to anticipate academic career challenges.

I can do it! Throughout their narratives, individuals noted a strong awareness of their personal aptitude as it related to research, teaching, and service. Participants noted an overall strong sense of self-efficacy related to the ability to navigate the demands of an academic position as they expressed beliefs in their ability to succeed in a full-time faculty position. In detailing their self-efficacy beliefs, individuals also discussed an awareness of various barriers to an academic career. As participants acknowledged various barriers, they expressed feelings of uncertainty or trepidation but at the same time detailed confidence that things would work out. It was this sense of self-efficacy that sustained participants’ continued strivings toward full-time faculty positions and leadership positions within higher education. For example, describing her beliefs about her ability to meet the expectation of an academic career, Hazel shared:

This program has allowed me or given me the kind of like, the umph to say, “I can do this.” I might not see many people that look like me, but I know it’s doable, and I know that I’m capable. This program has taught me to believe in myself. I might not remember all the theories that I've learned the first year, but I can go pick up a book. If anything, this doctoral process has really taught me how to believe in myself. I'm at the point that, I know if I complete everything and if I work really hard, and if I show people my drive and my passion, I can definitely transition into the professorship.
Similarly, describing her beliefs about her preparedness for an academic career, Ivey detailed:

I think that the course of the progression that I’ve had since my undergraduate career has prepared me for an academic career. I’ve been at small private, large public, large private, urban schools, suburban schools, middle of nowhere schools. So, I think that in terms of my experience in my education, I feel prepared. I don’t feel prepared for every situation, but I feel like I am prepared to adjust to any situation.

Although most participants noted a strong awareness and belief in their ability to meet academic career expectations and challenges in general, they also spoke more specifically about particular tasks related to an academic career. Participants shared their beliefs about various tasks such as teaching, service, research, and balancing the personal and professional. Most participants felt strongly about their abilities to teach and engage in service. On the contrary, many participants described a weaker sense of self-efficacy beliefs in their abilities to meet the research expectations of a faculty career and to balance personal and professional goals and expectations. For example, commenting on her beliefs about various components of an academic career, Gina gave the following comparison:

Whereas, I believe as far as the teaching and service activities like, yes, yes, yes, however, publications and journal articles would be like, no, no, no for me. In other words, I remember my program was like “oh you should have at least two to three exiting.” I literally have one exiting and then one that was just recently accepted. So, what I worry about is perishing quickly.
Also commenting on her beliefs about various components of an academic career, Liz shared:

I know I can teach. I know I’m a good teacher. Then I know I can do service. I guess the other parts are like administration. As an administrator, I’ve taught and my whole job is service to the institutions. So, I know I could do those things. Again, I’m struggling with the publication piece. So, if that is the bigger part of what it means to be a faculty member and I am not doing it well then it almost seems like you would naturally follow that, then maybe I wouldn’t be a good professor. I feel like that just means I wouldn’t necessarily be a star researcher and so then I just have to find somewhere that looking for someone who’s going to be a great professor, an instructor, not someone who’s going to crank out article all the time.

For Liz, her belief in her ability to teach comprised a large part of her academic career self-efficacy. On the other hand, her lack of confidence in her research abilities caused her to question her attractiveness as a faculty candidate. For instance, she described, “in some ways, I don’t think I’m necessarily going to be as prolific of an author”. She further explained, “(w)ith that comes the ‘what makes you an attractive candidate.” Some things I feel I would have had to have done already to be an attractive candidate, and I’m not there”.

Leah also discussed her teaching abilities. Describing how she viewed the development of confidence in her teaching abilities, she explained:

One of the things that I’ve just noticed, obviously I pursued this and wanted this. I think I may have believed at some point that the teaching portion would be really
difficult, or challenging, or hard to get a handle of. One thing that I’ve been so happy about is how much I enjoy teaching. How I just feel really comfortable and I feel like I’m in my zone in that aspect. And so that part. Learning actually how to do it, has been certainly a part of my journey. Kind of integrating different pedagogical strategies and feeling more comfortable with that has been something that I’ve been really happy to grow in.

Contrasting a strong sense of teaching self-efficacy, Danielle discussed her concerns about teaching success due to her lack of practical experience within the field of higher education and student affairs. She explained:

But, let me say this, I think my field is a very practical field. I think it’s important to learn from people who have a ton of experience and varied experience in the field and who have been able to move their way up and can tell you how things worked years ago and how things are now and how everything’s changed. I just don’t think I’m there yet. I don’t think I have enough of that experience to share with graduate students who are looking to really solidify themselves in the field. I think I would probably be good in the undergraduate program because I have enough of that entry level experience to where I could help students understand the ins and outs of the fields. I don’t think I have enough of the practical experience to share with graduate students, both master and doctoral level.

In addition to teaching, participants also discussed self-efficacy beliefs as it related to service. For example, contrasting her beliefs about the ability to meet and enjoy the service aspects of a faculty career compared to the research expectations, Frances shared:
That kind of service work is something that I would enjoy as well. Again, if that’s essential to tenure and promotion, I can see myself being able to meet those expectations and tenure, as opposed to, you got to get four publications out of the year in order to receive tenure. I think that’s much more, the service piece, is much more obtainable for me than the research. You can write until you’re blue in the face, but if you keep getting rejected, you don’t have a lot of control over that. So, that’s something that I think is much more daunting for me.

Offering further commentary on the lack of control one has related to publications, Gina discussed her abilities to develop realistic expectations. In reflecting on her evidenced growth and skill development, she relayed:

Now what I’m working on is having more realistic expectations about scholarship and not being so anxious. I don’t know how a program is going to weight the number of materials produced, but I do know now how to discuss authorship with my research team members. Then also to consider how authorship order number and the nature of the journal can impact me being selected for an institution.

A weak research self-efficacy seemed to encompass two dynamics: research experience and research publications. Offering commentary on her lack of publications, Abigail explained her view that the lack of publications may impede her entry into an academic position. She explained:

I would say, right now, one of the barriers that I think that I have, I haven’t had anyone particularly tell me this, is the publications piece. So not having like a publication in a peer reviewed journal, I think, is a barrier because of the strong emphasis that we have on research. And, I know that’s an area that I am
continually working on and intentionally trying to get more experience in. But I think that that’s also an area like it really just depends on the focus for the university as well. So, that piece is, I guess I would consider a barrier.

Hazel commented on both the experience and publication aspect of research. She shared:

I feel like I need to do more research, besides my own dissertation. And I don’t even know if I have the opportunity to, but I feel like I need to either start publishing some articles, maybe off my dissertation, potentially go to a conference and present, and just groom myself as a professor, I should say.

For many participants, a weak sense of self-efficacy related to research impacted their confidence and approach to academic positions. Describing the mindset she takes based on her self-awareness of her research experience, Cynthia expressed:

I have to go in with this mindset of like “Yeah, you don’t have the amount of research.” I have some research experience, but I don’t have it in the level that I’d love to have it at unfortunately. It is just like I guess after I finish my dissertation I think that experience will definitely help where I can try to see if I can do more research experience until I get to the point where maybe I would be willing to apply to a program that does focus on research, a little bit more. But at this point in time, I have to kind of remember to kind of stay in my lane on what experience I have. So that’s my perception is just recognize that not every program is going to be for me. And you might have to start off with what you know and be okay with that.

A sense of self-efficacy also included the anticipated barriers one expected to navigate within an academic career. Within this study, common anticipated barriers
among participants included family obligations, geographical location, as well as concerns about isolation, mentorship, respect, and access to resources as it related to cultural identities such as gender, age, race, and class. Several participants discussed the reality that a faculty position often means changing geographical location. Describing this reality generally, Justine offered the following summary: “depending on where you’re located, you’ll probably have to end up moving. And for some people, that’s just not an option.”

Relocation emerged as a significant challenge common across participants. Discussing challenges related to relocation, Ivy talked about the fact that her husband also held a doctoral degree and would be looking for a faculty position. She explained the situation stating:

I feel like a barrier for me, I guess another one that I should have thought about, but I didn’t think about in terms of like job searching. My husband has a doctorate, too, so wherever we go, we’ll do a dual search. So that could be a barrier for me in terms of finding the ideal job that I want, because he would have to find something like in the same surrounding area. So, I would have to be essentially looking for two jobs instead of one.

Similarly, Mia talked about relocation challenges on account of her husband’s career. She described her husband’s career industry as being more lucrative in urban settings and desiring a location that fit that need. Describing the challenge it posed for her, she explained:

The places of the jobs, like where the jobs are. A ton of them in certain areas that may not necessarily be an area that would work well for…it could work for me,
but would it work well for my husband and what he does, not necessarily. So, in making those types of matches and that type of stuff, that's currently what’s not appealing to me right now.

In addition to relocation restraints on account of family dynamics and obligations, class also emerged as a meaningful component related to barriers. Illustrating this struggle, Gina expressed:

With me being an African American female, with me being 37 years old, with me being of I want to call it middle class but it’s more or less that [of a] working class background, (despite what the census or the federal income reporting guidelines are). ... Like right now, I can look at some other institutions, but realistically, I don’t have the moving costs and so it’s limiting me. Like honestly, I would be open to packing my bags and going wherever. Doing a *Coming to America*, spin the globe and where it lands that’s where I’m going to go.

Further discussing the challenge of relocation, Liz explained:

I think because whenever I look for jobs I always look at faculty position that eventually I would again try to travel that path. The challenge though is that I don’t want to live in some obscure random place again. I lived in a small town in [Midwest State] for my masters and my PhD. My bachelor’s wasn’t in a large town, but it was our state capitol. I feel like after I graduated from undergrad I went to the middle of nowhere for a long time. I also worked at a small school in literally the middle of nowhere for a while. For the type of institution where I’d want to be a faculty member, or even just the opportunities because of where colleges are located, I have to balance between again my personal desires and my
professional desires. She went on to express the way these factors impact her reasoning. She reasoned, “(a)ll of that, with consideration of where am I in my life, what’s going on with my family; am I really willing to move again for a job.”

In addition to family obligations related to relocation, family composition dynamics also emerged as an anticipated barrier to an academic career. Justine discussed concerns related to the age of her children and evening course offerings. She specified:

Right now, I think it’s because my children are still in high school and they’re very active. So, most of the classes that I teach are in the evening, so I have to miss out on stuff in their life that I would not want to miss out. So just that part. But, you know, once they graduate and everything, I think that wouldn’t be a problem. But just the time the classes are offered.

Participants commonly mentioned family obligations as an academic career limitation discussing its impact on partner’s employment, children’s education, and dating (family planning) options.

Another area of perceived barriers common among participants revolved around concerns about isolation, mentorship, respect, and access to resources as it related to cultural identities such as gender, age, race, and class. Several participants discussed the impact of their race, gender, age, and/or class in their beliefs about their ability to succeed within an academic career. For some participants, the intersectionality of these identities was discussed while others focused more narrowly on one or two of these identities. For example, discussing the intersectionality of her racial and gender identities, Hazel commented:
I’m hoping this is not a barrier, just me being a Black woman in America. I can see that as the barrier. I feel like we’re rocking and rolling out here but depending on who’s sitting on the other side of the table it may be a barrier, it may not be a barrier. They may respect you, because you know your stuff, you have your experience, you have your doctorate, I don’t know. I don’t want to hold that over my head either thinking, okay, I’m going into this interview to be a professor in this program, I hope me going in as a Black woman doesn’t faze them. So that, like I said, may or may not be a barrier.

Also discussing her intersecting identities, Danielle shared:

You know specifically, as a young, Black, non-US citizen, I think those are the three identities for me that have really, I think I’ve just become more proud of them. I’m realizing now, just being marginalized in those three specific areas. So, people, anytime I tell someone I’m working on a doctorate, they look at me like, “really, you’re really young.” And I’m like, “well, yeah, I know, you don’t have to point out the obvious.” But it’s just this understanding that because I’m going to be viewed a certain way because of those three identities, I have to be different. I have to work 10 times harder, than say one of my classmates. Who she’s also young, but she’s American and she’s also White, so she may not have the same struggles that I’m going to have.

Danielle went on to talk further about the role of her age, apart from her commentary regarding the perceived barriers related to the intersection of her age, nationality and gender. She pointed out:
I think a big part of it might just be and I hate saying this, but race might be a really big barrier. There’s research that says people are not as willing to hire people of color for faculty position. But also, I just think your experiences and your background and just how people perceive your abilities. So, I think being able to show that you have the skills to teach people and if you don’t have that I think people kind of look at you differently. And then, of course, age. People are always pretty skeptical of a young person, someone who at such a young age who has a doctoral degree is sort of, I think there’s this look that people give, or these questions people have of why pursue something like that so young. And granted, I have had quite a few younger professors but again, they’ve faced some challenges and I think a lot of that has to do with their age. And people’s perceptions of young people and especially millennials. And so yeah, I think those are some of the barriers, age, race, and just experiences in general.

Age surfaced as a meaningful factor for many participants. Participants’ generally viewed a younger age as a barrier. For example, discussing her academic career self-efficacy beliefs related to her age, Hazel stated:

I’m a young black woman, black don’t crack. Not that I won’t see myself sitting at the front of the class telling all these adult learners, “this is this, this is that, here’s my experience.” I feel like I almost need to be like 45 or up to really feel like a comfortable professor and that’s just me being honest. And that also gives me time to get the professional experience that I want before I make that jump as a professor. So, I don’t feel like I’m ready right now so.
Also discussing the impact of being young, Abigail mentioned the difficulties people’s perceptions of a younger aged person can have on an academic career. Explaining her conceptualization of age, she remarked:

Age, specifically with me, to speak into my own experience, with me being younger than a lot of the faculty members that I was around. Being younger in age, it definitely had its benefits but then it also had some disadvantages with it as well. Especially when you’re working with students who are older than you, it almost becomes like a question of competency and that sort of thing.

Commenting on age but doing so from the perspective of an individual who identifies as middle aged, Leah described the benefits of pursuing a faculty career at a later age in life. She explained:

I think I’m happy that, I said before I was reluctantly middle age, but I’m glad that I am the age I am because I think it takes a lot of maturity, for me as an individual. I think it would have been much more difficult for me to feel the level of isolation that I anticipate may continue and just to feel happy, satisfied, fulfilled in what I’m doing.

For many participants within this study, isolation, marginalization, lack of promotion, visibility, and lack of support were all anticipated challenges identified. For instance, Gina discussed the anticipated challenges of invisibility, hypervisibility, and lacking mentorship within a counselor educator career. She shared:

I would say two factors, invisibility and hypervisibility. Something that concerns me is that as an African American female, we still tend to be underrepresented in Counselor Ed, but we’re overrepresented when we come to like the junior level
faculty. And so, what I would be concerned about is not only being viewed as like the superwoman of the program, but also, like, “oh, we not only want you on this diversity committee, but, since you’re a Black and you are female, we want you to mentor all the Black students coming through.” What I also fear is not necessarily being mentored by senior level faculty and them using the excuse that they’re working on all these other activities and they don’t have the time to sit down and work with me.

Frances addressed the challenge of isolation though her sharing of a story about a faculty member she knew who struggled with isolation. She detailed:

I think it would be very isolated if I were in a program where the faculty really didn’t collaborate and come together. I very much would feel like I was on my own. That wouldn’t be something that I enjoy. We have a faculty member where she’s in tenured track position. I think she was there in her particular department for two years and because of that kind of dynamic, she ended up leaving. She just felt very isolated. She didn’t feel that her colleague were at all supportive of her and she was able to make some connections with others outside her program, some of which were in my program, but it wasn’t enough to help her feel like she was going to be successful. So she left.

Speaking further to other anticipated challenges, Leah commented:

So, I mean, again, you may be feeling isolated. Being microaggressed against by students, by other faculty, or by maybe some of your research interest not being as welcomed or appreciated. By being over loaded or over committed to service work, especially in mentoring other students of color, which of course you want
to do, but sometimes that happens at the peril of your own progress in terms of your own research and scholarship and just climbing the ladder.

In discussing the consideration of all the issues related to her job search, she explained:

I just want to make sure that not only in this role that I’m anticipating moving into as an assistant professor in the Fall that I am in an environment here and elsewhere, that I might choose to go in the future, that does support research identity. …I just want to make sure I’m in a space where that’s supported. Because I think that’s hard enough as it is to achieve as a member of the professoriate, but I think probably even more challenging for women of color.

For several participants, the recognition of their research as credible and being respected by their colleagues as researchers was important. Leah discussed the importance of an academic environment that supported her research identity. Similarly, Gina discussed her research interest being supported. Gina outlined:

Barriers, I would probably say my research interests. So, like my research interests include mentorship, I also have interest in social justice and I have interests in ethical issues in supervision, but a lot of it focuses on marginalized populations. So that might be a barrier, I may get perceived as the multicultural person and put into the box.

Participants’ strong sense of self-efficacy was also seen through the expression of their career intentions. Participants within this study had varied higher education career intentions with most intending to pursue a career in academia and all identifying an interest in remaining in higher education. The participants’ common intent to pursue higher education careers further underlined participants’ strong sense of self-efficacy.
Determination and resilience. Participants articulated a variety of specific reasons for their academic career intentions, but an underlying theme among participants intending to pursue an academic career was determination and resilience. That is, despite any perceived challenges, sacrifices, or uncertainties, participants voiced a determination to strive for a faculty position. For instance, reflecting on her intent to pursue an academic career in light of perceived challenges, Leah expressed:

I do, and I will. I think in part it's because I said that's what I’m going to do. So, I think that's one of the reasons why I'm going to do it. But I do have questions about whether or not that's the right thing for me overall, because of some of the challenges that we have already discussed … I think that there are some sacrifices that I may have to make to do what I said I was going to do. But I do plan to push forward, even though I have some questions, some reservations about it. I mean, I feel very blessed to have this opportunity that I have, but at the same time again, I'm still kind of processing what is the right fit. Institutionally, what would be the right fit for me? Again, maybe none of it is actually the right fit.

In this statement, Leah voiced her doubts about the fit while simultaneously arguing a sense of obligation to go after the goal she had set for herself. In using language such as “push forward” when discussing her intentions, Leah’s determination to move past the weight of uncertainties is clear. Despite concerns about fit, balancing a faculty position and parenthood, and perceived sacrifices, she plans to push forward in her pursuit of a faculty position.

This idea of an obligation to persist was seen in other participants as well. For example, describing her intentions, Mia asserted:
I do intend to do that, to pursue a position in academia. Being in that setting is something that I've desired for some time. I also feel that because of that dream of wanting to do that for some time, I'll be doing myself a disservice if I didn't at least go out and pursue it. It may not be for me. It could turn out to be a major mistake, [where] I really, really do wish and hope to choose to be doing something else, [like] being a practitioner. If that's the case, that is fine. At least I've aligned myself with whatever the goal is.

For Mia, if she did not try to pursue an academic position, it would be a disservice to herself. Mia was determined to put herself in a position where she is at least a contender.

Similarly, Liz, who was not among one of the seven women who intended to pursue and academic career, also expressed a sense of obligation. Liz, uncertain about pursuing an academic career, summed up her sense of obligation to “at least try” as she discussed feeling as sense of duty to pursue something in higher education due to the effort and sacrifices she had already made. Specifically, she explained:

Also, because even though I'm frustrated and am like, “why is it taking so long finishing my dissertation,” it's sort of like, I don't know that I want to finish my dissertation and then become a yoga instructor. I want to for at least some amount of time to do the thing that I've struggled to do. There are other things that are interesting to me and I might include them in my life as hobbies or pet project kind of things. At the end of the day I started a PhD program to work in higher education and I've given up quite a few things to get this PhD. I'm trying to think of the right word, because it's not necessarily like I've earned it, or that I deserve it, but I don't want to dismiss what I've been pursuing essentially for the past 10
years, first with a master's programs and then with a PhD, by not looking or at least trying to get a job in academia.

Gina also discussed her intentions to “at least try”. She talked about the importance of positioning herself within the professorate sharing:

How I perceive an academic career, I see it as something positive. I see it as being something where it may take a lot of strength, a lot of guidance, definitely a lot of prayer. It’s something that’s still appealing to me. I want to at least have the opportunity to say that I tried it. And if it's not for me, it’s not for me.

In short, the participants acknowledged all they had invested and sacrificed as a motivation to “at least try” and “push forward” in pursuing the professoriate. They seemed to reflect on their journey and progress resolving they had come too far to not at least make an attempt at pursuing the professoriate.

Although participants articulated a commitment to try, such goals for some developed over time. For most participants within the study (n=5), academic career intentions related to long held goals, whereas two participants identified an academic career as a more recent choice. For example, in both Leah and Mia’s descriptions of their plans to pursue an academic career, they discussed a faculty position as something they wanted to do for a long time. On the contrary, Hazel described a more recent commitment to pursuing an academic career. She explained that she initially entered a doctoral program “to cross over into the academic affairs life and potentially be a professor.” The interest in being a professor manifested, however, as a goal that she felt was important to keep in sight. Describing her intentions, Hazel shared:
Yes, I do intend on pursuing a career in academia. I just had this revelation probably within the last couple of months. I love what I do now, but I know that people always ask you, what are you going to do when you get your doctorate. And for a while, I just was like, I don't know, I'm just gonna do what I'm doing now. But this idea has still been coming back to me of making sure that my end goal is, I'm going to be [a] professor.

Five participants within the study discussed pursuing an academic position exclusively whereas two discussed being open to other options while intending to pursue the professoriate. For example, Abigail indicated pursing an academic position in conjunction to being open to other options. Abigail explained:

Yeah, well I do intend to seek one. But I'm also open to what else might be for me. I'm a very spiritual person so I'm going to go where I feel that the position is best for me. I don't want to necessarily limit that to academia.

For Abigail, unlike the other participants who intended to pursue an academic career, her job search also included clinical positions and administrative roles. She noted, however, that the majority of her applications were for academia positions.

Also, indicating more openness in her pursuit of an academic career, Cynthia discussed intending to first pursue an adjunct position as a means to achieve her ultimate goal of an assistant professor position. She affirmed, “I do plan on starting an academic career” and in discussing her intentions around pursing an academic career noted:

I have been questioning that a lot, if I want to do just something adjunct, just to kind of get my feet wet a little bit and then move into more of like an assistant
professor [position]. That might be the route that I go, adjunct and then assistant professor.

Women ranged in the position type they desired with most indicating an interest in something that was teaching focused. Four participants expressed wanting a position that was teaching focused, one was undecided, and two indicated interest in a more research focused position. For a more detailed description of the type of academic position each participant discussed pursuing, see Table 2.

**Theme Summary.** The overarching theme *self-efficacy: I can do it!* classified participants’ beliefs of personal competence to pursue an academic career and complete academic career related tasks. It encompassed participants’ perceptions of academic career barriers and their abilities to overcome the barriers. Common anticipated barriers identified by participants included family obligations, geographical location, as well as concerns about isolation, mentorship, respect, and access to resources as it related to cultural identities such as gender, age, race, and class. Participants within the study reported an overall strong sense of self-efficacy as they identified feeling prepared for an academic career and expressed a resolve to strive for academic career positions. Participants expressed differences in their self-efficacy beliefs related to teaching, service, and research with research self-efficacy being weaker than the others. While participants expressed uncertainties about their research abilities, and identified challenges due to factors such as relocation, they still articulated a determination to pursue the professoriate. The finding illustrated by the theme *self-efficacy: I can do it!* demonstrated participants’ perceptions of being capable to occupy the professorate and determined to occupy such spaces.
Summary of Member Checks

In addition to participants’ interview narratives contributing to the study’s findings, member checks were also used to further solidify the themes identified in the study. The emerging themes and patterns of the study’s data analysis were sent to participants via an e-mailed follow-up survey. The survey included an overview of the three themes and six follow up questions that asked participants to evaluate the results and provide feedback on the themes. Examples of questions within the follow-up survey included: please share what initial thoughts, feelings, feedback or response you have to the themes identified, briefly describe to what extent these themes capture your experiences and is there anything additional that you would like to add regarding the results, research topic or your experiences. (See Appendix E for a complete listing of the survey questions).

The results of the member checks further enhanced the trustworthiness of the study’s findings. Of the study’s 13 participants, nine participants completed the follow-up survey. All nine of the participants who completed the follow-up survey affirmed the reliability and validity of the identified themes and patterns. For example, describing the accuracy of the themes in capturing her experiences, Frances explained, “These three themes accurately capture my experiences in my journey to complete my doctoral degree.” Similarly, Justine shared, “It seems like the themes echo my experiences and the literature on the topic. Nice job!” Ivy stated, “The themes accurately reflect my experience in academia. I was not surprised at all that other women of color have similar experiences.” Abigail shared, “Reading through the themes made me reflect (again) on my experience and I remembered a particular experience for each theme identified.” In
commenting on the accuracy of the themes she went on to articulate, “Captures my experiences very accurately!” Similarly, Danielle commented,

   I think these themes capture my experience almost perfectly. I think the results capture all aspects of the Black female experience in academia. The themes are accurate and in line with what I’ve heard from other black women I know.

Through the member check process, participants affirmed the identified themes and recognized the themes as not only capturing their lived experiences but also the experiences of other Black women they knew and what they had read in literature.

   In addition to commenting on the themes in general, participants also elaborated further on specific themes. For instance, Gina elaborated on higher education being a tough terrain as she talked about academia being a boys club. She shared, “When reading the themes, I was not surprised about the themes identified. Often, I have observed whiteness and male patriarchy deeply embedded in the university institutional climate.” Hazel also expanded on this theme and underlined the ways Black women occupying the professorate serves as resistance. She noted:

   My first initial thoughts about the themes are that they are all make sense. It is nice to see how you took 13 interviews and scaled down all that information into three themes. I get the sense that academia is a “boys club” and many people view it that way. To some extent, it seems like more women are starting to learn that this is an option for us and we need to gather the best information to get to the career we see fit for ourselves.
Through her commentary on the theme academia is a boys club, Hazel shed further light into Black women pursuing the professorate as empowerment and transformative resistance.

The member checks highlighted that the themes identified from the data analysis process captured participants experiences and gave voice to their lived experiences. In addition to demonstrating the trustworthiness of the findings, the member check process also highlighted participants views on the usefulness of the research. For example, Hazel commented:

This is such a great topic! I feel like you will be presenting on this topic forever or creating a training on the road to academic careers for Black women. Theme number one stating that higher ed is a tough terrain is so true, but looking at theme three, it seems as if women are willing to try to fight for their goals of being in academia, tackle social justice issues in higher ed, be role models, and more.

The influence of the self-efficacy theme identified in the study also resonated with other participants. For instance, Leah explained, “I feel my experience is represented here. The self-efficacy theme is empowering. It is a good reminder for me especially on today.” Leah went on to comment,

Thank you for doing this important research. It was an honor to participate. Seems like it could be important to follow-up with your participants in 3 to 5 years if you remain interested in this topic. I already feel as if I have grown a lot this year.

In addition to affirming the patterns identified, the member checks also served to further shape and fine-tune the themes identified in the study. That is, from the member’s
feedback, mentorship was categorized as a subtheme of access makes a difference. This emerged as several participants highlighted the accuracy of the themes but also commented on mentorship as a central factor in their experiences. For example, commenting on what she perceived as missing from the initial results, Leah shared, “The themes seem pretty accurate. Although, Theme 2 Access to Information, I thought may emphasize more the use of mentorship to prepare one for the professoriate.” She went on to note that, “similar to mentorship, building a professional community seems to be important.” Similarly, in describing how the themes captured her experiences, Gina shared:

The themes that best capture my experiences is higher education is a tough terrain, access to information makes a difference, and self-efficacy. Having black female mentors helped prepare me for the professoriate. Additionally, I benefitted from cross-cultural mentoring. I believe I can do it and am better prepared for an academic career. Although I am aware of the barriers and the uncertainties, I still want to pursue an academic career.

Given, that several participants in the follow-up survey mentioned mentorship, this feedback was used to further define the subtheme mentorship experiences in the major theme access makes a difference. It informed the emergence of mentorship as a distinct subtheme within access to information.

**Chapter Summary**

Through detailing the shared perspectives of participants within this study, this chapter described the experiences of Black female doctoral students at predominantly White institutions. The collective voices of the participants provided a greater
understanding of Black women’s academic career development and intentions. Their narratives gave insight into their perspectives of an academic career, their academic career intentions, and the factors that shaped their perspectives and intentions. The three overarching themes that captured the common experiences of participants within this study included: higher education is a tough terrain, access makes a difference and self-efficacy: I can do it!

Within the study, each woman’s story enhanced the picture of Black women’s experiences with the intersection of race and gender during their doctoral studies, their perception of the academic environment as challenging, and their self-efficacy to continue pushing forward in pursuing the professoriate. Individuals shared the multiplicity of experiences they had while enrolled in their doctoral programs detailing: the impact of White male leadership dominating the professoriate; Black female underrepresentation; the importance of access to information through, mentorship, professional development, and intentional career conversations; and Black women’s continued determination to complete their doctoral degree and pursue a full-time faculty position or leadership position within higher education. Overall, participants within the study intended to pursue a faculty career and all indicated a desire to remain in higher education despite the various perceived barriers within academe.

The next chapter, provides additional descriptions and explanations of the finding from the study. It summarizes and discusses the themes detailed in this chapter as it connects the findings to current literature and trends. Further, it discusses the implications of the findings on career development theory and practice in higher education and counseling. It details the limitations of the finding and offers recommendations for Black
female doctoral students, higher education institutions, counselor educators, and future research.
Chapter 5

Discussion

This study explored the academic career perceptions and intentions of Black female doctoral students to gain a better understanding of Black women’s academic career development. Literature has evidenced that Black women continue to make strides in doctoral degree attainment and occupying faculty and leadership positions within higher education (Green & Mabokela, 2011; Henry & Glenn, 2009; Pitt et al., 2015). Conversely, research has also revealed a need to increase the number of Black women within academic careers to counter the underrepresentation of Black women in full-time faculty positions and to promote a sizeable and visible presence of Black women in the professoriate (Pitt et al., 2015). Formulating connections to previous research, this chapter provides a summary of the findings from the current study. The findings discussed in Chapter Four informed the implications, recommendations, and suggestions for future research discussed within this chapter. The discussion is particularly relevant for faculty, doctoral students, counselors, counselor educators, and institutions of higher education.

Summary of the Study

The purpose of this qualitative study was to explore the lived experiences of a group of Black female doctoral students to better understand Black women’s academic career perceptions and intentions. The study also examined what factors shaped women’s perceptions and career intentions during the doctoral process. Grounded in a theoretical framework based on Black Feminist Thought (Collins, 2000) and Social Cognitive Career
Theory (Lent, Brown, & Hackett, 1994), the study used an interpretive paradigm to allow for the emergence of meaning from participants personal accounts.

Personal accounts within the study included the narratives from the 13 semi-structured interviews conducted with Black female doctoral students, member checks, and the reflective journal of the principal investigator. Each of the narrative accounts were transcribed and analyzed. The qualitative techniques of line-by-line open coding, constant comparison, and axial coding steered the data analysis process performed by the principal investigator and a research assistant. The coded data were further analyzed by the principal investigator to identify relevant themes. Three major themes emerged: higher education is a tough terrain, access makes a difference, and self-efficacy: I can do it!

**Discussion of Findings**

Several relevant themes revealed that Black women within this study commonly perceived academic careers as challenging yet intended to pursue academic careers as they viewed Black female representation in academia as important. The Black female doctoral students within this study felt prepared to face the challenges of an academic career as they expressed a strong sense of self-efficacy and determination to pursue and thrive in the professoriate. The findings from this study contribute to BFT research that centers the experiences of Black women and acknowledges Black women's everyday acts of resistance to various system of oppression. It serves to empower Black women as it contributes to literature that documents Black women’s continual strides in academia, history of valuing education, and resilience in the face of marginalization,
underrepresentation, and overcoming the multiplicity of barriers that impede Black women’s academic and career advancement.

In order to further explore the insights that can be gained from the voiced experiences of the participants’ doctoral process and academic career perceptions, the following connects the study’s findings to the research questions guiding the study. This study explored the experiences of Black female doctoral students to better understand: (a) What perceptions do Black female doctoral students have of an academic career?, (b) What factors shape Black female doctoral students academic career perceptions during the doctoral process?, (c) What are the academic career intentions of Black female doctoral students?, and (d) What factors influence the development of Black female doctoral student’s academic career intentions during the doctoral process? Further discussing the findings in light of these research questions deepens the understanding of Black female doctoral students’ academic career development in considering the intersectionality of their cultural identities as Black and female. Further, it illuminates information useful in the development of interventions and career support for Black female education doctoral students in pursuit of the professoriate.

What perceptions do Black female doctoral students have of an academic career? The findings of this study indicate that, generally, Black women within this study viewed higher education and an academic career as a tough terrain to navigate. Within this study, participants’ perception of an academic career as political, a struggle to balance, and still a boys’ club demonstrated ways women within the study viewed an academic career as challenging.
The perspective that within an academic career a student focus should be prioritized represented for the participants within this study their value for the teaching, student development, and service aspect of an academic career. Individuals within this study viewed the professoriate as moderately to highly political and viewed the political nature of the professorate negatively. Participants identified the misuse of power, academic hazing, the tenure process, and accessing funding as underlined with politics.

For the individuals within this study, the political environment was unappealing, frustrating, and draining. Participants felt in order to navigate the political environment they had to engage in “game playing” or hypervigilance. Common among participants were comments on the need for strategy, game playing, and being very careful, as tactics needed to navigate the political environment of an academic career. Participants discussed the emotional strain and drain of having to employ such navigation tactics. For instance, some women mentioned knowing how to engage in “game playing” but not enjoying doing so. The conceptualization of using strategy, “playing games,” and being hypervigilant, to navigate the negative political academic career environment is consistent with literature that discusses Black women’s use of various self-altering coping strategies to navigate barriers within higher education such as stereotypical images, isolation, and marginalization (Bell, 1990; Rice, 2010; Terhune, 2006).

Next, participants within the study discussed a faculty career as a continued struggle for balance. Participants perceived an academic career as encompassing a large workload and perceived balancing that large workload as an ongoing and consistent struggle. Further, individuals questioned the ability to have personal professional balance. This finding is consistent with literature such as Davidson et al. (2013) who found
graduate students perceived the research demands of a faculty position as challenging. It also supports studies such as Seldomridge (2004), who found students viewed faculty as working hard incessantly and described the faculty workload as never finished.

Also, the Black women within this study perceived a faculty career as still advantaging White men as it related to entry, access, promotion, and resources. The perception of an academic career as still a “boys’ club” informed the women in this study’s perspectives of having to work harder and that they would experience isolation, microaggressions, and difficulty accessing mentors. This view is consistent with literature that has shown that Black females experience a great deal of isolation, marginalization, and othering within academia (Alfred, 2001; Bertrand Jones et al., 2013; Ellis, 2001; Green & Mabokela, 2011; Hannon et al., 2016).

Women discussed the lack of diversity as a challenge describing growing tired of at times being “the first” or “the only.” The lack of diversity in the professoriate impacted women’s perceptions of an academic career as well as their doctoral training. It also, however, served as an opportunity for transformative justice as they sought to change the outlook of academia through their entry into the professoriate and their research as scholars. Several women talked about the importance of Black women conducting and disseminating research with academia and beyond. Women made statements such as “we belong” and “we need more women who look like us.” Thus, for Black women within this study, entry and occupation of the professoriate served as a means of resistance to the status quo in higher education.

**What factors shape Black female doctoral students academic career perceptions during the doctoral process?** The second research question asked within
this study investigated how academic career perceptions developed during the doctoral process. It looked specifically at what internal and external factors, during the doctoral process, influenced the development of Black women’s academic career perceptions. The results of this study found that women’s access to information significantly influenced their perceptions. Access was defined as occurring in two ways: vicarious learning experiences and direct learning experiences. Common among the vicarious learning experiences was observing faculty and hearing stories about other faculty and students’ academic career experiences. Observation of faculty included those within and outside one’s institution. Participants discussed the importance of acquiring academic career information from attending conferences and interacting with faculty at professional conferences. This finding is consistent with Richards et al. (2016) who found that students reported involvement in professional organizations as important to their career development.

Common in the direct learning experiences identified as important by individuals within this study were participation on research teams, writing and publishing with faculty, co-teaching and teaching as instructor on record, and conference presentations. The importance of these activities in the development of Black women’s academic career understanding is consistent with doctoral student socialization literature that explains the importance of socialization activities such as observations, interactions, and emulating behaviors of advisors, faculty members, and senior graduate students to acquire knowledge about the academic life (Jazvac-Martek, 2009).

Importantly, several women in the study identified limited opportunities to participate in various direct activities. Several women discussed having participated on
one research team, having few opportunities to write with faculty or desiring more opportunities to engage in researching, writing, and teaching with faculty. Women attributed the lacking opportunities to issues related to class, race, and gender and a lack of diverse faculty. For instance, women noted family obligations (gender), part-time student status (class), and lack of minority faculty (race) as common factors that contributed to their limited opportunities. These findings are consistent with literature which has evidenced that faculty-student mentorship differs across race and gender as it relates to faculty providing mentorship (Curtin et al., 2016; Smith, 1982). It supports Curtin et al. (2016) who found that female PhD students reported receiving less research mentoring and professional development. Also this study found female PhD students reported being advocated for less and receiving fewer introductions to their mentor’s professional networks.

The theme access makes a difference highlights the importance of cultivating equitable research opportunities, mentorship and professional development for Black female doctoral students. The cultivation of such equity requires the establishment of structural support that advance the academic and career development of Black female doctoral students throughout the doctoral process and into tenure and promotion. Attention should be given to interventions and programmatic efforts, as well as structural support that can be integrated into curriculum, institutional policy, and the academic climate. For example, programs may integrate into curriculum requirements to engage in various research activities throughout one’s doctoral program to help more systematically expose Black female doctoral students to research activities. Required activities may include identifying a research mentor, participating on a research team, having a required
number of manuscripts submitted for publication, or providing manuscript reviews for faculty and peers’ manuscripts. This approach affirms Ellis’s (2001) suggests that departments should be intentional to create opportunities for Black female doctoral students to work on research teams and in research assistant positions with faculty members. Ellis (2001) argued these opportunities should be within departments creating a culture where there is an expectation and opportunities for Black female doctoral students to publish and present at conferences. The integration of formalized research requirements not only enhances Black female doctoral students access to research opportunities but also contributes to the overall research productivity and culture of the department.

Formal opportunities for research are important as Black women within the study reported more research opportunities given to male and White students through informal opportunities and a lack of formal research opportunities available. While participants in the study reported having some opportunities for engaging in research activities through informal opportunities, they also expressed receiving less access compared to their male and White peers. Thus, not only is it important to create formal research opportunities that can be integrated into the curriculum, but it is equally important to foster collaboration and mentorship among Black female scholars. The formation of research collaborations and networks can provide more informal research opportunities and foster more research on and by Black women.

**What are the academic career intentions of Black female doctoral students?**

The discoveries from this study indicated participants in this study varied in their stated current academic career intentions with some indicating clear academic career intentions
and others indicating clear intentions not to pursue an academic career. Overall, women within the study intended to pursue an academic career and all indicated a desire to remain in higher education. Academic career intentions were heavily intertwined with an interest in teaching and impacting student development. The emphasis that women within this study placed on teaching and student development is consistent with concepts in literature such as the racial uplift ideology, which explained creating opportunities for Blacks as a motivating factor for many Black women to serve their community and dedicate their lives to educator-based roles (Berry 1982; Perkins, 1983).

The majority of women within this study had intentions on pursuing a teaching-focused position with only a few indicating an interest in a research-intensive university. While most women in the study identified intentions to pursue a full-time faculty position soon after obtaining their degree, several discussed delaying pursuits of a full-time position. Women discussed interest in adjunct positions to gain more experience. Also, women discussed delayed entry due to family obligations. Some women, however, saw these as steps to their attainment of an assistant professor position. This speaks to women’s expanded view of an academic career and following a nontraditional academic career pathway. Several women in the study talked about viewing an academic career as more than just tenure and noted intentions beyond the traditional academic career pathway.

It is important that when looking at the academic career development of Black female doctoral students, one acknowledges the conceptualization of an academic career outside of the traditional career path. For Black female doctoral students, the traditional stage-based models (e.g., Grover, 2007; Shaw & Stanton, 2012; Tinto, 1993; van Anders,
2004) may not be applicable as some women in this study did not articulate a strong adherence to the apprentice model or the pipeline conceptualization. This finding is consistent with research that has evidenced that the apprenticeship model does not account for academic careers that do not follow a linear process (Bieber & Worley, 2006) and that has criticized the failure of stage models to account for the role of systematic bias (Monroe & Chiu, 2010). These findings reiterate the importance of applying culturally informed theories to Black women’s career development and gives insight into supporting Black female doctoral students. When working with Black female doctoral students’ faculty and administrators must be aware that the doctoral process and academic career pathway for the student may differ from traditional models and what the tenured faculty member may have experienced when initially pursuing an academic career. Engaging in conversation with knowledge of the traditional models but an awareness that Black women may differ as it relates to the traditional pathway is important. Participants in this study voiced their frustrations with faculty and advisors who had a ridged view of the pathway to the professoriate. This frustration at times served to hinder career focused conversations and important career development. Research must continue to examine academic career pathways in light of the changing landscape of academia and develop culturally informed theories of career development for Black women.

**What factors influences the development of Black female doctoral student’s academic career intentions during the doctoral process?** This study revealed that participants’ academic career intentions were influenced by a sense of self-efficacy and meaningful career preparation experiences. This finding is consistent with work by
Lindholm (2004) who identified personal perceptions of competence along with undergraduate and graduate school training as two of the sources of influence related to developing an attraction to academic work. Most participants within the study reported an overall strong sense of self-efficacy and identified feeling prepared for an academic career. Women also expressed a general sense of confidence in navigating the barriers that they perceived as associated with an academic career. Most participants felt strongly about their abilities to teach and engage in service. On the contrary, many participants described less self-efficacy in their abilities to meet the research expectations of a faculty career and to balance personal and professional goals and expectations.

The differences expressed between participants’ teaching and service self-efficacy compared to their research self-efficacy underscores research that highlights the challenges Black female faculty face related to over engagement in service within the professoriate (Griffin & Reddick, 2011). Research has documented that an unbalanced commitment to service can draw faculty away from research responsibilities and hinder research productivity. This becomes problematic as within many academic institutions, tenure and promotion decisions rely heavily on excellence in research (Griffin & Reddick, 2011). In preparing Black women for entry and advancement within the professoriate, attention is needed on developing Black women’s research identity and research self-efficacy. Further it is important to explore the various structures and system that may contribute to women’s over-engagement in service and under-engagement in research.

One of the factors that contributes to Black women’s over-engagement in service is related to gendered and racialized expectations of Black women within the academy.
For example, Griffin and Reddick (2011) explored Black faculty’s heavy service commitments investigating how service work differs by gender and found that racism and sexism influence how Black faculty members mentored and engaged in service work. (Griffin & Reddick, 2011). Black women engaged in more close, personal relationships and faced high gender-based expectations of service work focused on students (Griffin & Reddick, 2011). Further, in noting these differences, Griffin and Reddick (2011) argued Black women’s positionality within academia is unique as they not only face the “black tax” but also the “female tax”. The intersectionality of Black women’s identities as Black and female inform their experiences within higher education and their preparation for academic careers. Thus, the influences of the gendered and racialized stereotypical images that pervade society, impact Black women’s academic career development. It is thought, that stereotypes that surround Black women in academic spaces contribute to the underdevelopment of Black female doctoral student’s research preparation. Women have traditionally been viewed and expected to carry out nurturing and service roles in academic spaces (Bryant et al., 2005) and it also influences how they are prepared for academic work. For Black women, however, this is further burdened by gendered and racialized stereotypes such as the mammy and superwoman that reinforces Black women’s role within academia as serving. It is expected that Black women act maternal, effectively handle multiple taxing situations, and possess no strong ambitions related to their own professional growth and achievement (Bryant et al., 2005). This was seen as participants discussed being asked to help with work that serviced the department but not being asked to participate in research and presentation opportunities. While White women may also experience some of the same gendered expectations—nurturing and
service expectations—the racialized expectations do not also accompany those experiences.

Another factor that may influence this finding is the cultural influence of the racial uplift philosophy. As indicated through participants' narratives on their perspectives of an academic career was the importance of having a student focus, contributing to student development, and serving the community through supporting students. While these roles have cultural value for Black women, they do not always equate to the same value within the academic system. It is important to understand and explore the ways in which Black women’s value for education and service through education is influenced by the racial uplift ideology. As noted earlier, the emphasis that women placed on teaching and student development is consistent with the racial uplift ideology, which explains creating opportunities for Blacks as a motivating factor for many Black women to serve their community and dedicate their lives to educator-based roles (Berry 1982; Perkins, 1983). Although the racial uplift ideology served to facilitate the work of Black women as educators, it should not be forgotten however, the burden it placed on Black women. The responsibility of taking primary charge in serving the Black community through educating Black women and children emerged as the ideology was influenced by sexism, patriarchy, and paternalism after the Civil War (Perkins, 1983). Exploring with Black female doctoral students their motivations for service work and the influence of such ideals becomes important.

In acknowledging some of the barriers related to Black female doctoral students’ research self-efficacy, it is important to identify processes and support that help Black women overcome these barriers. The stereotypes that surround Black women’s roles and
function within academia must be challenged. It becomes important for Black women to define what it means to be a Black female scholar within the role of the professoriate. Further, Black women through their research and mere presence in academia can actively engage in liberation work that dismantles oppressive and dehumanizing stereotypes.

In working to develop Black female doctoral students, faculty and administrators should seek to integrate theories, methodologies and various other research by Black female scholars into doctoral curriculum, career focused conversations and their own research. The dissemination of Black women’s research enhances their research visibility and provides an example for Black female doctoral students who may not have Black female scholars to work with on their campus. It also provides a way to dismantle the notion that Black women are not engaging in and producing quality research.

Another approach is to help Black female doctoral students better understand research as an important contribution to students and communities. Efforts should be made to help Black women connect the influence of their research not only to the scholarly body of literature and their professional field but also to the communities and students that are important for them to serve. Helpings students understand how to engage in meaningful community-based research that connects them to students, families, schools, and urban communities can help develop a greater interest and appreciation for the role of research within a faculty career. Additionally, efforts should be taken to challenge the way institutions undervalue the service contributions of Black women.

In addition to beliefs about their abilities to perform the research, service, and teaching aspects of a faculty career, participants also identified perceived barriers related to their entry and advancement in the professoriate. Common barriers identified by
women within this study included family obligations, geographical location, and concerns about isolation, mentorship, respect, and access to resources as it related to cultural identities such as gender, age, race, and class. These barriers resemble findings of Woo et al. (2017) who examined the academic career intentions of counselor education doctoral students. Their study found that women within their study ranked geographic location, family need, and work conditions as the most important variables when considering a faculty career. These variables differed, however, from men who prioritized geographic location, salary, and collegial relationships as the most important factors.

Personal initiative and advocacy surfaced as another key factor important in participants’ preparation experiences. Women discussed the importance of being present as a doctoral student as well as taking initiative. The identification of initiative and advocacy is important in light of research that has noted the influence of coping variables on academic career entry. For example, Gasser and Shaffer’s (2014) career development model made the proposition that, in order to transition effectively from graduate training into academic careers, women must have solid career coping skills. It requires both the ability and confidence to make good career decisions.

For women within this study, career focused conversations with mentors, advisors, and peer supports served to aid their academic career planning and goal setting. Most women within the study identified being able to have a meaningful career focused conversation with at least one mentor, advisor, or peer support. For some women however, such conversations were not very frequent with one woman identifying she had never had a career-focused conversation with an advisor, mentor, or peer support. In discussing the dynamics that are viewed as helpful in career-focused conversations,
participants identified discussing both the positives and negatives of an academic career as an important factor. They talked about wanting to be fully aware of what they were walking into and discussed being skeptical of career-focused conversations that only dealt with the positive and enjoyable aspects of an academic career. This emphasis by participants is important to note as Corbett (2016) highlighted that cross-racial mentoring relationships can have difficulty forming, developing, and maturing. One barrier to such formation is what Corbett (2016) terms “protective hesitation” which refers to individuals in the mentor/mentee relationship choosing to avoid addressing sensitive issues.

The importance of career focused conversations also evidenced through the impact of the study on participants. That is, the study itself served as an interventional tool and catalyst to have participants think more deeply about their career development and ideas about academia. The research design provided participants with an opportunity and space to explore with another Black female doctoral student academic career perceptions and intentions. A space to process one’s doctoral experiences and explore barriers, supports, and aspirations aids in one’s academic career development. Providing evidence of the impact of such exploration, was one participant’s self-report of planning to have a conversation with her advisor about career intentions as a direct result of discussing the topic during the study’s interview process. Moreover, in her follow-up survey this participant expressed having followed through with her plans and having engaged in a conversation with her advisor. She reported:

I finally was able to share with my advisor my thoughts about becoming a faculty member and she stated that the idea was wonderful, so we need to talk about publishing immediately. This conversation made the light bulb go on in my head.
I immediately began to think that after completing my dissertation work, I would have to start thinking very strategic about my transition from an administrator to finding my path to academia as a faculty member. Again, I have reflected on my own experiences and I am trying to plan out my next “big” move now that I am done with my doctoral work. I’m starting to feel like the road to academia is not just a job search, it like a game of chess. Every move is strategic.

The conclusion shared by this participant evidences the importance of opportunities for Black women to process their doctoral experiences giving attention to the intersections of race and gender. It notes the importance of ongoing conversations and helping students plan, prepare, and develop strategy. It also speaks to the importance of early and ongoing conversations. That is, while this participant is now looking to start publishing at the end of her doctoral journey, an earlier conversation would have helped publishing be an ongoing part of her doctoral process.

In noting the importance of career focused conversations, the three major themes from the study can be drawn upon to help generate academic career focused conversations. They provide a tool to have Black female doctoral students explore their academic career development. These questions can be posed as an individual reflective exercise, as a group reflective exercise or used as a means to guide conversations between a Black female doctoral student and her advisors or mentors. The following is an example of questions that can be posed and explored:

Theme 1: Higher Education is a tough terrain?

- What particular aspect of academia/higher education is a tough terrain for you?
• What are some specific characteristics of this terrain that make it challenging for you to navigate.

• What aspect of academia/higher education are not as tough of a terrain for you?

• What are some specific characteristics of this terrain that make it easier to navigate.

• How do your identities impact your navigation of the terrain?

Theme 2: Access makes a difference

• Do you feel you have access to the resources and support you need to successfully navigate the tough terrain(s) you identified?

• What recourses do you need access to today to aid in dealing with the tough terrain(s) you identified?

• What resources will be helpful in the future to help aid in dealing with the tough terrain(s) you identified?

• In what ways (and how often) will you access and use these resources and support?

• How do your identities impact your access, use, and understanding of the resources and support identified?

Theme 3: Self-Efficacy: I Can Do It!

• What are the motivating factors for your academic career intentions?

• In what ways have your past experiences prepared you for success?

• What strategies are working well in helping you navigate the terrain of academia?
• What strategies need refined or removed from your navigation tools?
• What barriers are important for you to develop a strategy to overcome as you navigate an academic career?

In approaching academic career focused conversations with Black female doctoral students using the themes identified in this study, faculty have an opportunity to help Black women consider their academic career from a framework centered in Black women’s lived experiences. These questions help to allow Black female doctoral students process their doctoral experiences, perceptions of academia, and understanding of their strengths and resources in navigating an academic career pathway. The themes also provide a starting point for future research to build upon in developing interventions, programs, and theories for Black women’s academic career development.

Implications

Counselor educators have opportunities to provide leadership within schools/colleges of education and faculty development offices in shaping policy and programs that support the advancement of Black women in academic careers. As counselor educators comprise a growing body of scholars, practitioners, and leaders within the field of education, their training and positionality provide a unique skillset for attending to the career development of Black women pursuing the professoriate. Informed by the findings of this study as well as similar research on Black women in higher education, counselors should be aware of the unique experiences and challenges faced by Black female doctoral students and work to create specific services, programs, and interventions designed to address the needs of Black women pursuing academic careers. For example, counselor educators may work with their institution to create
support groups for Black female doctoral students. These groups may serve as spaces where Black female doctoral students can gather to share resources, offer support and mentorship to one another, identify research collaborations, and build community. Such groups may also serve to expose Black female doctoral students to other Black women in academia through hosting Black female scholars as invited speakers and highlighting the research and publications of Black female scholars within and outside of their own institution.

Findings from this study provide important implications for the development of professional development and academic career preparation initiatives. Several participants within the study identified the importance of access to information and mentorship as it related to various aspects of applying for academic positions. Counselor educators can work with faculty development offices, career services and research offices to design and implement programs that target providing Black female doctoral students with professional development opportunities. Such initiatives may include opportunities for Black female doctoral students to practice salary negotiations, discuss the various aspects of a faculty position that can be negotiated, hear faculty give job talks, practice giving job talks, and practice sharing their research agenda.

In light of the current research, education programs must examine how they offer support and career development for Black female doctoral students. The examination should include a consideration of programmatic support such as mentoring programs, research retreats, and curriculum that provides access to academic career development information. For example, programs should integrate academic career topics such as balancing the workload, maintaining family and career, developing research networks,
and navigating underrepresentation into the doctoral curriculum. For many participants in the study, a lack of access to opportunities for research and scholarly publications was identified. Participants described research as an area where they desired to have more experience and confidence. As such, programs should seek to implement support programs that strive to expand Black female doctoral students’ access to and experience with research. Initiatives can include research retreats, workshops, brown bag seminars, or the like that have sessions on grant writing and funding research, getting published, serving as a peer reviewer for a journal, identifying and using research mentors, and working effectively on research teams. Discussion on research should also include attention to Black female scholars, critical theories, and theories based on the experiences of underrepresented populations. Including such topics helps to outline the importance of Black female doctoral students’ own research interests as many participants within this study articulated concerns about the perception of their research because their work often focused on underrepresented populations.

As faculty advisors play a key role in Black female doctoral student’s navigation of the doctoral process, attention should be given to providing faculty with advising training. This training should incorporate ways to explore academic career development with Black female doctoral students including how to address both academic career intentions and perceptions, and how to broach topics of race, gender, and class with advisees. In working with Black female doctoral students, advisors and higher education professionals should: seek to establish a trusting and supportive relationship; be willing to explore the positive and negative aspects of academic careers; discuss issues related to marginalization, invisibility, and hypervisibility; be consistent in asking about career
intentions throughout the course of the doctoral process; and process with students the impact of various direct and vicarious learning experiences. As indicated by participants in this study, open and honest conversations with mentors and advisors about the advantages and disadvantages of academic careers help Black women feel prepared to deal with academic career challenges.

Additionally, the findings from this study have implications for the development of a theory of academic career development for Black women. Research should continue to explore the nuances of Black women’s academic career development identifying and outlining the systems and structures that advance Black women’s academic career preparation, representation, retention, tenure and promotion. This study has provided some insights into the factors that influence Black women’s academic perspective and intentions. It highlighted that Black women may not follow traditional academic career pathways and that engaging in early and ongoing academic career focused conversations that address cultural barriers Black women face within academia is important. These findings provide helpful insight into further exploring the needs and experiences of Black female doctoral student and theory development may focus on the relational nature of Black women’s academic development.

**Recommendations**

Constructed from the results and implications of this study, several recommendations are proposed to facilitate Black women’s academic career pursuits, improve the doctoral experiences of Black female doctoral students at PWIs, and support the increased representation, success, and promotion of Black women in full-time faculty
positions. Suggestions are offered for Black female doctoral students and university and academic departments.

**Black female doctoral students.** It is useful for Black female doctoral students to initiate career-focused conversations with advisors, mentors, and peer supports throughout the doctoral process. Career-focused conversations should occur early and frequently. Black female doctoral students should get involved in professional organizations and networks including attending conferences, volunteering, and taking advantage of leadership opportunities and development. Also, they should seek to develop a mentoring network that is comprised of people at various stages in the academic career process. This should include seeking out as mentors and support academic career professionals beyond one’s field and institution. As a Black female doctoral student, one should recognize that Black female underrepresentation in higher education may necessitate identifying allies and mentors that may be culturally different. Black female doctoral students should also identify and seek out research opportunities and research collaborations and be willing to take a leadership role in creating research teams and initiatives. Black female doctoral students should advocate for themselves and remember to engage in regular healthy self-care to aid in navigating the challenges of academia.

**Faculty, academic departments, and higher education institutions.**

Universities and departments should encourage and implement practices that promote healthy self-care and wellness among faculty. This should include universities critically examining practices and policies that promote self-care in word but not in deed. Further, departments should consider investing in resources that promote self-care, mindfulness,
and multiple dimensions of wellness within their faculty. Faculty should keep in mind that engaging in healthy self-care and wellness not only benefits their health and productivity but models to doctoral students how balance, wellness, and self-care actualize within an academic career.

Another recommendation is for universities to implement policies and practices that reward and incentivize faculty for tasks such as student advocacy, mentoring, teaching, and community related service. The implementation of equitably rewarding advocacy, teaching, and service can help to address the perception that universities reward and value research, publications, and grant funding over service, student development, and teaching. Similarly, institutions of higher education should implement programs and resources that provide safe spaces for Black women to gather collectively to discuss career development, intentions, and strategies. Further, institutions should develop structured opportunities for all students to engage in mentorship and meaningful research and teaching experiences.

When working with Black female doctoral students as an advisor or mentor, faculty and administrators should continually ask about career intentions and process with students the impact of various direct and vicarious learning experiences. Faculty should be aware that career intentions shift throughout the doctoral process and some students may be uncomfortable bringing up their own shifting career intentions. Programs should seek to integrate academic career topics such as salary negotiation, dealing with students’ parents, and navigating balance into the doctoral curriculum. Further, graduate schools should consider establishing doctoral development offices that
serves to nurture and develop leadership, research excellence, mentorship, advocacy, and support for doctoral students.

Limitations

This qualitative study provided insight into the academic career development of Black female education doctoral students attending PWIs. The study voiced the 13 participants’ doctoral process and academic career goals by exploring their self-reported experiences and perceptions. Given the exploratory nature of the study, the findings cannot be generalized to all Black female doctoral students attending PWIs. The purpose of the study, however, was to examine the specific meanings and interpretations the Black female doctoral students within this study ascribed to their experiences. Although the findings are not generalizable, the study incorporated multiple women’s perspectives. Further, strategic steps were taken and outlined to provide a thick and robust description of the participants and the research process. For example, some of the descriptive elements included a detailed account of the research context and setting, recruitment strategy and timeframe, inclusion and exclusion criteria, interview procedures and questions, and a description of the sample including sample size, and demographics. The thick descriptions included within this study provide a context for judging the application of the study’s findings to other settings, context, and populations. It is important that conclusions about the transferability of this study be made taking into full consideration the specific context and procedures that informed this study (Amankwaa, 2016; Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

In contemplating the application of the study’s findings, several considerations should be noted. First, although this study explores academic career intentions, it does not
account for actual career decisions. Consequently, although women within this study articulated their intentions, it cannot be assumed that all intentions will result in direct action. It was outside of the scope of this study to examine participants’ actual academic career choice. Second, although participants in this study attended PWIs in various locations, no participant reported attending a doctoral program located in the Western or Northwestern regions of the United States. Further, only one participant reported attending an institution in the Southwest. As such, the findings in this study are derived largely from women attending institutions located in the Midwestern, Northeastern, and Southeastern regions of the United States. The dynamics and perceptions of doctoral training experiences and academic careers may differ in other regions throughout the United States.

Third, this study explored the experiences of a relatively small sample of women attending on-site/face-to-face doctoral programs. Women attending online and hybrid doctoral programs were not represented in this study. Likewise, the study only looked at women in education doctoral programs. Another characteristic of the sample that should be taken into consideration is the large representation of first generation doctoral students. Twelve of the 13 participants in this study identified as first-generation doctoral student. The impact of being the first in one’s family to pursue a doctoral degree no doubt has an impact on the participant’s experiences. For instance, participants talked about family not understanding the doctoral process and feelings as if they lived in two different worlds. Being a first-generation doctoral student placed participants in the position to rely solely on support programs, advisors, faculty and mentors to navigate the academic process. In programs and institutions that offered little support, first-generation
doctoral student did not have family that could serve as a source of doctoral and academic career guidance. Students that are not first-generation doctoral student may have additional social capital and resources within their family to help navigate the doctoral and academic career process.

A fourth limitation to consider is attributable to the research methods. Although the study incorporated both face-to-face and telephone interviews, only one interview occurred face-to-face and although the telephone interviews allowed for the widening of geographical access, it also eliminated visual interaction and the use of body language and facial expression to aid in the conveying and confirming of messages (Irvine, Drew, & Sainsbury, 2013). Further, some technology connectivity limitations impeded communication, for example, some participants had to relocate during the interview to gain a better signal or experienced a drop call during the interview. Such may have influenced the rapport between the researcher and participant. At the same time, however, the use of telephone interviews reduced visual distractions and/or bias that could have emerged related to the age, status, gender, physical appearance, or behavior of the researcher during the interview process (Volg, 2013).

A final factor to consider when assessing the transferability of this study’s findings relates to the identity and role of the researcher. As an African American female, enrolled in a Counselor Education Doctoral program at a Midwestern PWI, my identity and experiences provide me with an insider’s perspective. As a current doctoral student in the midst of making decisions around pursuing an academic career, I am keenly aware of the challenges I have faced as well as my own past and current experiences as an African American female doctoral student. Although I used various checks and balances
throughout the research process (research assistant, researcher field journal, and member checks), it is important to acknowledge that it is possible for the values and beliefs of the researcher to influence participants.

Relative to the number of Black women pursuing doctoral degrees at PWIs and who earn doctoral degrees in Education programs, the sample size of this study is small. The intent, however, was not to produce results that could be generalized on a large scale. The purpose in this basic qualitative research study was to explore and give voice to the lived experiences of Black female education doctoral students attending PWIs. The study sought and achieved saturation among the 13 participants. Saturation was initially reached from the first 10 interviews and two additional interviews were conducted to confirm saturation.

**Suggestions for Future Research**

The current study looked at a very specific group of doctoral students, Black female on-site education doctoral students at PWIs. Findings from the study revealed a number of themes which could be further investigated in a larger and wider sample. Future research should consider exploring the academic career perceptions and intentions of samples that include online students, hybrid students, and doctoral students from a wide range of academic disciples. Such studies should explore how academic career perceptions and intentions compare across these populations. Additionally, the career intentions of Black female doctoral students across institutional types should be explored. Future research should explore how the type of school may impact career decision-making. For example, a study may examine the academic career intentions of Black female doctoral students including participants from historically Black colleges and
universities, research intensive universities, teaching focused universities. Including a sample that includes varying institution types can provide insight into how academic career intention differ among students attending universities with different institution classification types.

Another area for future research is a longitudinal study that would provide more in-depth analysis of the progression of Black female doctoral students’ career intentions and perceptions throughout the doctoral process and into career choice, attainment, and advancement. Although the current study looked at career intentions, which provided insight into career choice, intentions may not equate to actual behavior. A longitudinal study could explore doctoral student academic career intentions across time and their actual career choice. Such studies could trace academic career perceptions and intentions from the start of one’s doctoral process, interviewing participants at various time intervals throughout their doctoral journey. For example, a study might identify incoming doctoral students conducting an initial interview at the beginning of their doctoral program and then continuing to engage in interviews at the end of each semester or academic year through the course of their pursuit of the doctoral degree and initial career choice. Conducting interviews at such time intervals can help to better isolate changes over time and understand differences between intentions and actual career choices.

Further, it could provide insight on Black women’s academic career development encompassing academic career development milestones such as entry, tenure, opportunities for continued advancement, and retirement.

A third direction for future research could be a comparative study between doctoral student’s perceptions of an academic career and current faculty’s descriptions of
their academic career. For example, within the current study, one participant described viewing a faculty member’s experience as “challenging to watch” and then expressed questions around her perception being what is actually experienced by faculty—“I don't know if it's challenging for those professors to go through.” Gaining insight into how students perceive an academic career compared to those in academic positions could provide valuable information in understanding how faculty roles are experienced by faculty and then communicated and understood by doctoral students. Further, understanding what areas faculty differ from students regarding how they perceive the professoriate would be important to give attention to how differences and perception may impact mentorship, advising, and the career development.

An unexpected outcome of this study was that some participants reported an intention to have conversations with advisers, mentors, and/or peers, about career intentions as a direct result of discussing the topic of career intentions during the study’s interview process. As this study used individual interviews, future research may seek to incorporate focus group interviews in addition to individual interviews to see what influence talking about career intentions during the research process may have on participants. Future research should also investigate the effectiveness of various interventions that enable Black women to gather and discuss their career interest, intentions, and choices.

Conclusion

This study contributes to the current body of literature on Black female doctoral students’ doctoral experiences and academic career development by confirming and identifying the factors that impact their academic career intentions and development.
Black female doctoral students gendered, and racial identities informed their doctoral experiences, perception of academia and intentions to pursue the professoriate in important ways that should be acknowledged by faculty, administration, and others looking to support the academic and leadership advancement of Black women. The study highlighted the necessity of culturally informed mentorship and faculty development programs that focus on providing Black women with research experience, faculty mentors, and career development to aid in Black women feeling prepared for faculty careers. Thus, this study not only explored the lived experiences of Black female doctoral students but examined themes across the participants’ doctoral process to identify and bring awareness to the norms and behaviors both of Black female doctoral students and within higher education that support and enhance the academic career development of Black women. The study also served a liberating function as it critiqued the systems and structures within the doctoral process and higher education that exert an oppressive and dehumanizing force on Black women’s doctoral experiences and academic career development. Further, the study called for liberating and socially conscious curriculum, programmatic support, and institutional policies and practices to advance the academic career preparation, representation, retention, and successful tenure and promotion of Black women in academia.
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Informed Consent for Participation in Research Activities

Pursuing the Professoriate: Exploring the Academic Career Development of Black Female Doctoral Students at Predominantly White Institutions

Participant: ____________________________ HSC Approval Number __________________

Principal Investigator: Jennifer D. Culver  PI’s Phone Number: 314-884-1842

1. You are invited to participate in a research study conducted by Jennifer D. Culver, M.A., Doctoral Candidate and Angela Coker, Ph.D., Faculty Advisor, at the University of Missouri–St. Louis in the Department of Education Sciences and Professional Programs. The purpose of this research is to explore the experiences of Black female doctoral students enrolled in education doctoral programs to gain an understanding of their academic career intentions and doctorate process.

2. a) Your participation will involve:
   a) Engaging in a one-on-one interview conducted by the principal investigator, Jennifer Culver. During the interview, you will be asked to respond to several questions about your doctoral education and career intentions.
      • The interview will take place at a location convenient and comfortable for you and will be audio-recorded.
      • The interview duration will last approximately 60-90 minutes.
   b) Completing one follow-up survey administered electronically to review study results and provide your thoughts and feedback on the initial findings.
      • You will be provided with a copy of the research results and asked to share your feedback in an online survey format.
      • The survey will take approximately 15-20 minutes.

Up to 20 women will participate in this research project. All interviews will be audio-recorded and transcribed by a professional transcription service who will sign a non-disclosure agreement to keep all materials confidential. All transcripts, recordings, and other material related to the study will be kept in a secured location and on a password-protected computer that is stored in a secure location.
b) The total length of time for participation in this study is approximately 75-110 minutes (60-90 minute interview; 15-20 minute follow-up survey) and you will receive a $25 gift card for your time.

3. There may be certain discomforts associated with this research. It may be possible that talking about certain experiences around doctoral education and career intentions may bring up difficult or uncomfortable feelings. If you wish to discontinue your participation in the interview at any time, for any reason, please notify me immediately.

4. There is no direct benefit to you taking part in this study, other than the potential personal satisfaction you might gain in participating in the interview experience and reflecting on your own experiences with doctoral education and career decisions. It is hoped that the results of this study will help counselors and other helping professionals understand the ways in which the doctoral process impacts Black women academic career development.

5. Your participation is voluntary and you may choose not to participate in this research study or withdraw your consent at any time, for any reason. If you want to withdraw from the study, you can contact me at jdcbq6@mail.umsl.edu or 314-884-1842. You may choose not to answer any questions that you do not want to answer. You will NOT be penalized in any way should you choose not to participate or withdraw.

By agreeing to participate, you understand and agree that your data may be shared with other researchers and educators in the form of presentations and/or publications. In all cases, your identity will not be revealed. In rare instances, a researcher's study must undergo an audit or program evaluation by an oversight agency (such as the Office for Human Research Protection). That agency would be required to maintain the confidentiality of your data. In addition, all data will be stored on a password-protected computer and/or in a locked office.

6. If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study, or if any problems arise, you may call the Investigator, Jennifer Culver, M.A. at (314) 884-1842 or the Faculty Advisor, Angela Coker, Ph.D. at (314) 516-6088. You may also ask questions or state concerns regarding your rights as a research participant to the Office of Research, at (314) 516-5897.

I have read this consent form and have been given the opportunity to ask questions. I will also be given a copy of this consent form for my records. I hereby consent to my participation in the research described above.

Participant's Signature __________________________ Date ______________

Signature of Investigator or Designee __________________________ Date ______________
Appendix B

Recruitment Message

Greetings!

You are being invited to participate in a study examining the experiences of Black female doctoral students enrolled in education doctoral programs. This qualitative study aims to explore the experiences of Black female doctoral students to gain an understanding of their academic career perceptions and intentions. The study is being conducted using auto-recorded, semi-structured face-to-face, telephone, or video interviews (e.g.-Zoom, Google Hangouts). The interviews will last between 60 to 90 minutes and will focus on understanding your academic career intentions and experience as a Black female engaged in the doctoral process. You will also be contacted at a later time following the interview to complete a 15-20 minute follow-up survey providing feedback on the study’s findings. For participating in the study, you will receive a $25 gift cards for completing the interview.

Eligibility for participation in the study include the following criteria:

1. 18 years of age or older
2. identify as a female doctoral student of African diaspora descent
3. currently enrolled in an on-site education doctorate degree seeking program in the United States
4. have completed all doctoral coursework.

If you are interested in participating, please use the hyperlink below to complete the screening questionnaire.

This study serves a significant purpose in understanding the experiences of Black female doctoral students and their perceptions of academic careers.

If you have any questions about the study or about participation in the study, please contact Jennifer D. Culver (Principal Investigator) jdcbo6@mail.umsl.edu or Dr. Angela Coker (Faculty Advisor) cokera@umsl.edu.

It is our hope that you will participate in the study and contribute to the voicing of Black women’s experiences.
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Participant Screening Questionnaire

Demographic Information:

- Name
- Age
- Ethnicity
- Gender

Contact Information:

- Email Address
- Telephone Number

Degree and Institution Information:

- What type of doctoral program are you in?
- When did you start your doctoral studies?
- Estimated graduation year:
- Enrollment status in your program
  - Full-time
  - Part-time
- How would your program be classified?
  - Online Program
  - Face-to-Face
- Progress in program
  - Completed all coursework
  - Completed all coursework & Comprehensive Exams
  - Completed all coursework, Comprehensive Exams and Dissertation Proposal
- Location of Institution (Select all that apply)
  - Northeast
  - Southwest
  - West
  - Southeast
  - Midwest
  - Urban Setting
  - Rural Setting
If you know any other Black female doctoral students who may like to participate in this study, please consider forwarding the study information to them.

Thank you for completing the Participant Screening Questionnaire. Your information will be reviewed assessing the participation criteria and current participants. If selected to participate, you will be contacted by the researcher to schedule an interview time based on the preferences you listed. Also, please note that before the start of the interview process, you will be given an opportunity to ask questions and consent to participation in the study. Should you have any questions before being contacted, please contact Jennifer Culver (Principal Investigator) at jdcbq6@mail.umsl.edu.
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Interview Protocol

Demographic Questions:
1. How do you identify?
   – Age
   – Ethnicity
   – Gender
   – Sexual Orientation
   – Employment Status
   – Social Class Status
   – Marital Status
2. Do you have children?
3. Principal source of income during the doctoral process?
   – How did you fund your doctoral education?
4. What is your family education/higher education history?
   – Who in your family has a doctoral degree?
   – Do any members of your family work in academia?

Perceptions
5. What is your current understanding/perception of a career in academia?
6. How has your understanding/perception of an academic career changed/developed during the doctoral process?
7. What is appealing about an academic career?
8. What is unappealing about an academic career?

Influence of doctoral process (perceptions)
9. What during the doctoral process has shaped your understanding/perception of an academic career? (What experiences, people, information)
10. What are specific times/circumstances during your doctoral process where you noticed shifts in your thinking about an academic career?

Academic career intentions
11. Do you intend to pursue a career in academia? Why or Why not?
12. What are your career intentions within academia? (Position type; institutional type)

Influence of doctoral process (intentions)
13. What factors during the doctoral process have contributed to your decision to pursue/not pursue an academic career?
14. What are specific times/circumstances during your doctoral process where you noticed shifts in your intent to pursue an academic career?

Support
15. What type of apprenticeship opportunities have you had? (Graduate assistantships, Research teams, Mentorships)
16. What conversations have you had with your advisor or mentor(s) about your intentions to pursue an academic career.

17. Did you seek any support services on campus or in your program of study? If so, what were they? Were they helpful?

18. Is there anything else that you would like to share about your experiences or career intentions?
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Follow Up Questionnaire

Thank you for your previous participation in the Pursuing the Professoriate Research Study. The time you took to interview was greatly appreciated. The following provides a summary of the results from the analysis of the 13 interviews conducted for the study. Please review the results and provide feedback on the findings?

**Theme 1: Higher Education is a Tough Terrain** - women within the study viewed an academic career as challenging and a demanding environment to navigate.

- The academic environment is political
- The academic environment is a continual struggle for balance (balancing workload; balancing personal-professional
- Academia is still a boy’s club
- Whiteness and maleness embody the professoriate.
- It is difficult not to see a lot of people that look like me
- Black female representation is important.
- A student focus should be prioritized
- Seeing students learn and develop is the best part.
- Perceived conflicts between prioritizing students and institutional practices.

**Theme 2: Access to Information Makes a Difference** - women within the study referenced the importance of gaining information about academic life through participation in various learning and professional development activities. This theme defined the ways access (or lack of access) to various information during the doctoral process, altered or solidifying perceptions, expectations, and views of an academic career.

- Direct learning experiences
- Research experiences.
- Teaching experiences
- Professional development experiences.
- Vicarious learning experiences.
- Faculty observations.
- Shared stories (stories shared about faculty, their experiences, consequences, success, struggles)
- Career focused conversations (intentional conversations related to career goals, planning, and considerations)

**Theme 3: Self-efficacy: I can do it!** - this theme defined women’s beliefs about the ability to meet the expectations of an academic career and overcome the barriers associated with an academic career. The category ranged from a weak sense of self-efficacy to a strong sense of self-efficacy. Most participants within the study reported an overall strong sense of self-efficacy as they identified feeling prepared for an academic
careers and confidence in navigating the barriers they perceived associated with an academic career. Women within the study had a strong sense of self and the ability to anticipate academic career challenges.

- I can do it! (Women discussed feeling prepared for an academic career. Women identified strengths related to an academic career. Women had a strong awareness of barriers and uncertainties related to an academic career)
- Determined to try. (Women who identified an intent to pursue the professoriate identified barriers but despite barriers and a tough academic terrain were determined to pursue a full-time faculty position)
- I’m on the fence, delayed intent. (Women were on the fence between pursuing an academic career full-time or another position within higher education)
- The professoriate does not interest me. (Women intended to pursue a career in higher education but did not have an interest in full-time faculty work)

Please answer the following questions:

1. Please share what initial thoughts, feelings, feedback or responses you have to the themes identified.

2. Briefly describe to what extent these themes capture your experiences.

3. From your perspective, is there anything missing from the results?

4. Are there any themes that surprised you?

5. Is there anything additional that you would like to add regarding the results, research topic (Black female doctoral students pursuing academic careers), or your experiences.
Appendix F

Department of Education Sciences and Professional Programs

One University Blvd.
St. Louis, Missouri 63121-4499
Telephone: 314-884-1842
E-mail: jdcbq6@mail.umsl.edu

Nondisclosure/Confidentiality Agreement

Pursuing the Professoriate: Exploring the Academic Career Development of Black Female Doctoral Students at Predominantly White Institutions (HSC Approval Number: 1158768-1)

Principal Investigator: Jennifer D. Culver  PI’s Phone Number: 314-884-1842

I have been hired to transcribe audio recorded interviews into text for Principal Investigator, Jennifer D. Culver.

I agree to:

1. keep all the research data shared with me confidential by not discussing or distributing the research information in any form or format (e.g., disks, tapes, transcripts) with anyone other than the Principal Investigator, Jennifer Culver

2. keep all research data in any form or format (e.g., disks, tapes, transcripts) secure while it is in my possession.

3. return all research information in any form or format (e.g., disks, tapes, transcripts) to the Principal Investigator, Jennifer Culver when I have completed the research tasks.

4. after consulting with the Principal Investigator, Jennifer Culver, erase and/or destroy all research information in any form or format regarding this research project that is not returnable to the Principal Investigator, Jennifer Culver (e.g., information stored on computer hard drive).

Service Provider Signature  Date

Signature of Investigator or Designee  Date

The plan for this research study has been reviewed and approved by The University of Missouri Institutional Review Board (IRB Number: 1158768-1). For questions regarding ethical conduct of research, you may contact the he University of Missouri-St. Louis, Office of Research, at (314) 516-5897.