THE EFFECTS OF SOCIALIZATION AND RACIAL IDENTITY ON DOCTORAL

SUPERSTARDOM

by

CASSAUNDRA LINETTE GOVAN

(Under the Direction of Edward Anthony Delgado-Romero)

ABSTRACT

Many faculty members differentiate between superlative doctoral students and average doctoral students. However, distinctions between superstardom and just completing the degree requirements are not as clear cut for most novice doctoral students but the benefits of being a superstar are far greater (Bloom & Bell, 1979). Additionally, researchers have posited that socialization into doctoral programs is a significant predicator of success for doctoral students' of African descent (Ellis, 1997; Nettles, 1990; Turner & Thompson, 1993). Although the existing literature acknowledges significant differences between African American and European American students in their socialization experiences, there is a paucity of insight about how doctoral students' of African descent who attend Predominantly White Institutions experiences differ from their counterparts at Historically Black Colleges and Universities. In addition, the literature lacks information about how students' of African descent doctoral experiences are related to their racial identity. The purpose of this study is to examine the effects race and the socialization process on African American doctoral students as it relates to their perception of possessing attributes of doctoral superstardom. Furthermore, the research presented here attempted to examine the following superstardom qualities: visibility, reflection of program

values, professor relationships, and the "W" factor (ability to make faculty feel valuable and satisfied with their decision to invest in this student's future in a given profession, easy to work with, learn quickly, and receive and process feedback well) for current relevance and validity. The findings suggest that racial identity and socialization effect a doctoral student's perception of possessing attributes of superstardom. It was also found that there are differences in the socialization process of students who attend HBCUs and their counterparts at PWIs. Additionally, the findings suggest that the attributes of superstardom have changed over time.

INDEX WORDS: doctoral superstardom, socialization, racial identity, doctoral experience, CRIS, HBCU, PWI

THE EFFECTS OF SOCIALIZATION AND RACIAL IDENTITY ON DOCTORAL

SUPERSTARDOM

by

CASSAUNDRA LINETTE GOVAN

B.B.A., The University of Georgia, 2001

M.S., Georgia State University, 2006

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial

Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2012

THE EFFECTS OF SOCIALIZATION AND RACIAL IDENTITY ON DOCTORAL

SUPERSTARDOM

by

THE EFFECTS OF SOCIALIZATION AND RACIAL IDENTITY ON DOCTORAL

SUPERSTARDOM

Major Professor: Edward A. Delgado-Romero

Committee: Linda F. Campbell
                     Louis A. Castenell
                     Alan E. Stewart

Electronic Version Approved:

Maureen Grasso
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia

August 2012

DEDICATION

I dedicate this dissertation to my family, especially my father. Dad, although we did not

have the traditional father daughter relationship, I know that you were one of my biggest fans. I

know that if you were here, you would be in the stands at graduation with your chest out smiling.

I wish I had the opportunity to let you know just how much I loved you and understood you. And

more than anything, I wish you were here to be with me on my graduation day. Well dad, I did

you proud! Your life will forever have meaning as you birthed a budding superstar!

I thought of you today, but that is nothing new. I thought about you yesterday and days

before that too. I think of you in silence, I often speak your name. All I have are memories and a

picture in a frame. Your memory is a keepsake from which I'll never part. God has you in his

arms; I have you in my heart.

> You may have thought I didn't see,
> Or that I hadn't heard,
> Life lessons that you taught to me,
> But I got every word.
> Perhaps you thought I missed it all,
> And that we'd grown apart,
> But Dad, I picked up everything,
> It's written on my heart.

In loving memory of Walter LeBlanc Trimble, Jr.

v

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to take this time to first acknowledge my family. My husband, Jamell

Govan, has been with me on this journey since day one. While this road has not been an easy one

to travel, I appreciate you for sticking with me and seeing me through. Not many marriages

survive doctoral programs and we did it, together! I love you Mell, you earned this degree just as

much as I did! Thank you for seeing my dream, believing in me, and helping me follow my

heart.

Jamin and Jamia, you were mommy's inspiration. When I did not feel like going on, I

looked at your beautiful, innocent faces and gained energy and motivation to continue. Your

strength gave me drive and courage. I hope that this journey I have taken and successfully

completed, paves the way for you to realize that your dreams can come true. I pray that my

accomplishments will open up doors for you and that life will be a little sweeter. You both are

troopers and I thank you for sticking with mommy through the tough times. I love you both "all

the day"!

Momma, what can I say? You were determined to see me through to the end and you did

just that! You were my friend, my parent, and my prayer warrior. I thank you and love you more

than words can express. You life too, will forever have meaning as you birthed a bright and

shining superstar.

Many people enter your life for a reason, a season, or a life time. It is my belief that God

knows exactly what we need and when we need it. I would like to thank the many people that

entered my life for a reason or a season. I recognize that you too played a role in helping me to

accomplish my goals. I would like to also thank my friends and family who have been and will be in my life for a life time, especially my best friend Andrea Wattree. Andrea, friend is an understatement. You are my sister from another mother. You were and still are my biggest, loudest, most enthusiastic cheerleader! You encouraged me, prayed for and with me, laughed with me, cried with me, and cheered me on to victory. I can never repay you, for your friendship is priceless. I hope that my sincere thanks is a start toward expressing how much gratitude and love I hold in my heart for you.

I also would like to sincerely thank The University of Georgia's Counseling Psychology faculty and staff. I would like to give a special thank you to my major professor, Dr. Edward Delgado-Romero. Dr. D-R, you have supported and encouraged me through this program from the beginning. If it were not for you, I am not sure I would have been able to continue to face the challenges and adversities that I experienced while in the program. Thank you for always affirming me as a person of color, a woman, a mother, a wife and a student. Thank you and your family for supporting me and my family during one of my most challenging and difficult times, the miraculous birth of Jamin. I will never forget the love and support that your family displayed during that time. And although I am entering into the realm of being your colleague, I will forever look to you as my mentor. I hope and pray that I will continue to make you proud to be my major professor!

I would also like to thank my committee members, Dr.'s Linda Campbell and Alan Stewart and Dean Louis Castenell, Jr. Dr. Campbell, not often do we meet a person who drives us to our potential. I thank God that for me, that person was you. I often questioned my ability to successfully navigate and complete this program and you ALWAYS gave me words of encouragement. You were there for me when I was not sure if I belonged and you reassured me

that I had a few great people on my side. Because of you, I became determined not to give up. I will always remember the time you took out of your busy schedule to come up to the hospital and sit with me and my family while Jamin was recovering. Not only did you visit, but you held Jamin and sang to him! This act of kindness is one that I hold near and dear to my heart. It showed me the sincerity of your words and thoughts of me. I pray that I will always exemplify the great qualities that you see in me and continue to be the type of person that a person of your caliber can be proud of.

Dr. Stewart, thank you for your continued support both personally, professionally and academically. Knowing that you were determined to see me succeed, gave me permission not to fail. I greatly appreciate you taking time to come and visit me and Jamin in the hospital. Your presence, anecdotes, and acts of kindness made all of the difference. Every doctoral student should have a faculty member like you on their side!

And last but not least, Dean Castenell. When I met you I was broken and discourage. I was experiencing challenges both personally and academically. You created a safe space for me to come in and poor my heart out to you. You continued to check in with me and make sure that things were running smoothly. You will never know the relief I experienced when you offered to be on my dissertation committee! Finally, someone who I did not have to ask for help! That experience has been invaluable to me and I am forever in your debt! I will continue to strive for excellence and make you proud to have mentored me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPENDICES

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Background and Context

Much of the research on successful African American students' experiences in college has been focused on undergraduates (Allen, Epps, & Haniff, 1991; Beckham, 1988; Fleming, 1984; Gandara & Maxwell- Jolly 1999; Nettles, 1988). In addition, there have been many studies conducted on the effects of and influences of socialization at the undergraduate level but there is a scarcity of literature that focuses on the effects of graduate student socialization and more specifically, African American graduate student socialization (Gardner, 2005). African Americans remain underrepresented as students, faculty, and administrators. They are still invisible women and men in opposition to the conditions of an American educational system where education is a principal path toward upward mobility and higher salary (Adair, 2001). Taking into account that graduate degrees are the new requirement for achieving employment opportunities that allow one to attain middle class status, graduate education has even more significance for African Americans whose economic status is far behind that of Caucasian Americans (Adair, 2001; Bowen & Bok, 1998; Gurin, Dey, Hurtado, & Gurin, 2002; Yasso, Parker, Solórzano, & Lynn, 2004).

Increasing enrollments among African Americans can be observed throughout education (National Center for Education Statistics [NCES], 2009). However, this racial group continues to attain degrees at significantly lower rates than their peers (Gandara & Contreras, 2009; Solórzano, Rivas, & Velez, 2005; Yosso, 2006). Doctoral degree attainment is a prime example.

In 2007, the enrollment of black doctoral students was 11.5% (NCES, 2008). In that same year only 6% of doctoral degrees were awarded to African American. An apparent gap between enrollment, persistence, and attainment exists in the doctoral education of students of African descent. While increasing enrollment of racially diverse students in doctoral programs is important and a necessary ongoing effort, scholars must do a better job at understanding the experiences of doctoral students of African descent, particularly those that might contribute to or prevent these students' persistence and graduation (Castellanos, Gloria, & Kamimura, 2006; Gay, 2004; Gonz´alez, 2006; Gonz´alez, 2007; Pruitt-Logan, Gaff, & Jentoft, 2002).

Understanding doctoral student success is important as only fifty percent of those students who enter doctoral education actually complete the degree (Renn & Jessup-Anger, 2008). More specifically, studying doctoral student of African descent success is particularly essential as understanding the experiences of students of African descent is crucial to supporting their persistence through doctoral programs (Gasman, Hirschfeld, Vultaggio, 2008). Students of African descent have been severely underrepresented among graduate students and doctoral degree recipients in the United States (Nettles, 1990). Focus on doctoral students of African descent is also important because while the numbers of minority students obtaining advanced degrees has increased, the rate at which students of African descent successfully complete their doctoral program is at a lower rate than that of any other minority group (Planty, et. al., 2008; Chenoweth, 1998).

The U.S. Department of Education did not begin reporting data on graduate education of underrepresented minorities until 1976. The first report showed that African Americans and Latinos represented 16% of the American population, yet only 6% to 7% of the graduate enrollment and 5% of doctorates were awarded each year (National Board of Graduate

Education, 1976; Nettles & Millet, 2006). The committee's first report concluded that it was important for African Americans to participate in graduate education and obtain graduate degrees. The committee suggested that increasing African American participation in this venture should be a national objective for the benefit of social, economic, intellectual and cultural well-being.

Between 1977 and 2000, African Americans had the smallest increase (3.8% to 4.8%) in doctorate recipients when compared to other underrepresented ethnic groups (Latino/as: 1.6% to 3.1% and Asians, 2.0% to 5.1%) (Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System, 2000; Nettles & Millett, 2006). According to Nunez (2003), the low numbers of African Americans pursuing doctoral degrees is of particular concern as these rates guarantee that African Americans will continue to be underrepresented in professional positions. This contributes to the disparities between the racial make-up of research and policy generating institutions and the populations which they served. In sum, research on doctoral student of African descent success will increase doctoral programs and faculty members' ability to help them reach their educational and professional goals. Additionally, understanding how doctoral students of African can become doctoral superstars may increase the likelihood of these students having a successful experience and thus increase the probability of degree completion.

Doctoral Superstardom

Graduate school can be a traumatic experience. Some graduate students focus their energy and time on the increased amount of work associated with graduate studies, indifferent attitudes of faculty, or constant pressure of being evaluated. These students instantly fail to appreciate their graduate school experience and education and settle for merely satisfying degree requirements. Conversely, another group of doctoral students seem to flourish in their graduate

education. Bloom and Bell (1979) declare that the latter students are considered superstar doctoral students. These students encounter little difficulty proceeding through the program and perform at higher levels. As a result, superstar doctoral students receive advantages that average doctoral students do not (e.g. respect from faculty members, the best financial assistance and accolades). These scholars identified factors which were most often noted by graduate school faculty to classify superstar doctoral students they have known.

The most often mentioned factor is visibility. Superstars were observed to be physically present in the department, during and often after working hours. Another factor is having professional values that align with the program. This includes valuing research and scholarly excellence. Superstars also understand the value of having a broad knowledge base even though their own programs might be highly specialized. The next most often cited factor is that superstars are hard working. It is imperative to mention that the superstars are labeled hard working because faculty actually saw them working hard. Other students may have worked harder, but because they were not observed working in the department, they were not perceived to be as hard working as the superstars. This also speaks to being visible and physically present in the department. Yet another factor is the student's ability to recognize the need for help and reach out to professors for mentorship. It is noted that from day one, superstars attained mentorship from faculty members with whom they worked closely with throughout their doctoral studies. The last quality is the 'W' factor. This factor describes the superstar's ability to make faculty feel worthwhile and rewarded. The student is noted as being easy to teach, and can retain information in a timely fashion. Superstars also receive and process feedback well. They are able to be seen as equals without taking advantage of this status. In essence, the superstars listen, learn, develop, and produce through close working relationships with faculty.

Consistent with the qualities and advantages of doctoral superstardom are possible predictors of African American doctoral student success. Researchers have found that institutional support is positively correlated with doctoral student of African descent success. Girves and Wemmerus (1988) found that financial assistance and favorable perceptions of faculty-student relationships were the strongest predictors of progress in doctoral programs for students of African descent. Financial need has been shown to be one of the most prevalent barriers to recruitment and retention for students of African descent. African Americans continue to make up a majority of those living at or below the poverty line (Boyd-Franklin, 2003; Lang, 1992) thus making the idea of financing an undergraduate degree and further, a graduate degree seem out of reach (Jones, 2001). According to Pruitt and Isaac (1985), it is unrealistic to expect students of African descent to increase debt that has been previously incurred by undergraduate education in order to pursue doctoral studies. The above noted financial dilemmas illustrate why it is important to understand how doctoral students of African descent can achieve superstardom since research advises that doctoral superstars are given the best financial assistance. Again, aiding doctoral students of African descent in funding their doctoral education may assist in the degree persistence.

Having a positive relationship with faculty is a factor in achieving both doctoral superstardom and doctoral student of African descent success. Hurtado (1994) asserts that interactions with faculty become more important to the academic achievement and career development of students at the doctoral level. Faculty expectations and attitudes constitute a significant part of the graduate experience of students of African descent. The National Study of Black College Students revealed that doctoral students' academic performance was enhanced by positive relations with faculty (Hall & Allen 1982). These studies show that the quality of

interactions students of African descent have with their faculty is an essential component of graduate student success.

Conceptual Framework

In a supportive environment, doctoral students experience increased levels of academic and social integration into programs and activities. Integration may also have an influence on a student's development. Tierney (1997) posits that an organization's culture educates individuals about what to expect and how to succeed. Wulff and Nerad (2006) talk about major influences on the culture of doctoral education. These influences affect the ways in which doctoral students experience their graduate education. One main indication of these influences is the doctoral socialization process.

Socialization is the process whereby students learn to adopt the values, skills, attitudes, norms, and knowledge of any given discipline through mentoring and advising relationships as well as by engaging in research, service, and teaching (Becker et al. 1961; Bieber & Worley, 2006; Kuh and Whitt 1988; Merton 1957; Rosser, 2003; Turner & Thompson, 1993; Van Maanen 1984). Socialization is imperative to a successful graduate school experience for doctoral students (Clark & Corcoran, 1986). Weidman, Twale, and Stein (2001) argue that the doctoral student socialization process is cyclical and students acquire knowledge about their professional careers through academic learning. After receiving this information individuals are able to be successful in their profession. Those who do not learn these things do not become competent (Gardner, 2008).

In conclusion, socialization affects every part of the student experience, from the first contacts with the graduate program through the dissertation defense. One of the major goals of doctoral programs is to give students the knowledge and requisite skills needed to become

successful in their field. In addition, these programs are responsible for socializing students into diverse professional roles. Few known studies have attempted to address socialization processes as possible factors in doctoral student success and achievement. Bragg (1976) asserts that the socialization process enables the goals of education to be achieved. Therefore, if doctoral students are to succeed it is due to the learning they acquire throughout the process of graduate school. Therefore it is essential to learn how to successfully socialize students of African descent into doctoral education.

The present study uses the framework for doctoral student socialization developed by Weidman et al. (2001) to explore the experiences of African American doctoral students. It reflects the prospective graduate students' characteristics, including ethnicity, gender and socio-economic status. Additionally, it takes into consideration educational background as well as values and expectations needed to successfully achieve a doctoral degree. It also represents the outcomes of successful academic socialization as it relates to doctoral students of African descent attaining the knowledge, skills, values and norms necessary in order to achieve graduate superstardom.

Statement of the Problem

Pruitt and Issac (1985) argue that doctoral education for many students of African descent is synonymous to trial by fire. In other words, there is not much guidance about how to successfully navigate doctoral studies. Difficulties range from those produced by advisor-advisee relationships to those that originate from rigid curriculum expectations. Concerns associated to retaining doctoral students of African descent, then, are a sub-set of a broader issue. Since most graduate schools have low minority enrollments and a small number of if any minority faculty members, students of African descent are likely to find themselves isolated in situations that lack

both formal and informal support systems. Often the expectations and attitudes of faculty members that possess more tradition values and beliefs lead students of African descent to feel stigmatized.

Socialization is a significant factor in doctoral student of African descent success. Although socialization into professional roles is vital for all doctoral students, research implies that the process may be more difficult for individuals of African descent (Gasman, 2008). Girves and Wemmerus (1988) argue the significance of academic and social integration of doctoral students of African descent into their departments. Doctoral student development is a process where faculty members have huge influence to increase the probability of success (Gasman et al., 2008; Walker, Golde, Jones, Bueschel, & Hutchings, 2008). African Americans who pursue doctoral education may find it difficult to establish a positive relationship with the right faculty advisor; one who can mentor their professional development and nurture their disciplinary identities during their graduate student socialization experiences (Davidson & Foster-Johnson, 2001; Gasman et al., 2008; Thompson, 2006). Unfortunately, the research highlighting the problematic socialization into academe for individuals of African descent is sparse (Debord & Millner, 1993; Turner & Thompson, 1993). Therefore, one goal of this study is to add to the limited research about the socialization process for doctoral students of African descent.

In addition to socialization, there are several other factors that predict doctoral student of African descent success which parallel the characteristics of doctoral student superstardom. Doctoral superstars are given several perks that average doctoral students do not receive (e.g., respect from the faculty, the best financial assistance and recommendations). Yet very few studies have been conducted about how doctoral students can achieve superstardom or on the qualities that make up a superstar student. Of the extant literature, most are over thirty years old

and were normed on European American male students (as there were very few African American doctoral students at that time). As a result, the current characteristics have cultural limitations. Today's students of African descent come to doctoral programs with increasingly varied backgrounds, preparation, expectations, motivations, and responsibilities. In the United States, doctoral students tend to be older than in the past, mostly in a relationship, parents, employed in areas unrelated to their discipline, and reside far enough away from campus that impedes one's ability to be present and visible (Smith, 2000). Therefore it may be difficult for doctoral students of African descent to have the visibility, values associated with the doctoral program, and time to nurture relationships with faculty members, needed to accomplish doctoral superstardom.

In conclusion, as demographic changes continue to occur in the United States, doctoral programs need to prepare to work and learn in a multicultural society. This exploration of the experiences of students of African descent highlights the challenges they face during the professionalization process. It implies that for doctoral students of African descent, education is one of ambiguity, sacrifice, and strain. This is due in part to the apprehension that students bring with them, but more importantly, to the unsatisfactory experiences which seem to embody their socialization process into the doctoral education. Nevertheless, much of the literature on professional socialization disregards the reality of inequality and regular discrimination endured by students of African descent in doctoral programs. If these programs are to become places where students of African descent can flourish and successfully achieve doctoral degrees, the barriers and obstacles they face must be acknowledged, understood and addressed (Daniel 2007).

Significance of the Study

Many academic institutes acknowledge that they have very few doctoral students of African descent and even fewer faculty members of African descent. Holland (1994) identified the importance of social interaction for doctoral students of African descent. He noted that when there is limited involvement with major professors, occasional meetings, and basic advisement, the interactions are non-developmental. These exchanges do not aid in the nurturing and growth of the doctoral student. More importantly, very little research has been conducted on the socialization of doctoral students of African descent. Of the extant literature, scholars have noted that African American and European American students report significant differences in their socialization experiences (Ellis, 1997; Nettles, 1990; Turner & Thompson, 1993). These differences negatively impact of students' of African descent doctoral studies in that it aids to the disparity of knowledge and support necessary to successfully navigate the program. Although the existing literature acknowledges the significance of students' experiences and denotes the unpleasant experiences of African American students, there is a paucity of insight about how doctoral students' of African descent who attend Predominantly White Institutions experiences differ from their counterparts at Historically Black Colleges and Universities. In addition, the literature lacks information about how students' of African descent doctoral experiences are related to their performance in graduate school. Furthermore, there is a gap in the literature about how the socialization process for African American doctoral students is related to their graduate school experience, performance and ability to be successful. What is more is that African American doctoral students achieving superstardom is important as it may aid in the likelihood of having a successful doctoral experience and thus increase their degree attainment. This present study seeks to address these concerns and add to the dearth of current literature.

Hypotheses

The current research study will argue that: (1) while the research on the attributes of doctoral superstardom is dated, these attributes are still used to evaluate and assess doctoral students and therefore may currently be valid and relevant predictors of student success and (2) doctoral socialization directly impacts students' abilities to attain superstardom even when superstardom is not the end goal. The primary goals of this study are as follows:

Primary aim 1: Investigate the influence of racial identity development on the academic socialization of doctoral students. It is hypothesized that:

> H1: Level of racial identity development will predict African American doctoral students' perception of possessing superstardom attributes (e.g. visibility in the department, working hard, reflecting program values, relationship with faculty member(s), and the "W" factor [ability to make faculty feel worthwhile and/or rewarded for their investment in the student, easy to teach, ability to receive and apply feedback and quick learner]).
>
> H1.1: Low levels of racial identity will be positively correlated with socialization and doctoral superstardom.
>
> H1.2: African American students who endorse an immersion/emersion racial identity will encounter more adversity in the academic socialization process than other levels of racial identity development.
>
> H1.3: High levels of racial identity will also be positively correlated with socialization and doctoral superstardom.

Primary aim 2: Investigate the between group differences in the socialization process of students to the academic environment. It is hypothesized that:

H2: Doctoral students of African descent who attend HBCUs will experience higher

levels of academic socialization than doctoral students of African descent who attend

PWIs.

Primary aim 3: Investigate whether or not the attributes of superstardom are still relevant today

and determine whether students of African descent at PWIs perceive themselves differently than

their counterparts attending HBCUs with respect to those attributes. It is hypothesized that:

H3: Visibility, relationship with professors, reflection of program values and the "W"

factor (including ability to make faculty feel worthwhile, each to teach, ability to receive

and apply feedback and quick learner) will continue to be ranked as the most important

attributes contributing to faculty assessment of doctoral superstardom.

H3.1: Students attending Historically Black Colleges and Universities will be more likely

to rate themselves in terms of the attributes of doctoral superstardom when compared to

their students attending Predominantly White Institutions.

H3.2: Students who report more contact with faculty outside of the classroom will be

more likely to endorse attributes consistent with graduate superstardom. Further, these

students will report greater overall satisfaction with their doctoral experience.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Socialization

Graduate education in this country has historically catered to young, white, single, males (Berelson, 1960). The lack of diversity in graduate school is an increasing dilemma, initiating numerous programs to promote recruitment and retention initiatives students of color (Gardner, 2008). However, not much is known about the socialization and experience of this underrepresented population. Yet it is well-known that the retention rate for white, male, doctoral students is significantly higher than it is for doctoral students of color (Council of graduate Schools 2004; Lovitts 2001). Understanding the experiences and socialization process of doctoral students of African descent is critical to sustaining their success in doctoral programs (Gasman, et. al., 2008).

The departmental environment for doctoral students is important in molding their development (Golde, 1998). In fact, Lovitts (2001) found that the academic composition of one's professional identity creates opportunities for educational and social integration within that profession. This occurs by organizing the type of academic responsibilities and how often one has academic interactions as well as the nature of social relationships that may develop as a result. Taylor and Antony (2000) posit that socialization can be defined as "the process by which newcomers learn the encoded system of behavior specific to their area of expertise and the system of meanings and values attached to those behaviors" (p. 186). Along these lines, Tierney (1997) explained that the meaning of socialization was new members of the organization

successfully understanding and incorporating all of the rules and guidelines that exist in an organization. He went on to state that an organization's culture teaches doctoral students about appropriate behaviors, expectations and what it means to be successful.

In graduate school, faculty advisors play an important role for doctoral students, as faculty influence the socialization process for doctoral students (Barnes & Austin, 2009; Gardner & Barnes, 2007). Their capability to unite students with other faculty, and research and service opportunities are incomparable. Ferrer de Valero (2001) concluded that doctoral students, despite their particular social identities, can feel disconnected and lacking in support and socialization from advisors and assistantship supervisors (Ferrer de Valero, 2001). However, for doctoral students of color, race plays a more salient role in their interactions and meaning-making.

Yet Gardner (2008) was concerned about the nature of this structuring process for doctoral students of African descent as their educational and social interactions have historically been low. According to Turner and Thompson (1993), the above noted integrations have been a challenge for doctoral students of African descent. These researchers found that minority women reported receiving less assistance from faculty members with publishing, mentoring and career direction (Turner & Thompson, 1993). Using these findings in connection with Nettles and Millet's (2006) findings about the importance of mentorship on doctoral student development, it can be concluded that a lack of positive assistance from faculty members can endanger a doctoral student's degree attainment and overall success (Gardner, 2008).

African American doctoral students require "systematic guidance" from their advisors about the norms, values, and expectations of academic and nonacademic environments (Austin & McDaniels, 2006). Of great significance is the need to provide doctoral students of African descent with an understanding of the inner workings of the doctoral academic system and why

survival involves more than the will to do so. It is necessary that doctoral students of African descent learn to cope with the academic system (Pruitt, 1985). Adopting the rules and norms of a doctoral program is a vital principle to socialization. Gildersleeve, Croom and Vasquez (2011) indicate that doctoral students of African descent are faced with the task of adjusting behavior and natural forms of expression as consequences of adopting these values and norms.

In sum, socialization in academia is vital during the doctoral process (Gardner, 2008). Although socialization into a profession is essential for all doctoral students, research indicates that the process may be more complex for those from underrepresented populations. For example, Taylor and Antony (2000) suggested that effective socialization of doctoral students of African descent is probably hindered by their lack of sufficient mentoring, lack of teaching and research opportunities. Remarkably, all of these concerns are stressed in the literature (Benton, 2005; Cheatham & Phelps, 1995; Dixon-Reeves, 2003; Ellis, 2001; Golde, 2000; Lovitts, 1996; Pruitt & Isaac, 1985; Taylor & Antony, 2000).

Austin and McDaniels (2006) argue that doctoral students of color need sufficient advising from faculty about the norms, values, and expectations of the department. As discussed by numerous researchers, this lack of socialization into graduate education is increased for doctoral students of African descent, who often indicated that they receive inadequate guidance and mentorship from faculty (Dixon-Reeves, 2003; Golde, 2000; Lovitts, 1996). Therefore, in order to understand how doctoral departments can help African American doctoral students have a successful experience and reap the benefits of achieving superstar graduate student status, it is important to utilize socialization theory.

Doctoral Student Success

Many researchers have explored how factors like mentoring, student attributes, and specific constructs such as grades and test scores affect the idea of success in doctoral education. (Baird, 1972; Cook & Swanson, 1978; Burton & Wang, 2005; Girves & Wemmerus, 1988; Lannholm & Schrader, 1951; Nettles, 1990; Schroeder & Mynatt, 1993). These scholars found success to have multiple meanings such as year-to-year perseverance, high grade point averages and degree attainment. While various scholars have researched the concept of success from several different perspectives, its meaning is still obscure. The construct of success has been adopted to understand concepts such as academic achievement, retention, degree attainment and professional socialization throughout doctoral studies (Gardner, 2009).

During the course of a program, doctoral students are evaluated using varied measures that help approximate their level of success (Gardner, 2009). Coursework is the primary indicator of academic achievement, resulting in the standard measure of success grade point average (GPA) (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). However, GPA is not generally used as the single indicator for doctoral success. Doctoral students are expected to consistently perform at high levels in their courses, and often have a track record for doing so, which may create difficulty differentiating levels of success among students (Girves & Wemmerus, 1988; Nettles & Millett, 2006). Additionally, some programs may only have a few semesters of course work, which may give an inaccurate depiction of doctoral student success in the long run (Feeley, Williams, & Wise, 2005; House, 1999).

In addition to the completion of coursework and cumulative GPA, retention is an additional indicator of doctoral student success as it accounts for those students who continue in the doctoral program from year to year (Gardner, 2006). Golde (1998) found that nearly one

third of doctoral students drop out following the first year, an additional third before candidacy, and a final third during the dissertation phase. Doctoral students' retention issues are commonly linked to problems with assimilating into the program (Girves & Wemmerus, 1988; Lovitts, 2001; Tinto, 1993), feeling cognitively and psychologically inadequate (Golde, 1998; Katz & Hartnett, 1976), lack of financial assistance (Abedi & Benkin, 1987; Bowen & Rudenstine, 1992; Girves & Wemmerus, 1988), and discontentment with the program (Girves & Wemmerus, 1988; Lovitts, 2001; Perrucci & Hu, 1995). Accordingly, these dropout rates contribute to the lower number of doctoral students successfully completing graduate programs.

Degree attainment is another commonly used measure of success in doctoral studies. As with retention, there are several factors that influence degree attainment (Lovitts, 2001) including necessary time to completion differs by discipline (Bowen & Rudenstine, 1992) and socio-economic status (Bair & Haworth, 2005; Ferrer de Valero, 2001). Many researchers have noted that on average only fifty percent of doctoral students complete their graduate education (Bair & Haworth, 2005; Bowen & Rudenstine, 1992; Council of Graduate Schools, 2004; Nettles & Millett, 2006). Furthermore, the relationship between degree attainment and variables such as race, gender, and socio economic status (SES) is complex (Bair & Haworth, 2005; Bowen & Rudenstine, 1992; Council of Graduate Schools, 2004; Nettles & Millett, 2006).

According to the literature, professional socialization is also a vital factor in determining success in doctoral education. Doctoral students are growing into their profession of choice by developing the expertise, knowledge, values, and mind frame of that discipline (Soto Antony, 2002; Weidman, Twale, & Stein, 2001). Thus, in addition to factors such as GPA, retention, and degree attainment influencing perceptions of doctoral student success, the ability to socialize in

and have a positive attitude toward the profession are also beneficial qualities that determine success (Hagedorn & Nora, 1996).

Coupled with GPA, degree attainment and socialize, the relationship between faculty members and doctoral students is essential to doctoral student success (Austin, 2002; Clark & Corcoran, 1986; Lovitts, 2001; Weidman & Stein, 2003; Wulff & Austin, 2004). According to Gardner (2009), faculty members provide mentorship, advising, education, direction, leadership, and support. Although faculty members have an important role in aiding in doctoral student success, very few studies have focused on how faculty members in doctoral programs define success. Since faculty play such a vital part in determining doctoral student success, their conceptualization of success is important for students to understand how to best achieve their goals, structure programs and provide services (Gardner, 2009).

African American Doctoral Student Success

While many studies have attempted to examine factors that determine success in graduate school among students of African descent (Farmer, 2003; Nettles, 1990; Taylor, 2000) very few studies have attempted to address factors that contribute to students of African descent having successful experiences in doctoral programs. Walker et al. (2001) suggested that it is not enough to gain acceptance into a doctoral program and meet the requirements. Students must have a successful educational experience that enables, encourages, and motivates them to complete the program. Above and beyond degree attainment, GPA, and faculty relationships, positive experiences are essential to the overall success of doctoral students of African descent (Brown et al., 1999; Gasman et al., 2004). Conversely, negative experiences lead to doctoral students of African descent having low self-esteem and thoughts about leaving the graduate program (Gasman et al., 2004; Lovitts, 1996). Numerous studies have showed that a positive self-concept

is associated with minority adjustment at the undergraduate level (Hurtado, 1994). Since graduate study usually requires more independence, inner direction, and resourcefulness than at the undergraduate level, sustaining high self-concept is essential to the academic success of minority doctoral students (Hurtado, 1994).

In addition to students' background characteristics, researchers found that different kinds of institutional social support are connected to academic success for minority doctoral students. This institutional support consists of a supportive social and academic atmosphere, encouraging and beneficial relationships with faculty members, and help with adjustment problems and social integration (Allen, 1992; D'Augelli & Hershberger, 1993; Debord & Millner, 1993; Defour & Hirsch, 1990; Nettles, Thoeny, & Gosman, 1986; Trujillo, 1986; Turner, 1993). A supportive environment allows doctoral students to experience high levels of academic and social integration into doctoral programs (Felder, 2010). Girves and Wemmerus (1988) argued the significance of academic and social integration of minority graduate students into their doctoral programs. These scholars documented that financial aid and student's impressions of their relationships with faculty members were key predictors of success for doctoral students of color.

Felder (2010) showed that mentoring by faculty is fundamental to the improvement of African American doctoral student success. Faculty-student mentoring relationships, how students perceive faculty commitment and behavior, and the presence of faculty diversity can serve as motivating factors toward degree completion. This is supported by prior research studies that have showed a correlation between positive relationships with faculty and an improvement in experiences for doctoral students of African descent (Gasman et al., 2008).

Research concerning doctoral students of African descent perseverance has reinforced the tremendous need for having a diverse faculty to mentor and direct the academic and social

development of students of African descent, especially in predominately white institutions (Davidson & Foster-Johnson, 2001; Taylor & Antony, 2000). Having more minority faculty members can help doctoral students of African descent have a successful experience (Felder, 2010). Similar to many doctoral students, students of African descent need successful people they can relate to in order to succeed academically. Gasman et al. (2004) found that interacting with students inside and outside of the classroom enhances the student-faculty relationship and student satisfaction with their programs. In addition, Gasman et al. (2008) recommended increasing the frequency and quality of occurrences with students of African descent as a way to improve doctoral student success. Additionally, mentoring is vital for students of African descent as it helps them adjust by providing support in atmospheres that are perceived as culturally insensitive (Walker, Wright & Hanley, 2001).

Doctoral Superstardom

As previously stated, many faculty members differentiate between superlative doctoral students and average doctoral students. However, distinctions between superstardom and just completing the degree requirements are not as clear cut for most novice doctoral students but the benefits of being a superstar are far greater (Bloom & Bell, 1979). Further, Bloom and Bell note that success in graduate school is determined by more than having intelligence, excellent grades, or writing ability. They found that success is strongly affected by dedication, hard work, seriousness of commitment, clarity of goals, and a willingness to embrace the values of a program. They posit that a select few of these successful doctoral students advance through their program of choice with minimum difficulty and maximum performance. According to Bloom and Bell (1979) as well as Roth (1955), the benefits for this small sample of successful doctoral students are that they are well respected by the faculty, receive the best financial assistance and

accolades, and collectively, end up with the best employment. Faculty members consider this select few the "superstars" of the program.

Very few researchers have studied the characteristics of doctoral superstardom. For example, Roth (1955) asked ten faculty advisors to identify their general conceptions of highly successful students and students who are least successful. He found that most advisors stressed the importance of assertiveness, good adjustment or agreeableness, confidence, and independence. Similarly, Bloom and Bell (1979) asked 40 psychology faculty members to identify characteristics of a "superstar" graduate student with whom they worked. They found five factors consistent with graduate school superstardom: visibility, diligence, reflection of program values, professor attachment and the W factor. According to these researchers, superstar students that possess the W factor make the faculty feel valuable and satisfied with their decision to invest in this student's future in a given profession. They posit that these students are easy to work with, learn quickly, and receive and process feedback well.

Descutner and Thelen (1989) supported the constructs of superstardom using Bloom and Bell (1979) survey of graduate faculty perspectives of superstar students. In both studies, diligence was highly rated; in contrast, Descutner and Thelen (1989) found that faculty and students rated visibility in the department and reflecting program values relatively low for characteristics of successful graduate students but were considered important qualities of superstar graduate students. It was noted that faculty perceptions of superstar students were different from perceptions of successful graduate students.

Most of the previously cited studies about graduate student superstardom were from the viewpoint of professors. Faculty members significantly influence the development and success of doctoral students (Gasman et al., 2008; Walker, Golde, Jones, Bueschel, & Hutchings, 2008).

Hurtadon (1994) found that interactions with faculty became more important to the academic achievement and career development of students at the doctoral level. Roth (1955) posited that faculty members have specific ideas of what qualities differentiate "good" graduate students from "poor" ones. He theorized that because faculty members encourage good students and discourage poor students their conceptions contribute to the success of some students and not others. Additionally, Roth found that advisors believed that students who did not uphold the same values of the program should be discouraged, directly and indirectly, from pursuing a doctorate degree. These notions about success potentially foster an environment in which students with certain characteristics thrive, while others with negatively viewed characteristics face repeated obstacles.

Superstar graduate students differentiate themselves from others by demonstrating a number of characteristics such as intelligence, autonomy, assertiveness, and self-confidence (Descutner & Thelen, 1989). These self-promoting behaviors are especially significant due to the numerous stereotypes with which they are associated. Faculty members, knowingly or unknowingly, working from the mind frame of using negative stereotypes in the classroom, may cause minority students to become extremely uncomfortable, mistrustful, or discouraged (Davis et al, 2004). Minorities must be conscientious about balancing these negative perceptions about their lack of competence, initiative and social skills with their strengths and capabilities (Kram & Hampton, 1998).

Visibility

The most often mentioned characteristic of doctoral superstardom is visibility (Bloom & Bell, 1979; Descutner & Thelen, 1989). The construct of visibility emerged in the arena of social science research as early as the 1950s. March and Simon (1958) first noted the significance of

visibility in promoting an individuals' job success and mobility. Merton (1968) presented one of the first definitions of visibility as the extent to which others can readily observe performance in a role. Roberts and colleagues (2008) elaborated on this definition noting that visibility is the extent to which a person's characteristics and/or behaviors are a central focus point of others' attention in a particular situation or context. Those who have more visibility endure more public attention, while those who have less visibility, receive less focused attention on their attributes (e.g., personality, physical features, status, affiliations, values) and behaviors (e.g., role performance, cultural displays, mannerisms, verbal statements).

Faculty members expect doctoral superstars to be physically present in the department, during and often after normal business hours (Hammer & Hammer, 2009). According to these scholars, "face time" is very important in graduate school as it is one way to formulate good relationships with professors. Although visibility in the department is a much sought after attribute for a doctoral student, it may be difficult for many minority students to attain this visibility. Specifically, some doctoral students are often in the position of negotiating their various roles (Grace & Gouthro, 2000; Younges & Asay, 1998). Many doctoral students have different roles as spouse, parent, and caretaker for older parents and financial support for the household (Saunders & Balinky, 1993; Smith et. al, 2006). These responsibilities may be the basis for issues of managing time. Doctoral students often feel neglectful due to their inability to balance family and school. These multiple roles require the student to carefully allocate their time and therefore make it difficult to be as visible as some researchers have indicated is necessary for graduate superstardom.

Daniel (2007) described a correlation between doctoral students feeling invisible and the continual failure of White faculty, students, and administrators to see minority students as

individuals. Invisibility is defined as "an inner struggle with the feeling that one's talents, abilities, personality, and worth are not valued or even recognized because of prejudice and racism" (Franklin, 1999, p.761). Franklin (1999) noted that invisibility is a psychological experience in which the person feels that his or her personal identity and capability are weakened by racism in a multitude of interpersonal situations. He concluded that African Americans are often torn between the risks associated with being themselves and understanding what behavioral changes can be made to gain acceptance. Similarly, Brighenti (2007) alluded to invisibility being one reason why women and ethnic minorities lack approval and acknowledgement. Gasman et al.'s (2004) study revealed that minority graduate students often experience feelings of invisibility and are silenced as a result.

Along with feeling of invisibility, African Americans may experience feelings of hyper-visibility. Blake-Beard and Roberts' (2004) described how minorities make conscious decisions about being more or less visible in the attempt to manage their image and navigate social pressures. These researchers explored the process of managing the double-bind of visibility wherein minorities vacillate between two ends of the visibility continuum. At one end of this continuum, minorities face potential exclusion from the dominant group that renders them invisible in majority contexts; at the other end of the continuum, minorities experience heightened scrutiny, or hypervisibility due to their uniqueness from the majority group, this makes their attributes and behaviors more salient. According to Davis et al (2004) there are several reactions to the minorities who seek and/or receives this heightened visibility: their every action is scrutinized; their judgment is questioned; and their performance is evaluated closely and criticized vigorously. Small errors are considered confirmation of the incompetence rather than seen as opportunities to learn from mistakes and polish essential skills. African American

students at predominantly white institutions have recounted several instances in which their race

leads them to feelings of hypervisibility (Davis et al., 2004). Consequently, they reported that

they are less apt to seek out assistance from their professors or take part in extracurricular

activities with their Caucasian classmates. The following quote, from Ralph Ellison's Invisible

Man, describes the African American plight of wanting to be accepted and the stress that comes

with psychological invisibility:

> "I am an invisible man … I am a man of substance, flesh and bone, fiber and liquids –
> and I might even be said to possess a mind. I am invisible, understand, simply because
> people refuse to see me…When they approach me they see only my surroundings,
> themselves, or figments of their imagination – indeed, everything and anything except
> me"

Franklin & Franklin (2000) believed that this experience makes it difficult for African

Americans to decide how to be visible while striving for acceptance.

Reflection of Program Values

Austin (2002) underscores the importance of graduate students understanding their

departmental expectations, values, and conceptions of success. In addition to grasping this

information, many researchers have determined that it is just as important for students to

incorporate these values and norms into their own culture in order to be successful in their

scholastic careers (Austin, 2002; Weidman & Stein, 2003; Weidman, Twale, & Stein, 2001).

Additional scholars have denounced the assimilation point of view in exchange for a

socialization process that embraces diverse values and perspective (Govzalez, 2007; Solorzano &

Villalpando, 1998).

A frequently cited characteristic doctoral superstardom was professional values

consistent with program values (e.g., research and scholarly excellence) based on faculty

perceptions (Bloom & Bell, 1979). Hammer and Hammer (2009) indicated that classes are less

important than research success in graduate school. Further, Descutner and Thelen (1989) noted

that, in general, psychology graduate students believe that clinical skills are more valuable than their ability to conduct research. Conversely, they found that doctoral superstars work equally as hard developing both their counseling skills and research skills and that superstars viewed research as an integral part of their discipline. However, one research study showed that due to the increasing difficulty of statistics and research methodology classes, many graduate students develop negative attitudes toward research (Onwuegbuzie, 1997). Furthermore, Onwuegbuzie (2004) found that doctoral students of African descent tend to report having increased anxiety about statistics courses more so than do their European American colleagues. This anxiety may be the reason for discouragement in enrolling and completing graduate programs that have a thesis or dissertation requirement (Onwuebuzie, 1999).

The predominance of research productivity in academia may endorse a Eurocentric value system not held by many doctoral students of African descent, further working to intensify the intimidating atmosphere to which they are subjected to, which consequently hinders their determination and success (Antonio, 2002; Pruitt & Isaac, 1985). For example, African American focused dissertation topics may be thought of as not good enough by some white faculty as they may be seen as inappropriate or unimportant (Pruitt & Isaac, 1985). Furthermore, because of scrutiny by classmates and professors, doctoral students of African descent might believe they are obligated to prove their academic abilities above and beyond their colleagues (Gasman et al., 2004; Pruitt & Isaac, 1985). This finding highlights the rationale behind why doctoral students of African descent may struggle with research productivity when their thoughts and research ideas are not valued in previous classroom encounters.

Ancis, Sedleck and Mohr (2000) showed that students of African descent were more apt to undergo pressure to comply with racial and ethnic stereotypes related to their scholastic

achievement and conduct. This is the challenge that Harvey (1984) noted of African American college students when attending predominately white institutions (PWIs). The need to accept the values and prescribed behaviors and interests of these institutes (despite experiences of alienation and disaffirmation), result in dissatisfying and unfulfilling educational experiences for African American students (Lyons, 1990). A doctoral program culture that encourages multiculturalism recognizes the diversity of cultural backgrounds embodied within the institution and the individual contributions of each student to the graduate school culture (Ancis, Sedleck & Mohr, 2000). Instead of requiring students to abandon the unique abilities they derived from cultural heritage and conforming to the institute's cultural values, students are encouraged to embrace such competencies (Davidson & Foster-Johnson, 2001).

Despite the fact that traditional values are important for academic success, they may not take into consideration the differing lives of today's doctoral students. Younges & Asay (1998) suggest that graduate programs attend to the varying needs of doctoral students who are having to manage multiple roles and are overloaded by all of the responsibilities. These authors are not suggesting that the values and principles of the institution be diminished, on the other hand, they believe that the institution should establish a collaborative atmosphere where the students' and faculty members' expectations can be integrated.

Professor Relationship

Adjusting to graduate school can be a difficult task. Bloom and Bell (1979) concluded that doctoral superstars nearly always connected themselves with at least one or two faculty members who they worked with throughout their time in the program. Ostroff & Kozowolski (1993) propose that the influence of a mentor can shape how students adjust to the doctoral process. A student's experience with a faculty member can make the thought of entering a

doctoral program even more challenging (Felder, 2010). Felder (2010) concluded that students are more apt to receive the information needed to be successful and graduate from the program when there is a mentoring relationship between the graduate student and a faculty member. Hartnett (1976), Arce and Manning (1984), and Blackwell (1987) concluded that graduate students regarded their relationships with faculty and mentors to be the most distinct and significant reason for their satisfaction and successful degree attainment.

Pruitt and Issac (1985) strongly recommended that doctoral programs acknowledge the significance of faculty mentoring while creating answers for improving the academic environment. Mentors assist their star students through advocating for their needs, engaging them in their research, navigating them through departmental politics, assisting them in acquiring funding and recommending them for employment opportunities. They aid in creating a bearable experience and making the dream a reality (Pruitt & Issac, 1985).

According to Ellis (2001) doctoral students who had good advisers or mentors more frequently believed they were making good progress in meeting their degree requirements than did students who were without mentors or advisers. Further, doctoral students indicated that they met departmental deadlines in a timely fashion, received assistance preparing for qualifying exams and discussed research interests. Students with good advisers also reported participating in more research activities, teaching, and more professional presentations at conferences. As Collins (1994) indicated that mentorship frequently led to greater success among star students, and those who had a mentor reported greater contentment with their careers.

Minority students have historically experienced difficulty forming relationships with White faculty members (Daniel, 2007; Ellis, 2001). The lack of faculty of color in doctoral departments has made this dilemma even more challenging. According to Daniel (2007), it is

vital to employ minority professors in doctoral programs. Research respondents frequently articulated the necessity for minority faculty mentoring relationships. They expounded on the significance of obtaining a faculty member of color a mentor, explaining that these advisors are supportive, genuine and understanding. Respondents added that it was easier to disclose vulnerabilities with faculty of color because of their shared experience with inequity (Daniel, 2007).

The "W" Factor

As previously mention, the "W" Factor is the superstar characteristic that was described as the student's capability to create rewarding and worthwhile feelings for the faculty members. Faculty members stated that doctoral superstars were easy to teach, picked up things quickly, received and used feedback well and complained infrequently (Bloom & Bell, 1979).

There is an implicit expectation that doctoral students adapt to the dominant behavioral norm and assimilate into the graduate school culture. That expectation contributes to the misunderstanding that occurs when performance does not fit with expected norms (Davidson & Foster-Johnson, 2001). These researchers found that student's behaviors and values are an embedded element of their culture. Expecting people to conform and assimilate often induces a great amount of stress for minorities, producing a dissonance between their cultural values and behaviors and norms of the environment (Cose, 1993; Greenhaus, Parasuraman, & Wormley, 1990). Several minorities work through the dissonance by compartmentalizing their lives into professional behaviors and the values and behaviors that they follow at home. This polarity has grown to be a well-known phenomenon and has been associated with harmful lifestyle and professional outcomes (Bell, 1990).

A number of the cultural dissimilarities about power distance are related to behaviors of doctoral students. One difference is associated with a student's perception of their "power status" within an institution. Power distance is defined as the extent to which students in an institution expect and accept unequal power distribution within a culture (Hofstede, 1980). Students depend on faculty members less and are more comfortable approaching and confronting their mentors when they perceive the power differential as equal. Conversely, when the distance between power is higher, students depend on faculty members more and prefer emotional distance from them (Hofstede, 1980).

For instance, research implies that European American graduate students can be expected to experience little difficulty in approaching faculty members on an equal basis, articulating disagreements and opinions comfortably, and participating in a give-and-take that defines the mentoring relationship as equal. Students from traditionally high-power distance cultures (e.g., Latinos/Latinas and Asian Americans) have a fair amount of respect for people of greater authority and position and are less willing to take part in discussions that imply they are questioning the ability of a mentor (Hofstede, 1980; Knouse, 1992; Oyserman & Sakamoto, 1997). This difference in power may be one reason why some students are more comfortable around faculty members. It also suggests reasons why some students easier to get alone with and are able to make professors feel "worthwhile".

Although the ability to receive feedback is an important characteristic of the "W" factor, Daniel (2007) explained that numerous doctoral students indicated that stereotypical prejudgments about their academic performance capability made it hard to receive feedback from faculty. They reported that faculty comments were either excessively positive or excessively critical. Feagan, Hernan and Imani (1996) indicate that minority students are particularly

perceptive of the nature and quality of the feedback they receive because of the possibility of partiality. The amount of racial tension in a number of doctoral departments can create difficulty for White faculty members to give essential feedback to minority students about their academic performance as they may be apprehensive about appearing insensitive or biased (Daniel, 2007). This creates an environment of suspicion and distrust that is experienced by everyone (Romero and Margolis, 1999).

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Purpose

Quantitative research methods were used to examine the effects race and the socialization process on doctoral students of African descent as it relates to their ability to attain doctoral superstardom. To that end, the research presented here attempts to examine (1) the following superstardom qualities: visibility, reflection of program values, professor relationships, and the "W" factor (ability to make faculty feel valuable and satisfied with their decision to invest in this student's future in a given profession, easy to work with, learn quickly, and receive and process feedback well) for current relevance and validity, (2) doctoral students' of African descent perceptions that they possess qualities related to the concept of doctoral superstardom and (3) explore the effects of the socialization process and racial identity on doctoral students of African descent. It is anticipated that the findings will be helpful for increasing our understanding of how to help doctoral students of African descent have a successful experience and therefore accomplish their intended academic and professional goals.

Sample

Doctoral student participants (N=140) included in analysis were currently enrolled in psychology (77.9%, n=109), counseling (10.7%, n=15) and education (11.4%, n=16) programs. The mean age was 29.44 (SD=5.36) and all participants were between 23 and 42 years old. Sixteen percent of the participants (16.4%, n=23) were men and 83.6% (n=117) were women. Participants self-identified as African (2.1%, n=3), African American (60.7%, n=85), Black (20.0%, n=28), West Indian/Caribbean (7.9%, n=11), Hispanic Black (.7%, n=1), Mixed (6.4%,

n=9) and Other (1.4%, *n*=2). One individual did not report his or her race. The majority of the participants were seeking a Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) degree (80%, *n*=112), while others indicated that they were seeking a Doctor of Psychology (Psy.D.) degree (12.1%, *n*=17) or a Doctor of Education (Ed.D.) degree (7.9%, *n*=11). Seventeen percent of the participants (17.1%, n=24) were first year doctoral students, 17.1% (n=24) were in their second year, 15% (n=21) were in their third year, 25% (n=17.9) were in their fourth year, 6.4% (n=9) were in their fifth year, 5.7% (n=8) were in their sixth year, 6.4% (n=9) were all but dissertation (ABD) and 14.3% of the sample failed to indicate academic year. Demographic information detailed in Table 1.

Initial data was composed of 160 response sets. Participants were eliminated if they: were not current doctoral students in psychology, counseling or education; did not self-identify as a person of African descent; or did not complete the socialization inventory or the racial identity scale. Six participants were removed from further analysis because they endorsed a racial identity other than that of African descent. Two participants were removed because they were not current doctoral students and thirty-two were eliminated from the final analysis for failure to complete both the Cross Racial Identity Scale (CRIS) and the socialization questionnaire. The final analysis was composed of 140 response sets.

Faculty participants (*N*=62) were professors (41.9%, n=26), associate professors (30.6%, n=19), assistant professors (22.6%, n=14) and an adjunct professor (1.6%, n=1), who have supervised and/or advised doctoral students in psychology, counseling or education programs. Two participants elected not to indicate their faculty rank. Seventy-one percent of the respondents (*n*=44) were Caucasian, 9.7% (*n*=6) were Black American, 8.1% (*n*=5) were Other, 4.8% (*n*=3) were Bi-racial, 4.8% (*n*=3) were Hispanic/Latino and 1.6% (*n*=1) were East Asian (Chinese, Japanese, Korean). Thirty-two percent of the sample (32.3%, n=20) consisted of

faculty members who work at Very High research activity institutions according to the Carnegie Classification guidelines, 27.4% (n=17) work at High research activity institutions, 11.3% (n=7) work at Doctoral/Research Universities, 8.1% (n=5) work at institutions with no Carnegie Classification. Twenty-one percent of the respondents elected not to disclose the name of their institution. Demographic information detailed in Table 2.

Initial data was composed of 80 response sets. Participants were eliminated if they: were not faculty members; had never supervised/advised a doctoral student (in psychology, counseling or education); or did not complete the superstardom ranking question. 18 participants were removed from further analysis for failure to complete the superstardom ranking question. The final analysis was composed of 62 response sets.

Procedure

Institutional Review Board approval was gained from The University of Georgia (Athens, GA). Participants were recruited through various online forums (e.g., email listservs and social media websites) and directed to the study website. Additionally, an email was sent to the directors of training at American Psychological Association (APA) accredited programs in: clinical, counseling and school psychology. A reminder email was sent out thirty days after the initial email. The email included a link to the survey conducted through Survey Monkey, which was available from December 28, 2011 until May 15, 2012. The online survey directed participants to an informed consent page. After reading this page, electronic consent was obtained by requesting the participants to select the "continue to the next page" button below to indicate that they have read and understand the terms of this study and thus voluntarily agree to participate. If participants did not wish to participate in the study, they were able to decline participation by closing the window. Respondents were asked to complete a demographic survey

and a set of questionnaires that took approximately 20 to 25 minutes to complete. One feature of survey administration was that participants were able to start the survey and later return to finish it if completion was not possible in one sitting. To minimize incomplete questionnaires, the form is developed so that each data field (e.g., answer to a question) required participants to acknowledge each question with a response or the "*no answer*" option. At the completion of the data collection, compiled data was exported into a Microsoft Excel file and converted to SPSS for analysis.

Internet surveys have been found to be a valid method of conducting psychological research (Gosling, Vazire, Srivastava & John, 2004; Ross, Daneback, Mansson, Tikkanen & Cooper, 2003). Additionally, the use of the Internet for conducting survey research offers substantial benefits which include affordable access to large sample populations, standardization, and rapid collection of data (Barak, 1999; Cooper, Scherer, Boise, & Gordon, 1999; Smith & Leigh, 1997; Stanton, 1998). In an attempt to balance the numbers of intrinsically and extrinsically motivated students and professors who agree to participate, respondents were entered into a drawing to receive one of two $25 gift cards from a major retailer, which was awarded at the end of data collection. In order to be entered into the drawing, respondents entered their e-mail addresses at the end of the survey. Their contact information was kept separately from their responses in an effort to maintain confidentiality. Participants' responses on surveymonkey.com were password-protected and accessible only by the researcher.

Instrumentation

Racial Identity: Racial identity was assessed using the Cross Racial Identity Scale (CRIS; Vandiver et al., 2000). Participants completed the CRIS (Vandiver et al., 2000), a 40-item inventory designed to measure six racial identity attitudes as described in the expanded

nigrescence theory (Cross & Vandiver, 2001). The six CRIS subscales are Pre-Encounter

Assimilation (PA), Pre-Encounter Miseducation (PM), Pre-Encounter Self Hatred (PSH),

Immersion-Emersion Anti-White (IEAW), Internalization Afrocentricity (IA), and

Internalization Multiculturalist Inclusive (IMCI). Given the reported measurement problems with

the Encounter stage, it is not measured in the CRIS. The CRIS uses a 7-point Likert scale

ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). The PA subscale describes individuals

who have a pro-American reference group orientation with low emphasis on race. The PM

subscale depicts individuals who have a negative stereotypical mindset about Black people and

the African American community. The PSH subscale describes individuals who have a negative

view about being Black. The IEAW subscale depicts individuals who reject everything White

and demonize White people and White culture. The IA subscale measures attitudes that focus on

empowering Black people and the African American community. The IMCI subscale describes

individuals who focus on building coalitions within and outside the African American

community. In a study of adults, in which 55.2% of the participants were graduate students,

internal reliability ranged from .70 to .85 (Worrell, Vandiver, Cross, & Fhagen-Smith, 2004).

Cronbach's alphas for the CRIS have been reported to range from .78 for Pre-Encounter

Miseducation, .82 for Internalization Multiculturalist Inclusive, .83 for Internalization

Afrocentricity, .85 for Pre-Encounter Assimilation, to .89 for Pre-Encounter Self-Hatred as well

as Immersion–Emersion Anti-White (Vandiver et al., 2000). The CRIS demonstrated adequate

reliability in the study (α=.87 for Pre-Encounter Assimilation, .72 for Pre-Encounter

Miseducation, .92 for Pre-Encounter Self-Hatred, .83 for Immersion-Emersion Anti-White, .86

for Internalization Afrocentricity and .78 for Internalization Multiculturalist Inclusive).

Socialization: Socialization was assessed using a questionnaire created by Weidman and Stein (2003) to assess the socialization of doctoral students to the academic norms of research and scholarship. The survey questionnaire consisted of items designed to assess departmental characteristics that have been identified as being important elements in the socialization of graduate students. Some items were adapted from the 1969 National Survey of Faculty and Student Opinion sponsored jointly by the American Council on Education (ACE) and the Carnegie Commission (Trow, 1975), an index of scholarly activities developed by Braxton and Toombs (1982), and a questionnaire used for graduate program reviews at the research university where the initial study was conducted. Six composite variables were identified for the research: participation in scholarly activities, student–faculty interactions, student–peer interactions, supportive faculty environment, department collegiality, and student scholarly encouragement. The Participation in Scholarly Activities subscale includes 11 items for which respondents were asked to indicate activities they are involved in as a doctoral student in their department. Internal reliability for this subscale is .77. The Student–Faculty and Student–Peer Interactions subscale includes items for which respondents were asked to indicate yes or no to interactions that may or may not take place in the department. Internal reliability for the Student-Faculty subscale is .64 and Student-Peer subscale is .81. The Supportive Faculty Environment subscale includes items for which respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement (on a 5-point Likert scale, with 1 being the lowest level of agreement and 5 being the highest level of agreement) with statements having to do with the perceived departmental faculty climate. These items reflect the faculty's support for scholarship and the potential for faculty to act as role models for students. Internal reliability for this subscale is .84. The Department Collegiality subscale includes three items which reflect the extent to which an academic department is perceived by graduate

students as being a community of scholars, characterized by cooperation and mutual respect. Internal reliability for this subscale is .71. The Student Scholarly Encouragement subscale includes a set of four questions that assess aspects of the student climate that represent departmental goals or values. Respondents were asked to indicate how true each choice is (or seems to be) in their department. Options were very true (3), somewhat true (2), or not true at all (1). Internal reliability for this subscale is .80. The socialization questionnaire demonstrated similar reliability in this study (α=.76 for the Participation in Scholarly Activities and Student-Faculty Interaction subscales; .75 for the Student-Peer Interaction subscale; .72 for the Department Collegiality subscale and .81 for the Student Scholarly Encouragement subscale.

Doctoral Superstardom: Doctoral superstardom was assessed using items that were based on Bloom and Bell's (1979) survey of faculty perspectives of superstar graduate students and Descutner and Thelen's (1989) study of graduate student and faculty perspectives of graduate school. In addition, qualities used in the literature to describe successful doctoral students were added to the list of items. Faculty members were asked to think of the best doctoral student they have ever worked with and reflect on the behaviors he/she emitted to deserve praise. They were then asked to rank the top ten qualities they feel contribute to being a doctoral superstar. Additionally, doctoral students were asked to rate themselves according to the superstar attributes on a 6 point Likert scale ranging from not like me (1) to very like me (6).

Demographic Questionnaire: A brief demographic questionnaire was administered to quantify sample characteristics in this study. Demographic items included age, gender, self-identified ethnicity, level of education, parent's level of education, current occupation, number of children and marital status. The following items were added to the end of the demographic section: "Rate graduate satisfactory using a Likert scale ranging from very satisfied (5) to not

very satisfied (1)"; "How many hours do you spend in the presence of your faculty (outside of the classroom)?"; "What factors influences your decision to spend the amount of time in your department that you do?" Choices are: family, nonacademic employment related responsibilities, assistantship, research, discomfort/departmental conflict, commute, other". These questions were added to better understand the individual participant's view of their graduate experience.

Statistical Plan

The proposed study seeks to answer the following questions: (1) What is influence of racial identity development on the academic socialization of doctoral students and their perceptions of possessing doctoral superstardom attributes (2) Are there between group differences in the socialization process of students to their academic environment, (3) Are the attributes of superstardom are still relevant today, and do students of African descent at PWIs perceive themselves differently than their counterparts attending HBCUs with respect to those attributes?

An *a priori* power analysis was conducted to determine the minimum requisite sample size needed to achieve a given level of power using linear regression and correlation as predictive measures. Results indicated that a minimum of 133 participants were needed to detect a moderate relationship with power of .80. Several steps were taken before analysis began. First, data was entered into the SPSS 19.0 software and checked and corrected for data entry errors prior to analyses. Missing data was scrutinized for causes. Frequencies, means, and standard deviations were reported for all measured variables. The data sets were also screened to ensure that assumptions of normality were not violated (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). The following computations were completed: scale scores on the socialization questionnaire were constructed by summing the scores on all items comprising each variable, and sub scale scores in the CRIS

were obtaining by summing the scores of all of the questions composing each variable. Additionally, the Borda count method was used to determine which superstar qualities faculty members ranked the highest. In the Borda count method, voters rank contenders in order of preference. The Borda count decides the winner by assigning each candidate a specific number of points corresponding to the ranking given by each voter and the candidate with the most points is the wins.

Curvilinear regression was used to analyze the hypothesis H1: "Level of racial identity development will predict African American doctoral students' perception of possessing superstardom attributes (e.g. visibility in the department, working hard, reflecting program values, relationship with faculty member(s), and the "W" factor [ability to make faculty feel worthwhile and/or rewarded for their investment in the student, easy to teach, ability to receive and apply feedback and quick learner]). The relationship between the independent variable (racial identity) and dependent variable (superstardom attributes) was predicted to have a curved line as opposed to a straight line as higher (Internalization) and lower (Pre-Encounter) levels of racial identity will predict student's assessment of possessing superstardom attributes. Students in the Immersion-Emersion racial identity level will not endorse possessing superstardom attributes. Curvilinear regression is better used to analyze this data as the linear regression line will less likely predict that there is a relationship and the P-value may not be an accurate test of this hypothesis (McDonald, 2009). A Spearman's rank-order correlation was performed first to determine any significant relationships. After which, curvilinear regression was performed to further explore if the relationships were predictors of students' perception of possessing superstardom attributes.

A Spearman's rank-order correlation was used to analyze the hypotheses H1.1: "Low levels of racial identity will be positively correlated with socialization and doctoral superstardom, such that, African American doctoral students in the pre-encounter stage are more likely to embrace values more similar to the dominant group. Embracing such values will contribute to smoother academic socialization", H1.2: African American students who endorse an immersion/emersion racial identity will encounter more adversity in the academic socialization process than other levels of racial identity development. More specifically, students at this stage of racial identity development denounce values associated with the dominant group which are often expressed within departmental climate" and H1.3: "High levels of racial identity will also be positively correlated with socialization and doctoral superstardom." Spearman's correlation coefficient measures the strength of association between two ranked variables. There are two assumptions of the Spearman's rank order correlation. First, the variables must be ordinal, interval or ratio. A second assumption is that there is a monotonic relationship between variables. A monotonic relationship is a relationship that does one of the following: (1) as the value of one variable increases so does the value of the other variable or (2) as the value of one variable increases the other variable value decreases.

A *t*-test was used to test the hypothesis H2: "Doctoral students of African descent who attend HBCUs will experience higher levels of academic socialization than doctoral students of African descent who attend PWIs." T-tests evaluate the differences in means between the two groups. The means of the dependent variable (socialization) were compared between groups (students of African descent at PWIs and students of African descent at HBCUs) of the independent variable (institutional racial makeup). As mentioned before, the normality assumption was evaluated by looking at the distribution of the data. The equality of variances

assumption was verified with the *F* test. In addition, a MANOVA was performed to determine specific differences between variables.

Borda Count method was used to test hypothesis H3: "Visibility, relationship with professors, reflection of program values and the "W" factor (including ability to make faculty feel worthwhile, easy to teach, ability to receive and apply feedback and quick learner) will continue to be ranked as the most important attributes contributing to faculty assessment of successful students." Faculty members were asked to think of their best doctoral student and then rank the top ten qualities they feel contribute to being a doctoral superstar. The choices were based on items from two previous studies (Bloom & Bell, 1979; Descutner & Thelen, 1989). The ranks were assigned a point value such that the participant's first choice was given ten points and second choice was given nine points. In other words, where there are n attributes an attribute will receive n points for a first choice, $n - 1$ point for a second choice, $n - 2$ for a third and so on. The sums were then tabulated and the averages calculated. The results were compared to the results of the previous two studies.

A one-way Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was used to test the hypothesis H3.1: "Students attending Historically Black Colleges and Universities will be more likely to rate themselves in terms of the attributes of graduate superstardom when compared to their counterparts attending Predominantly White Institutions." MANOVA offers certain advantages over a series of ANOVAs. Specifically, Type I error is reduced. Another advantage is that the researcher increases the chances of finding exact differences by measuring several dependent variables instead of only one (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). This suggests that the variables are more meaningful when taken together than when considered separately. The outcome measures are the superstar attributes and the independent variable is institutional racial

makeup. The MANOVA was significant, therefore contrast (main effects) for each attribute were reviewed to determine significant differences.

A Spearman's rank-order correlation was used to test the hypothesis H3.2: "Students who report more contact with faculty outside of the classroom will be more likely to endorse attributes consistent with graduate superstardom. Further, these students will report greater overall satisfaction with their graduate experience."

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to examine: (1) the effects of racial identity and the

socialization process on doctoral students of African descent as it relates to their perception of

possessing doctoral superstardom attributes and (2) to explore the current relevance and validity

of the attributes of superstardom. This chapter will give detailed information about the

quantitative data and findings of the analyses conducted for this study. The analysis of data is

presented in three sections: 1) descriptive statistics on the demographic variables for the sample

populations, 2) results of the preliminary statistical analyses and correlations conducted for the

following variables: socialization, racial identity, racial composition of university and professor

rank, and 3) data related directly to the hypotheses of this study.

Demographic Data

Participants. The total number of doctoral student participants was 140; 15 from

Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs), 19 from universities that indicated other

and 105 from Predominantly White Institutions (PWIs). Of the 140 participants, 117 were

females and 23 were males. The female to male ratio in this current study is reflective of the

gender ratio in most psychology, education and counseling doctoral programs. Descriptive

information regarding the data gathered in the demographic survey is included in Table

1(students) and Table 2 (faculty). As indicated in Table 1, most student participants were fourth-

year students, single with no children. Their ages ranged from 21 to 42 years (M=29.44).

Notably, 45% of the participants indicated that their mother attained an undergraduate degree or better and 45.7% of the participants indicated that their father attained an undergraduate degree or better. This is more than twice as high as the national average for African American college graduates/graduate professionals (17.7% and 21.4%) respectively. According to Table 2, most of the According to Table 2, most of the faculty participants were full professors, had at least sixteen years of supervisory/advisory experience and at least 16 years of teaching experience. The total number of faculty participants was 62; 2 from HBCUs, 16 from universities of mixed race and 43 from PWIs. Of the 62 participants, 36 were females and 25 were males. Notably, most of the faculty participants had only supervised/advised between 1 and 5 doctoral students of African descent.

Descriptive Statistics. Means and standard deviations are reported for the superstardom construct and each subscale on the CRIS and socialization questionnaire. Reliability was calculated using Cronbach's alpha. The results are provided in Table 3 below. Spearman's Rank Order Correlations were also computed and analyzed on all of the independent variables to detect the existence of multicollinearity in the regression model of this study. Results of the correlations revealed that none of the correlation values exceeded .80 and thus the assumption of multicollinearity was not violated.

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of Doctoral Student Participants

Variable	N (%)
Gender	
Female	117 (83.6)
Male	23 (16.4)
Race	
African	3 (2.1)
African American	85 (60.7)
Black	28 (20.0)
West Indian/Caribbean Black	11 (7.9)
Hispanic Black	1 (.7)
Mixed	9 (6.4)
Other	2 (1.4)
Racial Composition of College/University	
HBCU	15 (10.7)
PWI	105 (75)
Mixed	19 (13.6)
Year in Program	
1st Year	24 (17.1)
2nd Year	24 (17.1)
3rd Year	21 (15.0)
4th Year	25 (17.9)
5th Year	9 (6.4)
6th Year	8 (5.7)
ABD	9 (6.4)
Degree	
Ph.D.	112 (80)
Psy.D.	17 (12.2)
Ed.D.	11 (7.9)
Major	
Counseling Psychology	51 (36.4)
Clinical Psychology	21 (15.0)
School Psychology	10 (7.1)
Psychology (general)	15 (10.7)
Educational Psychology	12 (8.6)
Counseling/Counselor Education	15 (10.7)
Education	16 (11.4)
Mother Education Level	
Less than high school graduate	13 (9.3)
High school graduate	21 (15.0)
Some college or specialized training	43 (30.7)
College/University graduate	26 (18.6)
Graduate/Professional training	37 (26.4)
Father Education Level	
Less than high school graduate	8 (5.7)
High school graduate	31 (22.1)
Some college or specialized training	31 (22.1)
College/University graduate	28 (20.0)
Graduate/Professional training	36 (25.7)
Marital Status	
Married	45 (32.1)
Single	89 (63.6)
Separated/Divorced	6 (4.3)
Children	
Yes	32 (22.9)
No	107 (76.4)

Table 2.
Demographic Characteristics of Faculty Participants

Variables	N (%)
Gender	
Female	36 (58.1)
Male	25 (40.3)
Race	
Mixed	3 (4.8)
Black American	6 (9.7)
Caucasian	3 (4.8)
Hispanic/Latino/Chicano/Puerto Rican	44 (71.0)
East Asian (Chinese/Japanese/Koren)	1 (1.6)
Other	5 (8.1)
Faculty Rank	
Professor	26 (41.9)
Associate Professor	19 (30.6)
Assistant Professor	14 (22.6)
Adjunct Professor	1 (1.6)
Carnegie Classifications	
Very High Research Activity Institution	20 (32.3)
High Research Activity Institution	17 (27.4)
Doctoral/Research Universities	7 (11.3)
No Carnegie Classification	5 (8.1)
No Answer	13 (21.0)
Racial Composition of Institution	
HBCU	2 (3.2)
PWI	16 (25.8)
Mixed	43 (69.4)
Supervisory/Advisory Experience (in general)	
1 to 5 years	15 (24.2)
6 to 10 years	14 (22.6)
11 to 15 years	10 (16.1)
16 + years	23 (37.1)
Number of doctoral students of African descent supervised/advised	
1 to 5	39 (62.9)
6 to 10	12 (19.4)
11 to 15	6 (9.7)
16 +	4 (6.5)
Doctoral Teaching Experience (in general)	
0 to 5 years	11 (17.7)
6 to 10 years	14 (22.6)
11 to 15 years	14 (22.6)
16 + years	22 (35.5)
Number of doctoral students of African descent taught	
0 to 5	17 (27.4)
6 to 10	13 (21.0)
11 to 15	5 (8.1)
16 +	25 (40.3)

Table 3.
Descriptive Statistics for Main Variables

Measures	M	SD	Cronbach's α (alpha)	n
Cross Racial Identity Subscales				
Pre-Encounter				
Assimilation (PA)	10.27	5.70	.87	5
Miseducation (PM)	11.54	4.64	.72	5
Self Hatred (PSH)	9.33	6.20	.92	5
Immersion-Emersion				
Anti-White (IEAW)	7.29	3.41	.83	5
Internalization				
Afrocentricity (IA)	14.61	6.09	.86	5
Muticulturalist Inclusive (IMCI)	29.34	4.59	.78	5
Weidman-Stein Socialization Questionnaire Subscales				
Participation in Scholarly Activities	5.81	2.71	.76	11
Student-Faculty Interactions	3.01	1.30	.76	4
Student-Peer Interactions	3.80	0.66	.75	4
Department Collegiality	10.45	2.59	.72	3
Supportive Faculty Environment	23.44	5.17	.83	7
Student Scholarly Encouragement	9.16	2.09	.81	140
Superstardom Attributes	40.94	5.00	.77	8

Note: Assimilation= CRIS items 2, 9, 18, 26, 34; Miseducation= CRIS items 3, 12, 20, 28, 36; Self-Hatred= CRIS items 4, 10, 17, 25, 39; Anti-White= CRIS items 6, 14, 23, 30, 38; Afrocentricity= CRIS items 7, 13, 22, 31, 37; Multiculturalist Inclusive = CRIS items 5, 16, 24, 33, 40. Superstar Attributes include: Working hard, Relationship with one or two faculty members, Ability to make faculty feel worthwhile, Visibility in the department, Reflecting program values, Easy to teach, Quick learner, Ability to receive and apply feedback.

Table 4
Correlation Matrix for Superstardom Attributes

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1 Working hard	--	.346**	.397**	.439**	.346**	.283**	.246**	.286**
2 Relationship with faculty member (s)	.346**	--	.507**	.309**	.350**	.216*	.231**	.238**
3 Ability to make faculty feel worthwhile	.397**	.507**	--	.431**	.439**	.402**	.365**	.168*
4 Visibility in the department	.439**	.309**	.431**	--	.324**	.262**	.250**	.138
5 Reflecting program values	.346**	.350**	.439**	.324**	--	.449**	.376**	.275**
6 Easy to teach	.283**	.216*	.402**	.262**	.449**	--	.651**	.463**
7 Ability to receive and apply feedback	.246**	.231**	.365**	.250**	.376**	.651**	--	.476**
8 Quick Learner	.286**	.238**	.168*	.138	.275**	.463**	.476**	--

* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). ** Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 5.
Correlation Matrix for Socialization Subscales

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1 Participation in Scholarly Activities	--	.176*	.086	.037	.081	.001
2 Student Faculty Interactions	.176*	--	.229**	.277**	.300**	.198*
3 Student Peer Interactions	.086	.229**	--	.005	-.055	-.029
4 Supportive Faculty Environment	.037	.277**	.005	--	.608**	.669**
5 Department Collegiality	.081	.300**	-.055	.608**	--	.596**
6 Student Scholarly Encouragement	.001	.198*	-.029	.669**	.596**	--

* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). ** Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 6.
Correlation Matrix for CRIS Subscales

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1 Assimilation (PA)	--	.208*	.249**	-.171*	-.236**	.053
2 Miseducation (PM)	.208*	--	.286**	.071	.085	-.148
3 Self-Hatred (PSH)	.249**	.286**	--	.242**	.013	-.021
4 Anti-White (IEAW)	-.171*	.071	.242**	--	.364**	-.145
5 Afrocentricity (IA)	-.236**	.085	.013	.364**	--	-.069
6 Multiculturalist Inclusive (IMCI)	.053	-.148	-.021	-.145	-.069	--

* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). ** Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Hypothesis One Findings

Correlations and curvilinear regression analyses were conducted to examine the relationship level of racial identity and doctoral students' of African descent perception of possessing superstardom attributes (e.g. visibility in the department, working hard, reflecting program values, relationship with faculty member(s), and the "W" factor [ability to make faculty feel worthwhile and/or rewarded for their investment in the student, easy to teach, ability to receive and apply feedback and quick learner]). Table 7 summarizes the descriptive statistics and analysis results. As can be seen the PSH racial identity subscale was negatively correlated with all but two of the superstardom attributes: visibility in the department and quick learner. The IMCI identity subscale was positively correlated with the superstardom attribute of establishing a relationship with faculty members. This indicates that those doctoral students who endorsed a Multiculturalist Inclusive attitude tend to believe that they establish relationships with one or two professors in their department. A curvilinear relationship was estimated between the CRIS subscales and Superstardom attributes which showed that the attribute of working hard had a quadratic relationship with the PA and PSH subscales. Additionally, the PSH subscales had a quadratic relationship with reflecting program values and ability to receive and apply feedback superstardom attributes (please see Tables 8-13 for curvilinear estimate results).

Table 7.
Spearman's Rank Order Correlation for CRIS subscales and Superstardom attributes

	Assim-ilation (PA)	Mis-education (PM)	Self-Hatred (PSH)	Anti-White (IEAW)	Afro-centricity (IA)	Multiculturalist Inclusive (IMCI)
Working hard	-.146	-.123	-.193*	-.028	.008	.102
Relationship with one or two faculty members	-.017	-.155	-.210*	-.085	-.044	.184*
Ability to make faculty feel worthwhile	-.014	-.015	-.196*	-.077	.066	.068
Visibility in the department	-.088	-.043	-.108	-.129	-.039	.141
Reflecting program	.047	-.063	-.188*	-.155	-.025	.150
Easy to teach	-.049	-.018	-.175*	-.063	.018	.073
Ability to receive and apply feedback	-.049	.020	-.310**	-.144	.058	.120
Quick learner	-.021	.032	-.053	.076	.043	.031

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed). ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 8.
Curve Estimation Summary for CRIS (PA) subscale and Superstardom Attributes

Superstardom Attributes	CRIS subscale	Linear Function R Square/F (df)	Quadratic Function R Square/F (df)
Working hard	Assimilation (PA)	.037/5.289 (1, 136)*	.051/3.665 (2, 135)*
Relationship with one or two faculty members	Assimilation (PA)	.002/.238 (1, 138)	.004/.269 (2, 137)
Ability to make faculty feel worthwhile	Assimilation (PA)	.001/.120 (1, 138)	.001/.089 (2, 137)
Visibility in the department	Assimilation (PA)	.004/.500 (1, 136)	.009/.581 (2, 135)
Reflecting program	Assimilation (PA)	.013/1.824 (1, 138)	.018/1.245 (2, 137)
Easy to teach	Assimilation (PA)	.002/.219 (1, 138)	.016/1.144 (2, 137)
Ability to receive and apply feedback	Assimilation (PA)	.000/.001 (1, 138)	.001/.091 (2, 137)
Quick learner	Assimilation (PA)	.014/1.931 (1, 137)	.036/2.533 (2, 136)

* significant at the 0.05 level

Table 9.
Curve Estimation Summary for CRIS (PM) subscale and Superstardom Attributes

Superstardom Attributes	CRIS subscale	Linear Function R Square/F (df)	Quadratic Function R Square/F (df)
Working hard	Miseducation (PM)	.066/.590 (1, 136)	.076/.392 (2, 135)
Relationship with one or two faculty members	Miseducation (PM)	.103/1.486 (1, 138)	.024/1.649 (2, 137)
Ability to make faculty feel worthwhile	Miseducation (PM)	.030/.123 (1, 138)	.030/.061 (2, 137)
Visibility in the department	Miseducation (PM)	.049/.326 (1, 136)	.132/1.203 (2, 135)
Reflecting program	Miseducation (PM)	.000/.030 (1, 138)	.000/.019 (2, 137)
Easy to teach	Miseducation (PM)	.000/.019 (1, 138)	.000/.009 (2, 137)
Ability to receive and apply feedback	Miseducation (PM)	.002/.214 (1, 138)	.010/.722 (2, 137)
Quick learner	Miseducation (PM)	.000/.002 (1, 137)	.005/.324 (2, 136)

Table 10.
Curve Estimation Summary for CRIS (PSH) subscale and Superstardom Attributes

Superstardom Attributes	CRIS subscale	Linear Function	Quadratic Function
		R Square/F (*df*)	R Square/F (*df*)
Working hard	Self Hatred (PSH)	.005/.615 (1, 136)	.074/5.432 (2, 135)*
Relationship with one or two faculty members	Self Hatred (PSH)	.010/1.368 (1, 138)	.040/2.883 (2, 137)
Ability to make faculty feel worthwhile	Self Hatred (PSH)	.012/1.686 (1, 138)	.025/1.764 (2, 137)
Visibility in the department	Self Hatred (PSH)	.002/.272 (1, 136)	.024/1.630 (2, 135)
Reflecting program	Self Hatred (PSH)	.021/2.968 (1, 138)	.059/4.295 (2, 137)*
Easy to teach	Self Hatred (PSH)	.011/1.576 (1, 138)	.040/2.829 (2, 137)
Ability to receive and apply feedback	Self Hatred (PSH)	.081/12.136 (1, 138)*	.093/7.022 (2, 137)*
Quick learner	Self Hatred (PSH)	.006/.771 (1, 137)	.006/.399 (2, 136)

*significant at the .05

Table 11.
Curve Estimation Summary for CRIS (IEAW) subscale and Superstardom Attributes

Superstardom Attributes	CRIS subscale	Linear Function	Quadratic Function
		R Square/F (*df*)	R Square/F (*df*)
Working hard	Anti-White (IEAW)	.001/.082 (1, 136)	.016/1.108 (2, 135)
Relationship with one or two faculty members	Anti-White (IEAW)	.002/.245 (1, 138)	.013/.922 (2, 137)
Ability to make faculty feel worthwhile	Anti-White (IEAW)	.000/.007 (1, 138)	.013/.880 (2, 137)
Visibility in the department	Anti-White (IEAW)	.002/.322 (1, 136)	.024/1.675 (2, 135)
Reflecting program	Anti-White (IEAW)	.014/1.942 (1, 138)	.038/2.709 (2, 137)
Easy to teach	Anti-White (IEAW)	.004/.560 (1, 138)	.012/.849 (2, 137)
Ability to receive and apply feedback	Anti-White (IEAW)	.005/.740 (1, 138)	.023/1.648 (2, 137)
Quick learner	Anti-White (IEAW)	.002/.213 (1, 137)	.008/.541 (2, 136)

Table 12.
Curve Estimation Summary for CRIS (IA) subscale and Superstardom Attributes

Superstardom Attributes	CRIS subscale	Linear Function	Quadratic Function
		R Square/F (*df*)	R Square/F (*df*)
Working hard	Afrocentricity (IA)	.000/.019 (1, 136)	.000/.013 (2, 135)
Relationship with one or two faculty members	Afrocentricity (IA)	.000/.005 (1, 138)	.004/.291 (2, 137)
Ability to make faculty feel worthwhile	Afrocentricity (IA)	.010/1.423 (1, 138)	.019/1.352 (2, 137)
Visibility in the department	Afrocentricity (IA)	.004/.598 (1, 136)	.005/.321 (2, 135)
Reflecting program	Afrocentricity (IA)	.000/.007 (1, 138)	.000/.031 (2, 137)
Easy to teach	Afrocentricity (IA)	.001/.192 (1, 138)	.002/.111 (2, 137)
Ability to receive and apply feedback	Afrocentricity (IA)	.005/.648 (1, 138)	.007/.483 (2, 137)
Quick learner	Afrocentricity (IA)	.004/.536 (1, 137)	.004/.290 (2, 136)

Table 13.
Curve Estimation Summary for CRIS (IMCI) subscale and Superstardom Attributes

Superstardom Attributes	CRIS subscale	Linear Function	Quadratic Function
		R Square/F (df)	R Square/F (df)
Working hard	Multiculturalist Inclusive (IMCI)	.002/.205 (1, 136)	.002/.102 (2, 135)
Relationship with one or two faculty members	Multiculturalist Inclusive (IMCI)	.038/5.408 (1, 138)*	.038/2.708 (2, 137)
Ability to make faculty feel worthwhile	Multiculturalist Inclusive (IMCI)	.004/.580 (1, 138)	.031/2.205 (2, 137)
Visibility in the department	Multiculturalist Inclusive (IMCI)	.002/.338 (1, 136)	.042/2.979 (2, 135)
Reflecting program	Multiculturalist Inclusive (IMCI)	.009/1.252 (1, 138)	.012/.866 (2, 137)
Easy to teach	Multiculturalist Inclusive (IMCI)	.005/.680 (1, 138)	.007/.511 (2, 137)
Ability to receive and apply feedback	Multiculturalist Inclusive (IMCI)	.003/.386 (1, 138)	.020/1.404 (2, 137)
Quick learner	Multiculturalist Inclusive (IMCI)	.000/.017 (1, 137)	.000/.025 (2, 136)

A Spearman rank order correlation was conducted to test hypothesis 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3.

Results are reported in Tables 7 and 14. The Spearman's rho revealed there were statistically

significant relationships with PSH and all of the superstardom attributes except two: (1) ability to

make faculty feel worthwhile and rewarded from their investment in the student and (2) quick

learner. However, the correlations were negative and it was hypothesized that there would be

positive correlations between lower racial identity attitudes and superstardom attributes. The

Spearman's rho revealed a statistically significant relationship between PA and the Supportive

Faculty Environment subscale (r_s(140) = .249, P = .003) thus supporting the hypothesis that

lower levels of racial identity will be positively correlated with socialization. There was a

negative correlation between IEAW racial identity attitude and the Student Scholarly Encourage

socialization subscale such that the more a student identified with Anti-White attitudes the less

they experienced scholarly encouragement from faculty members in their department. Therefore,

hypothesis 1.2 was supported. The Student Faculty Interaction subscale was positively correlated

with IMCI racial identity attitude (r_s(140) = .208, P = .014). The IMCI racial identity attitude

was also positively correlated with one of the superstardom attributes, establishing a relationship

with one or more faculty members ($r_s(140) = .184$, $P = .029$), thus supporting hypothesis 1.3.

Table 14.
Spearman's Rank Order Correlations for CRIS subscales and Socialization subscales

	Participation in Scholarly Activity	Student Faculty Interactions	Student Peer Interactions	Supportive Faculty Environment	Department Collegiality	Student Scholarly Encouragement
Assimilation (PA)	-.052	.060	.098	.249**	.069	.143
Miseducation (PM	-.121	-.075	-.096	.006	.019	.001
Self-Hatred (PSH)	.028	-.062	-.092	-.136	-.043	-.117
Anti-White (IEAW)	.141	-.062	.014	-.164	-.127	-.282**
Afrocentricity (IA)	.062	-.093	-.072	-.094	-.041	-.149
Multiculturalist Inclusive (IMCI)	.075	.208*	.135	-.016	.053	.079

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed). ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Hypothesis Two Findings

It was expected that doctoral students of African descent at HBCUs would experience

higher levels of socialization than their counterparts at PWIs. An independent-samples *t*-test was

conducted to test this hypothesis. There was only one significant difference in the scores on the

Socialization subscales. Student-Peer Interactions subscale for students attending HBCUs was

significantly different (M= 4.00, SD= .00) than students attending PWIs (M= 3.79, SD= 0.65);

t=3.32, p=.001. The results suggest that doctoral students of African descent attending HBCUs

have more interactions with their peers than doctoral students of African descent attending PWIs.

A one-way MANOVA was also conducted and revealed a significant multivariate main effect for

region, Wilks' $\lambda = .669$, *F* (17, 399) = 2.97, p <. 001, partial eta squared = .126. Power to detect

the effect was .999. Thus the result of the t-test was confirmed.

Hypothesis Three Findings

It was expected that the attributes that comprise doctoral superstar (visibility, relationship

with professors, reflection of program values and the "W" factor which consists of ability to

make faculty feel worthwhile, easy to teach, ability to receive and apply feedback and quick

learner) would continue to be valid and relevant. It was initially proposed that a Spearman's rank

order would be performed to compare the results of the current study to results in previous study. Upon further review, it was determined that there was no statistically sound way to complete this analysis, thus the result of the current study were tabulated using the Borda count method. The results were then averaged and the averages were compared to the averages of the previous study. The results are reported in Table 15. Descutner and Thelen (1989) fashioned their study after Bloom and Bell's (1979) original study. The results of the former study found that: (1) working hard, (2) getting along with people, (3) strong writing ability, (4) clinical/counseling skills, and (5) doing research contributed to success in graduate school. These researchers noted that although the three attributes from the previous study (visibility, faculty relationship and reflecting program values) were insignificant, faculty's views about superstardom qualities may differ from their views about the qualities of a successful graduate student. In the current study, faculty members were asked to rank attributes of a successful doctoral student and then rank attributes of a superstar doctoral student (see Table 15). According to this study, the top five attributes of superstardom were: (1) strong writing ability, (2) ability to receive and apply feedback, (3) discipline, (4) working hard (as visibility witnessed by faculty members), and (5) engaging in research in addition to the dissertation requirements. Working hard was the only consistent attribute in all three studies. Ability to receive and apply feedback was consistent with the Bloom and Bell (1979) study and engaging in research was consistent with the Descutner and Thelen (1989) study.

Table15.
Faculty Responses current and previous studies

Top 5 Successful Attributes (current)	Top 5 Superstar Attributes (current)	Top 5 Superstar Attributes (Bloom and Bell 1979)	Top 5 Successful Attributes (Descutner and Thelen 1989)
Strong writing ability	Strong writing ability	Visibility	Working hard
Ability to receive and apply feedback	Ability to receive and apply feedback	Working hard	Getting along with people
Working hard	Discipline	Reflecting program values	Writing ability
Handling stress	Working hard	Relationship with faculty members	Clinical/Counseling Skills
Discipline	Engaged in research in addition to dissertation requirements	"W" Factor	Doing research

A one-way Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was conducted to test the hypothesis 3.1. It was expected that doctoral students of African descent attending HBCUs would more likely rate themselves according to the attributes of graduate superstardom compared to their counterparts at PWIs. The results revealed a significant multivariate main effect for racial composition of college, Wilks' $\lambda = .803$, $F(7, 109) = 3.35$, p < .002, partial eta squared = .197. Power to detect the effect was .968. Thus the results confirmed the hypothesis. Given the significance of the overall test, the univariate main effects were examined. Significant univariate main effects for composition of college were obtained for visibility in the department, $F(1, 116) = 5.93$, $p < .016$, partial eta square = .049, power = .676; and, $F(1, 116) = 4.98$, $p < .008$, partial eta square = .059, power = .762. The results indicate that doctoral students of African descent attending HBCUs are less visible in their academic departments than their counterparts at PWIs. Additionally, the results also indicate that doctoral students of African descent attending HBCUs are more likely to endorse their academic program values than their counterparts at PWIs.

A Spearman's Rank Order Correlation was performed to test the hypothesis 3.2. It was expected that doctoral students of African descent who spent more time with faculty members outside of classroom instruction would more likely endorse attributes consistent with doctoral

superstardom and report greater overall satisfaction with their doctor experience. The results of

the correlations are listed in Table 16 below. The Spearman's rho revealed there were

statistically significant relationships between the number of hours a doctoral student spent with

faculty members outside of classroom instruction and two of the superstardom attributes:

working hard ($r_s(136) = .255$, $P = .003$) and establishing a relationship with faculty members

($r_s(138) = .184$, $P = .031$). Doctoral student's satisfaction was positively correlated with all of the

superstardom attributes except quick learner suggesting that a student's doctoral experience may

not be related to their ability to quickly learn information. These results support the hypothesis.

Table 16.
    Spearman's Rank Order Correlation for Superstardom attributes, Hours spent with faculty
members and Doctoral satisfaction

	Hours spent with faculty member outside of classroom	Doctoral student satisfaction
Working hard	.255**	.215*
Relationship with one or two faculty members	.184*	.345**
Ability to make faculty feel worthwhile	.023	.333**
Visibility in the department	.166	.295**
Reflecting program	.031	.170*
Easy to teach	-.037	.200*
Ability to receive and apply feedback	.040	.187*
Quick learner	.148	.127

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Summary

This study sought to examine the effects of racial identity and the socialization process on doctoral students of African descent as it relates to their perceptions of possessing superstardom attributes. To that end, the research presented here examined (1) the following superstardom qualities: visibility, reflection of program values, professor relationships, and the "W" factor (ability to make faculty feel valuable and satisfied with their decision to invest in this student's future in a given profession, easy to work with, learn quickly, and receive and process feedback well) for current relevance and validity; (2) doctoral students' of African descent perceptions that they possess qualities related to the concept of doctoral superstardom; and (3) the effects of the socialization process and racial identity on doctoral students of African descent. This chapter provides a synopsis of the study completed, a discussion of the research questions, implications, limitations and suggestions for further research.

This study collected data on doctoral students' of African descent socialization experience and racial identity as well as their perceptions about possessing superstardom attributes. Participants were doctoral students currently enrolled in psychology, counseling or education programs at Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs), Predominately White Institutions (PWIs) and other (participants who indicated that they did not attend neither a PWI or a HBCU. Additionally, data was collected on graduate faculty members who supervise or advise doctoral students (of all races) in psychology, counseling or education programs. All

participants provided demographic information. Graduate student participants completed the

Cross Racial Identity Scale (CRIS) and the Weidman Graduate Student Socialization Inventory.

Student participants were also asked to rank themselves and faculty participants were asked to

rank their best doctoral student (on a scale from 1 to 10; 1 being the best) according to

superstardom attributes and attributes that have been found to be associated with successful

doctoral students.

　　　　Primary research questions guiding this study were: (1) Does racial identity development

have an influence on academic socialization of doctoral students; (2) Are there between group

(HBCUs and PWIs) differences in the socialization process of students to the academic

environment; (3) Are the previously researched attributes of superstardom still relevant today

and (4) Do students of African descent at PWIs perceive themselves differently than their

counterparts attending HBCUs with respect to those attributes.

Conclusions

Racial Identity and Superstardom

　　　　The current study found a direct link between subscales of racial identity (in particular

Self-Hatred and Multiculturalist Inclusive) and doctoral superstardom. The Pre-Encounter Self-

Hatred (PSH) subscale was found to predict doctoral students' of African descent perceptions of

possessing the following superstardom attributes: (a) working hard; (b) reflecting program values

and (c) ability to receive and apply feedback. There was a curvilinear relationship between PSH

and the superstardom attributes in that students who scored lower and higher on PSH rated

themselves as hard working, having values aligned with their doctoral program and having the

ability to receive and apply feedback. These findings are supported by previous research

literature. In the Pre-Encounter stage an individual may feel that being African American is not a

significant part of their life experience, or they may hold anti-African American attitudes (e.g., Assimilation, Miseducation and Self-Hatred). In this stage, African Americans establish their identity based on the majority culture's values. Although individuals who score high on Self-Hatred view race as salient, they may have strong negative feelings about being African American and thus tend to reject ideas and values associated with such and accepted values of the dominant culture. (Canteno et al, 1998; Cross, 1991; Herd & Grube, 1996; Vandiver et al., 2001).

Results also indicated that the Multiculturalist Inclusive (IMCI) subscale was a predictor of doctoral students' of African descent perceptions of possessing the superstardom attribute of establishing a relationship with one or two faculty members. The regression analysis showed a linear relationship with these two variables instead of a curvilinear one. In the Internalization stage of the CRIS, (Multiculturalist Inclusive), individuals are capable of grasping their new identity and engaging in discussions or activities that speak to the challenges faced by people of African descent as well as other oppressed groups (Cross & Vandiver, 2001). This suggests that doctoral students of African descent who espouse to a multicultural way of approaching others also establish relationships with one or more faculty members in their academic departments. Literature suggests that racial identity and locus of control influence the perceptions of African Americans (Oler, 1989). It has been found that high internal locus of control is positively correlated with the following CRIS subscales: IEAW, IA and IMCI (Drummond, 2007). The implications of these findings are that individuals who endorse a multiculturally inclusive way of relating to others also believe that they are responsible for their own success. This is supported by Felder's (2010) assertion that African American doctoral students who are proactive and pursue relationships with faculty members realize the importance of their role in the mentorship

process as is relates to their overall success in their program. This may be another explanation for why doctoral students of African descent who scored high on the IMCI subscale also endorsed establishing relationships with faculty members as they may believe that they are in control of their own destiny and therefore seek out the support they will need to be successful.

This researcher would be remiss if this study did not acknowledge the fact that relationships are bi-directional. Although doctoral students of African descent in the Multicultural Inclusive stage of racial identity development are open and motivated to seeking mentorship from faculty members, research emphasizes the need for faculty members to be open and willing to work with students using a multicultural approach. Guiffrida (2005) argues that faculty members must demonstrate cultural/racial sensitivity. He posited that students expect faculty members to take a holistic and comprehensive approach to mentorship. Students seek relationships with faculty members who strive to understand their individual challenges and experiences and wholeheartedly support, encourage and advocate for them personally, professionally and academically (Guiffrida, 2005).

Racial Identity and Socialization

Racial identity was shown to be positively correlated with doctoral socialization. Students who endorsed a Pre-Encounter Assimilation attitude felt that their doctoral department had a supportive faculty environment. Doctoral students who scored higher on the supportive faculty environment subscale often felt that they identified more with professors than with students and felt free to call on faculty for academic help. They believed that faculty were aware of student problems and that they could depend on faculty members to give them good academic advice. Individuals with Pre-Encounter Assimilation (PA) attitudes do not view race as salient (Cross, 1978; 1991; Vandiver et al., 2001). Literature suggests that individuals who espouse stronger

assimilation attitudes tend to express greater levels of traditional Western/American values (Cross, 1978). It was hypothesized that doctoral students with Pre-Encounter attitudes would be more likely to embrace values more similar to the dominant group. This study showed that embracing such values contributed to a higher level of academic socialization.

Additionally, students who endorsed an Anti-White (IEAW) attitude felt that they did not experience student scholarly encouragement (e.g. an environment that fosters and develops scholarly self-confidence in students) from their doctoral academic departments. The Immersion–Emersion Anti-White stage of identity has been characterized as a tumultuous time when African-Americans submerge themselves in Black culture and reject White culture. The result of this study was supported by the literature as Awad (2007) found a negative relationship between immersion-emersion Anti-White and academic self-concept. Doctoral students of African descent that endorse an Anti-White attitude may find it difficult to accept encouragement or support from doctoral academic departments where there are limited or no faculty members of color. Another reason that might be offered is that doctoral students of African descent who espouse an Anti-White attitude may experience perceived or actual racial stereotyping, transition issues, and other concerns thus making it more difficult to form relationships with White faculty and thus have fewer interactions than their counterparts (Oden, 2003). Also, individuals in the Anti-White stage of racial identity development may be more likely to point out injustices that occur as a result of racism or discrimination and therefore elicit discomfort in faculty members that are less multiculturally sensitive. This may also lead to problems establishing positive faculty relationships and thus doctoral students that espouse these attitudes may feel unsupported in their academic departments.

Doctoral students of African descent who endorsed a multicultural attitude experienced more interactions with faculty members. In this study, the faculty-student interactions were considered as academic interactions as they include items related to research and academic progress. This further supports the expectation that higher levels of racial identity would predict doctoral superstardom attributes (e.g. establishing a relationship with one or two faculty members). Likewise, research has shown that holding a Multiculturalist Inclusive identity has been found to be associated with better adjustment to college (Anglin & Wade, 2007).

HBCUs versus PWIs

Research (Allen, 1992; Kim, 2004; Outcalt & Skewes-Cox, 2002) maintains that HBCUs augment the success of African-American students with regards to equality and providing multiple educational opportunities. Previous research indicated that African American students who attend HBCUs report higher academic achievement, higher levels of social involvement, and more positive interactions with faculty than their counterparts at PWIs (Allen, 1992). One reason why student-faculty interactions are observed to be more positive at HBCUs than at PWIs may be due to the philosophy that HBCUs hold about faculty-student interactions. They believe that Faculty-student interactions are an important part of the campus culture from which every student can benefit. At HBCUs, faculty members are expected to initiate interactions with students thus this relationship is not solely depended on students' actions. Additionally, researchers have found differences in the racial identity between African American undergraduate students who attend HBCUs and their counterparts at PWIs (Cokley, 1999). The data from the present study found that doctoral students of African descent who attend HBCUs reported experiencing higher levels of academic departmental socialization (specifically related to student- peer interactions) than peers at PWIs.

This current study found that doctoral students of African descent who attend HBCUs were more likely to reflect values of their academic program than did their counterparts at PWIs. These findings are consistent with previous research that asserts that the cultural values and beliefs of African Americans and other ethnic groups may be incongruent with those promoted and encouraged in the academy (Antony, 2002; Tierney & Rhoads). These researchers suggest that cultural incongruence might lead to difficulties in student socialization. This study also found that doctoral students of African descent that attend PWIs reported being more visible in their academic department than their counterparts who attend HBCUs. This finding was unexpected considering that some research has suggested that African American students at PWIs spend less time talking with faculty members outside of classroom instruction than their counterparts at HBCUs (Kim, 2004). One explanation for this surprise result may be the participants' interpretation of the definition of visibility. Although the survey question prompted students to indicate whether or not they were visible in their department before and after normal business hours, there is no way of knowing how the participants understood and thus answered the question. The construct of visibility is complex and may be viewed in a positive and negative manner. As mentioned earlier in this study, Franklin (1999) noted that invisibility is a psychological experience in which a person feels that his or her personal identity and capability are weakened by racism. He concluded that African Americans are often torn between the risks associated with being themselves and understanding what behavioral changes can be made to gain acceptance. Similarly, Gasman et al. (2004) found that minority graduate students often experience feelings of invisibility and are silenced as a result. In addition, many individuals of African descent have to navigate between feeling invisible and experiencing hypervisibility. Blake-Beard and Roberts (2004) defined hypervisibility as heightened scrutiny. According to

Davis et al (2004) minorities experience different reactions to this heightened visibility: their every action is scrutinized; their judgment is questioned; and their performance is evaluated closely and criticized vigorously. Small errors are considered confirmation of the incompetence rather than seen as opportunities to learn from mistakes and polish essential skills. This literature illuminates the double-bind of visibility wherein minorities vacillate between two ends of the visibility spectrum. At one end of this continuum, minorities face potential exclusion from the dominant group that renders them invisible in majority contexts; at the other end of the continuum, minorities experience heightened scrutiny, or hypervisibility due to their uniqueness from the majority group (Blake-Beard & Roberts, 2004). Consequently, doctoral students of African descent who attend PWIs may consider themselves visible in their academic departments not because their visibility is warranted or intentional, but possibly due to the effects of experiencing invisibility and/or hypervisibility.

Another potential explanation for the unexpected result may be that, although insignificant, there was a slightly higher mean for parental education level of doctoral students who attend PWIs than that of HBCUs. This suggests that students who have parents that have been through the graduate process (perhaps at a PWI) may receive additional information about how to be successful in higher education settings.

Superstardom Attributes

It was expected that there would be no difference in the current study results related to doctoral superstardom attributes and the previous studies conducted on graduate superstardom. The only consistent superstardom attribute throughout all three studies, present study included, was working hard. In contrast, visibility in the department and some of the "W" factor attributes (e.g. ability to make faculty feel worthwhile and easy to teach) received relatively low rankings.

Social desirability may have affected the way participants answered the items as it may not be socially acceptable for faculty members to admit that they would like students to make them feel worthwhile. It should be noted that almost twenty-five percent of the faculty participants reported having one to five years of supervisory/advisory experience. Professors' understanding of doctoral superstardom may vary according to their years of experience supervising/advising doctoral students. This researcher would argue that the more experience graduate faculty members have with supervising/advising students, the better their understanding of doctoral student development and the doctoral student learning curve thus their ability to readily recognize superstardom attributes may increase. Additionally, the last study on doctoral superstardom was conducted over twenty years ago. Those studies did not indicate demographic information about the faculty participants (e.g. faculty appointment). This is important as professors' expectations and ideals about doctoral superstardom may be different depending on their faculty appointments and responsibilities. For instance, in this study, over fifty percent of the faculty participants indicated that at least thirty percent of their faculty appointment was research based and of that fifty percent of the faculty participants, twenty-four percent indicated that at least half of their faculty appointment was research based. This may speak to why two out of the top five superstardom attributes in this study are related to research (e.g. strong writing ability and engaged in research in addition to dissertation requirements). Furthermore, several changes have occurred in the past twenty years (e.g. technology,). These changes may explain the difference in faculty conceptions related to doctoral superstardom attributes. For example, through the emergence of the internet, students are able to show that they are working hard from remote locations (e.g. sending emails and text messages to give professors updates on their work progress).

Implications

The current study is consistent with the philosophy of counseling psychology and offers research and practice suggestions. A distinguishing characteristic of counseling psychology is a concentration on studying educational development and environments of individuals (Gelso & Fretz, 2001). Moreover, counseling psychologists recognize the importance of understanding how a person's racial context impacts their identity, points of view, and experiences (Fouad & Brown, 2000). This study highlights the importance of healthy doctoral socialization and well-adjusted racial identity attitudes to promote positive outcomes (e.g. doctoral superstardom). Given the shift towards a strengths based approach (building on positive qualities shifting away from the focus on suffering and disease) a focus on the positive attributes of doctoral success allows for prevention of negative outcomes (e.g. attrition) and gives insight into how these strengths can be fostered in students (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000). Thus, academic departments should be aware not only of negative outcomes but also how to promote positive outcomes in doctoral students such as superstardom.

This study speaks to a number of the above noted significant counseling psychology emphases. Specifically, the findings of this study reveal that racial identity development is predictive of doctoral students' of African descent perception of possessing superstardom attributes and their socialization process. The results of this study may benefit counseling psychologist specifically and doctoral programs in general as it could provide important opportunities for doctoral programs to adjust the structure and the culture experienced by doctoral students.

This study establishes that racial identity influences doctoral students' of African descent socialization process as well as their perceptions of possessing attributes associated with doctoral

superstardom. It was also found that faculty members have conceptions of doctoral superstardom that differ from the previously noted research. It is posited that doctoral students, in general, would benefit from not only knowing the minimum graduation requirements but also ways in which they can exceed faculty expectations (Tierney, 1997). This may lead to higher socialization levels and increased relationships with professors as doctoral superstars are said to receive the best assistantships, have inside knowledge about employment opportunities and receive the most emotional encouragement and support (Bloom & Bell, 1979).

The results of this study support the literature that argues that today's doctoral students of African descent enter into graduate programs with increasingly varied backgrounds, preparation, expectations, motivations, and responsibilities. In the United States, doctoral students tend to be older than in the past, mostly in a relationship, parents, employed in areas unrelated to their discipline, and reside far enough away from campus that impedes one's ability to be present and visible (Smith, 2000). Results also reveal that not all doctoral students of African descent experience their doctoral process in the same way. This finding suggests that the same socialization strategy may lead to very different behavioral responses and outcomes. Ultimately, these results support Antony's (2002) call to doctoral programs to re-examine their current socialization approaches. Antony (2002) and Tierney and Rhoads (1994) assert that an important component of successful socialization is the need to accept and adopt the norms and values of the discipline. These researchers note that this process may be challenging as the values of the discipline are informed by the majority culture. Individuals from underrepresented groups such as individuals of African descent may have cultural norms, values, and beliefs that are distinctly different and in conflict with those promoted in their academic department. Antony (2002) maintained that socialization should be approached in manner by which students are made aware

that there is a difference between understanding the values and beliefs that are salient to practicing in a discipline but are not necessary to adopt personally. This would allow students more flexibility in determining and defining the roles they will fill in the future as well as a healthier racial identity development process. Research suggests that a positive racial identity (i.e., Internalization) can lead to positive health outcomes such as higher self-esteem (Munford, 1994; Phelps, Taylor, & Gerard, 2001; Poindexter-Cameron & Robinson, 1997; Speight et al., 1996) and unconditional positive self-regard (Speight, Vera, & Derrickson, 1996), as well as lower levels of perceived culture-specific stressors (Neville et al., 1997); and decreased depression symptoms (Munford, 1994). This may increase doctoral students' of African descent self-efficacy related to possessing attributes consistent with doctoral superstardom as well as lend itself to a more successful socialization process.

Faculty are encouraged to examine the values and beliefs of the discipline and the assumptions they hold regarding what is necessary for success in the field. Mentorship is essential in facilitating successful experiences for doctoral students of African descent (Guido-DiBrito and Batchelor, 1988; Locke, 1997). Although it has been argued that students of African descent prefer same-race mentors (Jackson, Kite,& Branscombe, 1996), Gasman et al. (2008) contend that due to the make-up of the professoriate, it is not feasible for African American faculty to bear total responsibility for mentoring all of the African American doctoral students that comprise the academy. Myers (2002) proposed that mentors do not have to be of the same race or gender as their mentees; however, they must possess multicultural awareness. This suggests that graduate faculty mentors who are not of African descent would need to be conscious of and responsive to how the academic environment may perpetuate negative interactions that doctoral students may experience as a result of their race. It is also crucial that

faculty mentors not of African descent willingly reach out to assist doctoral students of African descent, whether in a mentoring capacity or simply providing general guidance and encouragement.

This research suggests that doctoral students of African descent at HBCUs have better interactions with their peers that their counterparts at PWIs. This is important as peer interactions have been connected to greater levels socialization into the field (Austin, 2002; Becker & Carper, 1956; Gardner, 2007). Research has shown that doctoral students depend on peers for social and academic support (Gardner, 2010). For instance, students depend on their peers for social support in terms of engaging in informal social activities outside of the classroom. Additionally, individuals depend on their peers as colleagues, engaging in research and presentations unrelated to class assignments. Finally, peers can also act as mentors guiding individuals through the doctoral process as there are very few counseling psychology programs at HBCUs.

While the previously mentioned suggestions are specific successfully socializing doctoral students of African descent who hold different racial beliefs and values into their academic programs, such adjustments can improve any doctoral student's experience. By broadening the approach to socializing students in such a way that allows all students to experiences success, not just those who are like those who have preceded them or who are willing to abandon their own beliefs to be accepted, more diverse doctoral students will develop.

Limitations

This study had several limitations. To date, no scales have been developed for measuring doctoral superstardom. In fact, only the total scores could be used in this study. Additionally, the intercorrelations of the doctoral superstardom attributes were highly correlated. This may suggest that the attributes were not measure unique constructs. The self-report nature of all this measure

is a limitation because the use of such measures tends to inflate the correlations found among variables (Paulhaus, 1991). Another limitation has to do with the predictor variables. Although there were significant correlations and predictions, the variables included only accounted for a small amount of the variance in students endorsing doctoral superstardom attributes. This suggests that there are potentially other factors that could contribute to doctoral superstardom for students of African descent than the variables identified.

Participants in the present study used self-report as a way of conveying various attitudes and behaviors. Even though participants were advised that their answers would be kept anonymous, some still may have experienced difficulty reporting their true attitudes with regards to racial identity or their academic abilities and experiences. Given the fact that the participants in this study are students in doctoral programs where they have more than likely been exposed to and/or strongly encouraged to explore and accept multicultural attitudes, social desirability may have affected the way participants answered the items. Socially desirable responding, or responding to make oneself appear more favorable, interferes with accurate inferences from self-report scores (Fraboni & Cooper, 1989; Holden, 1994; King & Bruner, 2000). Many researchers have posited that social desirability and multicultural competence are closely related (Ottavi et al, 1994; Constantine & Hofheinz, 1997; Worthington et al, 2000). Additionally, Constantine and Ladany (2000) found a positive relationship between the multicultural competency scale and social desirability.

Because of the restrictive nature of survey research, the researcher is not given the opportunity to further explore answers to closed-ended questions (Nardi, 2006). Another limitation is that return rates can be low with surveys. For this study, there was no way to determine how many individuals looked at the survey and elected not to participate. The

generalizability of the data is another possible limitation of this study. It is important to note that forty-five percent of the doctoral student participants in this study reported that their mother has a college degree or better and 45.7% reported that their father has a college degree or better. This is more than twice the national average (17.7 and 21.4) respectively and thus not representative. This suggests that these participants may have been highly socialized prior to entering their doctoral departments and may not hold true for first generation doctoral students. Additionally, there were not enough participants who attended Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) to serve as a comparison group. Therefore, the results of this study related to comparing HBCUs to PWIs should be interpreted with caution. Also, the numbers of the groups of the MANOVAs calculated to test for the effects of the variables were small and unequal. The numbers for the HBCU group might have been too small to show significant effects. Although the sample size ($N = 140$ student participants; N= 62 faculty participants) was adequate for most of the analyses employed in this study, a larger sample size could increase the power of the results.

The recruitment efforts used in the current research study proved to be a limitation. Request for participants was met with resistance from some of the directors of training. Some departments required researchers to go through their IRB before their faculty or students could receive requests to participate in research studies. IRB approval was only gained from the institute where this researcher attends. Although emails were sent to listservs and posted on social media websites, not all doctoral students of African descent are members of professional organizations and therefore may have not received an invitation to participate.

Recommendations for Future Research

The results and limitations of this study provide possibilities for future research to address. Future researchers are encouraged to get a sample that has a relatively equal amount of participants who attend HBCUs and PWIs. This researcher experienced difficulty gaining support from academic training departments at HBCUs in terms of forwarding my request for participation to the doctoral students. It was explained that a lengthy IRB process would need to be pursued before students or faculty could be asked to participate in research. This may due to cultural mistrust as a result of negative intentions during research studies like the Tuskegee experiment (Brandt, 1978). Future research need to be aware of this information and adjust their timeline to make concessions to pursue IRB approval at these institutions.

Quantitative findings revealed limitations of self-reporting survey data with regards to the capturing a student's full experience, interviewing participants may provide the researcher with the opportunity to gather addition information about a student's perceptions of their doctoral experience. Qualitative methods of research have often been used to explore the experiences of Black doctoral students (Felder, 2010; Gasman, Gerstl-Pepin, Anderson-Thompkins, Rasheed, & Hathaway, 2004). The employment of a mixed-method approach, whereby both quantitative and qualitative data is collected, could provide more insights into the perceptions of doctoral students. Qualitative research may allow for a more thorough understanding if racial identity constructs are constant or if certain environmental conditions and experiences during doctoral studies impact values and beliefs that are connected to race.

This study focused on doctoral students of African descent in the helping professions (psychology, counseling and education). Initially, it was thought that the socialization process would be similar in these fields. After further review, this researcher research realizes that

limiting the participation criteria to reflect certain disciplines also limited the participant pool. It is suggested that future researchers expand the participant pool by including other disciplines (e.g. business, math, science, sociology, etc.).

This study focused on the relationship between racial identity and socialization. Future researchers who seek to prove whether value congruence is a factor in socialization may choose to use other measure of values or cultural orientation scale to examine the theory of cultural incongruence. For instance, a future researcher might use the Intercultural Values Inventory (Carter & Helms, 1990) to prove whether there are differences in cultural values orientation between HBCU students and PWI students and its effects on the doctoral socialization process.

It is also suggested that scale development be considered in an effort to assess the construct of doctoral superstardom more accurately. The items in the scale would benefit from reflecting both positive and negative intercorrelations. Additionally, a longitudinal study and analysis would be beneficial to scholars, students, and programs. Specifically, understanding the factors that impact the socialization process of doctoral students of African descent over time would be helpful in creating effective policy purposed to increase persistence, encourage more students to consider becoming faculty, and create a more satisfying educational experience in general. Future researchers may also want to explore the moderating effects of racial identity on the doctoral socialization process and doctoral students' of African descent perceptions of possessing superstardom attributes.

REFERENCES

Abedi, J., & Benkin, E. (1987). The effects of students' academic, financial, and demographic variables on time to the doctorate. *Research in Higher Education, 27*(1), 3-14.

Adair, V. (2001**).** Poverty and the (broken) promise of higher education. *Harvard Educational Review, 71*(2), 217-239.

Allen,W. R. (1992). The color of success: African American college student outcomes at predominantly and historically black public colleges and universities. *Harvard Educational Review*, *62*(1), 26–44.

Allen, W. R., Epps, E. G., & Haniff, N. Z. (Eds.). (1991). *College in Black and White: African American students in predominantly White and in historically Black public institutions*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Ancis, J.R., W.E. Sedlacek, and J.J. Mohr. 2000. "Students' perceptions of campus climate by race." *Journal of Counseling and Development* 78: 180-186.

Anglin, D. M., & Wade, J. C. (2007). Racial socialization, racial identity, and Black students' adjustment to college. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 13(3), 207-215.

Awad, G. H. (2007). The role of racial identity, academic self-concept, and self-esteem in the prediction of academic outcomes for African American students. *Journal of Black Psychology*, 33, 188-207.

Antonio, A.L. 2002. Faculty of color reconsidered. *The Journal of Higher Education* 73,(5), 582–602.

Arce, C. H., and W. H. Manning. (1984). *Minorities in Academic Careers: The Experiences of Ford Foundation Fellows*. New York: Ford Foundation.

Austin, A. E. (2002). Preparing the next generation of faculty: Graduate school as socialization to the academic career. *The Journal of Higher Education, 73*(1), 94-121.

Austin, A. E. (2009). The role of doctoral advisors: A look at advising from the advisor's perspective. *Innovative Higher Education*, *33*(5), 297–315.

Austin, A. E., & McDaniels, M. (2006). Preparing the professoriate of the future: Graduate student socialization for faculty roles. In J. C. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of Theory and Research, 21,* 397–456. Netherlands: Springer.

Bair, C. R., & Haworth, J. G. (2005). Doctoral student attrition and persistence: A meta-synthesis of research. In J. C. Smart (ed.), *Higher Education: Handbook of theory and research* (Vol. 19, pp. 481–534). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Baird, L. L. (1972). The relation of graduate students' role relations to their stage of academic career, employment, and academic success. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 7*, 428–441.

Barak, A. (1999). Psychological applications on the Internet: A discipline on the threshold of a new millennium. *Applied and Preventive Psychology*, *8*, 231–246.Barnes, B. J., &

Becker, H. S., Geer, B., Hughes, E. C., & Strauss, A. L. (1961). Boys in white: Student culture in medical school. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Beckham, B. (1988). Strangers in a strange land: The experience of Blacks on White campuses. *Educational Record*,   *68*, 74-78.

Bell, E. L. (1990). The bicultural life experience of career-oriented Black women. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 11*(6), 459-477.

Benton, M. A. (2005). Challenges African American students face at predominantly white institutions, www.colostate.edu/Depts/SAHE/JOURNAL2/2001/Challenges.htm.

Berelson, B. (1960). Graduate education in the United States. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Bieber, J. P., & Worley, L. K. (2006). Conceptualizing the academic life: Graduate students' perspectives. *Journal of Higher Education*, *77*(6), 1009–1035.

Blackwell, J. E. (1987). *Mainstreaming outsiders: The production of Black professionals* (2nd ed.). Dix Hill, NY: General Hall.

Blake-Beard, S. & Roberts, L. Morgan. (2004). Releasing the double bind of visibility in the workplace. *CGO Commentaries Series*. Boston, MA: Center for Gender in Organizations, Simmons College.

Bloom, L. J., & Bell, P. A. (1979). Making it in graduate school: Some reflections about the superstars. *Teaching of Psychology, 6*, 231-232.

Bowen, W. G., & Rudenstine, N. L. (1992). *In pursuit of the Ph.D.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Boyd-Franklin, N. (2003). Black families in therapy: Understanding the African American experience (2nd ed.). New York, NY, US: Guilford Press.

Bragg, A. K. (1976). *The socialization process in higher education*. Washington, DC: The George Washington University.

Brandt, A.M. (1978). Racism and Research: The Case of the Tuskegee Syphilis Study *The Hastings Center Report*,6, 21-29

Braxton, J. M., and Toombs, W. (1982). Faculty uses of doctoral training: Consideration of a technique for the differentiation of scholarly effort from research activity. *Research in Higher Education 16*, 265–282.

Brighenti, A. (2007). Visibility: A category for the social sciences. *Current Sociology, 55*, 323-42.

Brown, M. C., Davis, G. L., & S. A. McClendon. (1999). Mentoring graduate students of color: Myths, models, and modes. P*eabody Journal of Education, 74*(2), 105–118.

Burton, N. W., & Wang, M. (2005). *Predicting long-term success in graduate school: A collaborative validity study*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Castellanos, J., Gloria, A. M., & Kamimura, M. (Eds.). (2006). *The Latina/o pathway to the PhD: Abriendo caminos*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Cheatham, H., & Phelps, C. (1995). Promoting the development of graduate students of color. In Anne Pruitt and Paul Issac (Eds.). *Student services for the changing graduate student Population,72*(4), 91–99.

Clark, S. M., & Corcoran, M. (1986). Perspectives on the professional socialization of women faculty: A case of accumulative disadvantage? *The Journal of Higher Education, 57*(1), 20-43.

Collins, P. (1994). Does mentorship among social workers make a difference? An empirical investigation of career outcomes. *Social Work, 39*, 413-422.

Cook, M. M., & Swanson, A. (1978). The interaction of student and program variables for the purpose of developing a model for predicting graduation from graduate programs over a 10-year period. *Research in Higher Education, 8*, 83-91.

Cooper, A., Scherer, C., Boise, S., & Gordon, B. (1999). Sexuality on the Internet: From sexual exploration to pathological expression. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, *30*154–164.

Cose, E. (1993). *The rage of a privileged class*. New York: HarperCollins.

Council of Graduate Schools. (2004). *Ph.D. completion and attrition: Policy, numbers, leadership, and next steps*. Washington, DC: Council of Graduate Schools.

Cross, W. (1971). The Negro to Black experience: Towards a psychology of Black liberation. *Black World*, 20(9), 13-27.

Cross, W. E. (1991). *Shades of Black: diversity in African American identity*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Cross, W. E., Jr., & Vandiver, B. J. (2001). Nigrescence theory and measurement: Introducing the Cross Racial Identity Scale (CRIS). In J. G. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, & C. M. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (2nd ed., pp. 371–393). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

D'Augelli, A. R., & Hershberger, S. L. (1993). African American undergraduates on a predominantly white campus: Academic factors, social networks, and campus climate. *The Journal of Negro Education*, *62*(1), 67–81.

Daniel, C. 2007. Outsiders-within: Critical race theory, graduate education and barriers to professionalization. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare* 34, (1), 25–42.

Davidson, M. N., & Foster-Johnson, L. (2001). Mentoring in the preparation of graduate researchers of color. *Review of Educational Research, 71*(4), 549–574.

Davis, M., Dias-Bowie, Y., & Greenberg, K. (2004). "A fly in the buttermilk": Descriptions of university life by successful black undergraduate students at a predominately white southeastern university. The Journal of Higher Education, 75(4), 420-445.

Debord, L. W. & Millner, S. M. (1993). Educational experiences of African American graduate students on a traditionally White campus: Succor, socialization, and success. *Equity and Excellence in Education, 26*(1), 60-71.

DeFour, D.C., & Hirsch, B.J. (1990). The adaptation of Black graduate students: A social network approach. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *18,* 487-503.

Descutner, C. J., & Thelen, M. H. (1989). Graduate student and faculty perspectives about graduate school. *Teaching of Psychology, 16*(2), 58-61.

Dixon-Reeves, R. (2003). Mentoring as a precursor to incorporation: An assessment of the mentoring experience of recently minted Ph.D.s.*Journal of Black Studies*, *34*(1), 12–27.

Ellis, E. M. (1997).*The impact of race and gender on graduate school socialization, satisfaction with graduate study and commitment to completion of the degree among Black and White doctoral students*. Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertations & Theses.

Ellis, E. M. (2001). The impact of race and gender on graduate school socialization, satisfaction with doctoral study and commitment to degree completion. *The Western Journal of Black Studies,* 25(1).

Ellison, R. (1952). *Invisible man*. New York: Random House.

Farmer, V. (2003). *Finding a faculty mentor to help guide you through the doctoral process*. In V. Farmer & Moseley-Braun (Eds). *The black students guide to graduate and professional school success* (p. 68-81). Westport, CT: Greenwood.

Feagan, J. R., Hernan, V., & Imani, N. (1996). *The agony of education: Black students at White colleges and universities*. New York: Rutledge.

Feeley, T. H., Williams, V. M., & Wise, T. J. (2005). Testing the predictive validity of the GRE exam on communication graduate student success: A case study at University of Buffalo. C*ommunication Quarterly, 53*(2), 229–245.

Felder, P. (2010) On Doctoral Student Development: Exploring Faculty Mentoring in the

Shaping of African American Doctoral Student Success. *The Qualitative Report*, 15 (2), 455-474.

Ferrer de Valero, Y. (2001). Departmental factors affecting time-to-degree and completion rates of doctoral students at one land-grant research institution. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *72*(3), 341–367.

Fleming, J. 1984. *Blacks in college.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Franklin, A. J., & Boyd-Franklin, N. (2000). Invisibility syndrome: A clinical model of the effects of racism on African American males. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 70,* 33–41.

Gandara, P., & Contreras, F. (2009). *The Latino education crisis: The consequences of failed social policies*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Gandara, P., & Maxwell- Jolly, J. (1999). Priming the pump: Strategies for increasing the achievement of underrepresented minority undergraduates. New York: The College Board.

Gardner, S. K. (2005). *"If it were easy, everyone would have a Ph.D." Doctoral student success: Socialization and disciplinary perspectives.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Washington State University, Pullman.

Gardner, S. (2008). Fitting the Mold of Graduate School: A Qualitative Study of Socialization in Doctoral Education. Innovative Higher Education (2008) 33:125–138.

Gardner, S. K. (2009). Conceptualizing success in doctoral education: Perspectives of faculty in seven disciplines. *The Review of Higher Education*, *32*(3), 383–406.

Gardner, S. K., & Barnes, B. J. (2007). Graduate student involvement: Socialization for the professional role. *Journal of College Student Development*, *48*(4), 369–387.

Gasman, M., Gerstl-Pepin, C., Aderson-Thompkins, S., Rasheed, L., & Hathaway, K. (2004). Developing trust, negotiating power: Transgressing race and status in the academy. *Teachers College Record, 106*(4), 689-715.

Gasman, M., Hirschfield, A., & Vultaggio, J. (2008). "Difficult yet rewarding": The experiences of African American graduate students. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 1*(2), 126-138.

Gay, G. (2004). Navigating marginality en route to the professoriate: Graduate students of color learning and living in academia. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *17*(2), 265–288.

Gildersleeve, R. E., Croom, N. N. & Vasquez, P. L. (2011) "'Am I going crazy?!": A critical race analysis of doctoral education. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 44*(1), 93-114.

Girves, J. E., & Wemmerus, V. (1988). Developing models of graduate student degree progress. *Journal of Higher Education, 59*(2), 163-189.

Golde, C. M. (1998). Beginning graduate school: Explaining first-year doctoral attrition. In M. S. Anderson (Ed.), *The experience of being in graduate school: An exploration* (pp. 55-64). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Golde, C. M. (2000). Should I stay or should I go? Student descriptions of the doctoral attrition process. *The Review of Higher Education, 23*(2), 199–227.

Gonz´alez, J. C. (2006). Academic socialization experiences of Latina doctoral students: A qualitative understanding of support systems that aid and challenges that hinder the process. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education*, *5*(4), 347–365.

Gonz´alez, J. C. (2007). Surviving the doctorate and thriving as faculty: Latina junior faculty

reflecting on their doctoral studies experiences. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, *40*(4), 291–300.

Gosling, S. D., Vazire, S., Srivastava, S., & John, O. (2004). Should we trust web-based studies: A comparative analysis of six preconceptions about Internet questionnaires. *American Psychologist*, *59*, 93–104.

Greenhaus, J. H., Parasuraman, S., & Wormley, W. M. (1990). Effects of race on organizational experiences, job performance evaluations, and career outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal, 33*(1), 64-86.

Gurin, P., Dey, E. L., Hurtado, S., & Gurin, G. (2002). Diversity and higher education: Theory and impact on educational outcomes. *Harvard Educational Review, 72,* 330–366.

Hagedorn, L. S., & Nora, A. (1996). Rethinking admissions criteria in graduate and professional programs. In J. G. Haworth (Ed.), *Assessing graduate and professional education: Current realities, future prospects* (pp. 31–44). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hall, M. L., & Allen, W. R. (1982). Race Consciousness and Achievement: Two issues in the study of black graduate/professional students. *Integrateducation, 20*, 56-61.

Harvey, W. B. (1984). The educational system and Black mental health. *Journal of Negro Education, 53*(4), 444-454.

Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Holland, J. W. (1993). The effects of faculty involvement on African American doctoral students choosing careers in higher education. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 53*(8-A), 2703.

House, J. D. (1999). Predictive validity of the Graduate Record Examination for grades in graduate chemistry courses. *Psychological Reports, 85*(1), 41–44.

Hurtado, S. (1994). Graduate school racial climates and academic self-concept among minority graduate students in the 1970s. *American Journal of Education, 102,* 330–351.

Isaac, P. D. (1993). Measuring graduate student retention. In L. L. Baird (Ed.), *Increasing graduate student retention and degree attainment* (pp. 13-25). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Katz, J., & Hartnett, R. T. (1976). *Scholars in the making: The development of graduate and professional students*. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.

Kim, M. M. (2004). The experience of African-American student in historically Black institutions. *Thought and Action*, 20(1),107-123.

Knouse, S. B. (1992). The mentoring process for Hispanics. In S. B. Knouse, P. Rosenfeld, & A. L. Culbertson (Eds.), *Hispanics in the workplace* (pp. 137-150). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Kram, K. E. (1988). *Mentoring at work: Developmental relationships in organizational life*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Kuh, G. D., & Whitt, E. J. (1988). The invisible tapestry: Culture in American colleges and universities. Washington, DC: The George Washington University.

Lang, M. (1992). Barriers to blacks' educational achievement in higher education: a statistical and conceptual review. *Journal of Black Studies, 22*(4), 510-522.

Lannholm, G. V., & Schrader, W. B. (1951). *Predicting graduate school success: An evaluation of the effectiveness of the Graduate Record Examinations*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Lovitts, B. E. (1996). Who is responsible for graduate student attrition – the individual or the

institution? Toward an explanation of the high and persistent rate of attrition. Paper

presented at the annual meeting of the American Education Research Association, New

York.

Lovitts, B. E. (2001). *Leaving the ivory tower: The causes and consequences of departure from*

doctoral study. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Lyons, N. L. (1990). Once you're in, you gotta hold your own. Black *Issues in Higher*

Education, 6(22), 13-14.

Merton, R. K. (1957). *Social theory and social structure*. New York: The Free Press.

Merton, R. K. (1968). *Social theory and social structure*. Glencoe, NY: Free Press.

Munford, M. B. (1994). Relationship of gender, self-esteem, social class, and racial identity

to depression in Blacks. *Journal of Black Psychology*, 20(2), 157-174.

Myers, D. G. (2000). The funds friends and faith of happy people. *American Psychologist*,

55(1), 56-67.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2008). *Digest of educational statistics, higher*

education general information survey (HEGIS). Washington, DC: U.S.

Government Printing Office.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2009). Higher education general information survey

(HEGIS, "Fall Enrollment in Colleges and Universities" surveys, 1976 and 1980; and

1990 through 2008 Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS).

Nettles, M. T. (1988). Toward Black undergraduate student equality in American higher

education. New York: Greenwood Press.

Nettles, M. T. (1990). Success in doctoral programs: Experiences of minority and white

students. *American Journal of Education, 98*(4), 494-522.

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

Nettles, M. T., Thoeny, A. R. & Gosman, E. J. (1986). Comparative and predictive analyses of black and white students' college achievement and experiences. *Journal of Higher Education, 57,* 289 - 318.

Onwuegbuzie, A.J. (1997). Writing a research proposal: The role of library anxiety, statistics anxiety, and composition anxiety. *Library Information Science Research*, *19*, 5-33.

Onwuegbuzie, A.J. (1999). Statistics anxiety among African American graduate students: An effective filter. *Journal of Black Psychology*, *25*, 2, 189-209.

Onwuegbuzie, A. J., Mayes, E., Arthur, L., Johnson, J., Robinson, V., Ashe, S., Elbedour, S., & Collins, K.M.T. (2004). Reading comprehension among African American graduate students. *The Journal of Negro Education, 73,* 443-457.

Ostroff, C., & Kozlowski, S. W. J. (1993). The role of mentoring in the information gathering processes of newcomers during early organizational socialization. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 42*, 170-183.

Oyserman, D., & Sakamoto, I. (1997). Being Asian American: Identity, cultural constructs, and stereotype perception. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 33*(4), 435-453.

Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (2005). *How college affects students: A third decade of research* (Vol. 2). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Perrucci, R., & Hu, H. (1995). Satisfaction with social and educational experiences among international doctoral students. *Research in Higher Education, 36*(4), 491–508.

Pruitt, A. S., & Isaac, P. D. (1985). Discrimination in recruitment, admission, and retention of

minority graduate students. *Journal of Negro Education,54*(4), 526–536.

Pruitt-Logan, A. S., Gaff, J. G., & Jentoft, J. E. (2002). *Preparing future faculty in the sciences and mathematics: A guide for change*. Washington, DC: Council of Graduate Schools, Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Renn, K. A., & Jessup-Anger, E. R. (2008). Preparing New Professionals: Lessons for graduate preparation programs from the national study of new professionals in student affairs. *Journal of College Student Development, 49*(4), 319-335.

Romero, M. & Margolis, E. (1999). Integrating sociology: Observations on race and gender relations in sociology graduate programs. *Race and Society,* 2, 1-24.

Ross, M. W., Daneback, K., Mansson, S., Tikkanen, R., & Cooper, A. (2003). Characteristics of men and women who complete or exit from an on-line internet sexuality questionnaire: A study of instrument dropout bias. *Journal of Sex Research*, *40*, 396–402.

Rosser, V. J. (2003). Preparing and socializing new faculty members. *The Review of Higher Education*, *26*(3), 387–395.

Roth, J.A. (1955). A faculty conception of success in graduate study. *Journal of Higher Education, 26*, 350-356.

Schroeder, D. S., & Mynatt, C. R. (1993). Female graduate students' perceptions of their interactions with male and female major professors. *The Journal of Higher Education, 64*(5), 555–573.

Seligman, M. E. P., Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000). Positive psychology. *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 5-14.

Solórzano, D. G., Rivas, M. A.,&Velez,V. N. (2005). Community college as a pathway to

Chicana/o doctorate production. *Latino Policy & Issues Brief, 11*. Los Angeles, CA: UCLA Chicano Studies Research Center.

Solórzano, D. G., & Villalpando, O. (1998). Critical race theory, marginality, and the experience of students of color in higher education. In C. A. Torres & T. R. Mitchell (Eds.), *Sociology of education: Emerging perspectives* (pp. 211–224). Albany, NY: State University of New York.

Soto Antony, J. (2002). Reexamining doctoral student socialization and professional development: Moving beyond the congruence and assimilation orientation. In J. C. Smart (Ed.), *Higher Education: Handbook of theory and research* (Vol. 17, pp. 349–380). New York: Agathon Press.

Speight, S. L., Vera, E. M., & Derrickson, K. B. (1996). Racial self-designation, racial identity and self-esteem revisited. *Journal of Black Psychology*, 22, 37-52

Smith, M. A., & Leigh, B. (1997). Virtual subjects: Using the Internet as an alternative source of subjects and research environment. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, and Computers*, *29*, 496–505.

Stanton, J. M. (1998). An empirical assessment of data collection using the Internet. *Personnel Psychology*, *51*, 709-725.

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics* (5th ed.). New York: Harper Collins.

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

Thompson, P. F. (2006). *African American doctoral degree completers and the factors that*

influence their success in the Ivy League. Doctoral Dissertation, University of

Pennsylvania, Pennsylvania.

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

Tinto, V. (1993). *Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition* (2nd ed.). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Trow, M. (ed.) (1975). *Teachers and Students: Aspects of American Higher Education*, McGraw-Hill, New York.

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

Van Maanen, J. (1984). Doing new things in old ways: The chains of socialization. In J. L. Bess (Ed.), College and university organization: Insights from the behavioral sciences (pp. 211–247). New York, NY: New York University Press.

Vandiver, B. J. (2001). Psychological nigrescence revisited: introduction and overview. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, 29, 165-173.

Vandiver, B. J., Worrell, F, C., Fhagen-Smith, P, E., & Cross, W, E. (2002). Validating the cross racial identity scale. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 49(1), 71-85.

Walker, K. L., Wright, G. & Hanley, J. H. (2001). The professional preparation of African American graduate students: A Student Perspective. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 32*(6), 581-584.

Walker, G. E., Golde, C. M., Jones, L., Bueschel, A. C., & Hutchings, P. (2008). *The formation*

of scholars: Rethinking doctoral education for the twenty-first century. San Francisco: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Jossey-Bass.

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

Weidman, J. C., Twale, D. J., & Stein, E. L. (2001).*Socialization of graduate and professional students in higher education: A perilous passage?* ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, 28(3). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Worrell, F. C., Vandiver, B. J., Cross, W. E., Jr., & Fhagen-Smith, P. E. (2004). Reliability and structural validity of Cross Racial Identity Scale scores in a sample of African American adults. *Journal of Black Psychology,30,* 489–505.

Wulff, D. H., & Austin, A. E. (2004). *Paths to the professoriate: Strategies for enriching the preparation of future faculty*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Wulff, D. H., & Nerad, M. (2006). Using an alignment model as a framework in the assessment of doctoral programs. In P. L. Maki & N. A. Borkowski (Eds.), *The assessment of doctoral education: Emerging criteria and new models* (pp. 83–108). Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Younes, M. N., & Asay, S.M. (1998). Resilient women: How female graduate students negotiate their multiple roles. *College Student Journal, 32*(3), 451–462.

Yasso, T.J., Parker, L., Solórzano, D.G., & Lynn, M. (2004). From Jim Crow to Affirmative Action and back again: A critical race discussion on racialized rationales and access to higher education. *Review of Research in Education, 28*, 1-25.

Yosso, T. J. (2006). *Critical race counter stories along the Chicana/Chicano educational pipeline*. New York, NY: Routledge.

APPENDIX A

INFORMED CONSENT

The effects of socialization and race on doctoral superstardom

Investigator Identification: This study is being conducted by Cassaundra Trimble-Govan, M.S. a Doctoral candidate in Counseling Psychology at the University of Georgia, under the supervision of Edward Delgado-Romero, Ph.D.

Study Description: The purpose of this study is to examine the effects race and the socialization process on African American doctoral students as it relates to their ability to attain doctoral superstardom. The survey will consist of a series of questionnaires as well as questions asking your demographic information and will take approximately 30 minutes to complete. You will be able to save your answers as you work. Participation is strictly voluntary and you can terminate the survey at any time. To thank you for your time and effort, the email address that you provide (if you wish to do so) will be entered into a drawing to receive a $25 gift card from a major retailer. If you when, you will receive an electronic gift card via the email address that you provide.

Possible Risks and Benefits: Although there are no direct benefits to this study, the study contributes to our current understanding of African American doctoral student success and factors that aid in this success. This study provides no more than minimal risk to you, although some participants may feel uncomfortable answering questions about their doctoral experiences.

Participant Information: Your participation is this research is completely voluntary. You may discontinue your participation in the study at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. You may also choose to not answer any question (s) that you do not wish to, for any reason. The information that you provide will be anonymous. Your name will not appear anywhere on the questionnaires. All demographic information will be combined with other participants' information, so no individual responses will be reported.

On-Line Data Collection: This project has been approved by the University of Georgia Institutional Review Board. Approval of this project only signifies that the procedures adequately protect the rights and welfare of the participants. Please note that absolute confidentiality cannot be guaranteed due to the limits protection of Internet access. All information obtained in this study is strictly confidential unless disclosure is required by law. In addition, the Institutional Review Board and University or government officials responsible for monitoring this study may inspect these records.

Questions or Concerns: In the event that you have any questions or concerns about this study, you may contact Cassaundra Trimble-Govan at <u>ctrim19@uga.edu</u> or 678-386-5372 or contact

Dr. Edward Delgado-Romero at edelgado@uga.edu or 706-542-0500. If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant that have not been answered by the investigators, or if you wish to report any concerns about the study, you may contact the Chairperson, Institutional Review Board, University of Georgia, 612 Boyd Graduate Studies Research Center, Athens, Georgia 30602-7411; Telephone (706) 542-3199; E-mail address IRB@uga.edu.

Electronic Consent: Please indicate your choice below. Clicking on the "continue to the next page" button below indicates that you have read and understand the terms of this study and thus voluntarily agree to participate. If you do NOT wish to participate in the study, please decline participation by closing the window.

APPENDIX B

INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE

I hope this email finds you well. I am writing to see if you could forward my request for research participants to the listserves of your various organizations and departments.
Below is a message that you can copy and paste to send through your listserv. Thank you in advance for your time and consideration.

_____

My name is Cassaundra Trimble-Govan and I am a doctoral candidate in the counseling psychology program at the University of Georgia. I am conducting a research study, under the supervision of Dr. Edward Delgado-Romero, for my dissertation that will examine the effects race and the socialization process on African American doctoral students as it relates to their ability to attain doctoral superstardom.

Please note that I am inviting two separate groups of participants. The first group is **current doctoral students** in Education, Counseling or Psychology that self-identify as a person of African descent (including all ethnic distinctions). The second group is **faculty members who advise and/or supervise doctoral students** in an Education, Counseling or Psychology doctoral program are invited to participate in this study.

To participate in the survey click the appropriate link. You will be redirected to a confidential online survey. In compensation for your participation in this study, you have the option of entering a drawing in which each participant has equal chance of receiving one of eight gift cards valued at $25.00 each. After data collection is complete, the researchers will randomly select eight participants who will each receive one of the gift cards. Participation in the research is not required in order to enter the drawing. The gift cards will be electronically sent to your e-mail address which you will have the opportunity to submit once you have given informed consent to participant in the research study.

If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to email me at ctrim19@uga.edu or Dr. Edward Delgado-Romero at edelgado@uga.edu. Thank you in advance for your participation.

Sincerely,
Cassaundra L. Trimble-Govan, M.S.
Doctoral Candidate
University of Georgia

APPENDIX C

Demographics Questionnaire

1. Please indicate your ethnic background by choosing only one of the following:
   a. African
   b. African American
   c. Black
   d. West Indian/Caribbean Black
   e. Hispanic Black
   f. Mixed
   g. Other_____

2. What generation best applies to you?
   a. I was born outside of the U.S.
   b. I was born in the U.S.; my mother or father was born outside of the U.S.
   c. My parents and I were born in the U.S.; all grandparents born outside of the U.S.
   d. My parents and I were all born in the U.S.; at least one grandmother or grandfather was born outside of the U.S. with the remainder born in the U.S.
   e. All of my grandparents, both of my parents, and I were born in the U.S.
   f. I do not know what generation best fits since I lack some information.
   g. No answer

3. What is your sex?
   a. Female
   b. Male

4. How old are you (in years)? _____

5. Do you have any children?_____
   a. If yes, how many?_____

6. What is your current marital status?
   a. Single, never been married
   b. Not married, but living with a significant other
   c. Married and living with spouse
   d. Separated or divorced, with financial support from past spouse

      e. Separated or divorced, without financial support from past spouse

      f. Widowed, with financial support from deceased spouse

      g. Widowed, without financial support from deceased spouse

7. Indicate your current year and academic standing (student/candidate)?_____

8. Expected graduation year?

9. What is the highest level of education that your mother obtained?
   a. Less than 7th grade
   b. Junior high school (8th-9th grades)
   c. Some high school (10th-11th grades)
   d. High school graduate
   e. Some college or specialized training
   f. College/University graduate
   g. Graduate/Professional training

10. What is the highest level of education that your father obtained?
   a. Less than 7th grade
   b. Junior high school (8th-9th grades)
   c. Some high school (10th-11th grades)
   d. High school graduate
   e. Some college or specialized training
   f. College/University graduate
   g. Graduate/Professional training

11. What is the highest level of education that your spouse or significant other has obtained?
   a. Less than 7th grade
   b. Junior high school (8th-9th grades)
   c. Some high school (10th-11th grades)
   d. High school graduate
   e. Some college or specialized training
   f. College/University graduate
   g. Graduate/Professional training
   h. Not Applicable

12. Name of School: _____

13. City and State where school is located: _____

14. What is the racial composition of the school listed in #12?

a. Mostly Black
b. Mixed
c. Mostly White

15. My cumulative grade point average is:
    a. 3.75-4.00
    b. 3.50-3.74
    c. 3.25-3.49
    d. 3.00-3.24
    e. Below 3.00

16. What degree do you ultimately expect to receive?
    a. Ed.D.
    b. Ph.D.
    c. Psy.D.
    d. Other_____

17. What is your major? _____

18. How do you rate yourself academically among the students in your department?
    a. among the best
    b. above average
    c. about average
    d. below average

19. Rate your doctoral experience:
    a. Very unsatisfied
    b. Unsatisfied
    c. Somewhat unsatisfied
    d. Somewhat satisfied
    e. Satisfied
    f. Very Satisfied

20. If you had to do it again, how likely is it that you would chose to enroll in the same department?
    a. very likely
    b. somewhat likely
    c. somewhat unlikely
    d. very unlikely

21. How many hours do you spend in the presence of your faculty members (outside of classroom/supervision)?
    a. 0-1 hours
    b. 2-3 hours
    c. 4-6
    d. 6+ hours

22. What factors influence your decision to spend the amount of time in your department that you indicated in question 21? (Please circle all that apply)
    a. Family
    b. Nonacademic employment related responsibilities
    c. Assistantship
    d. Research
    e. Discomfort/departmental conflict
    f. Commute
    g. Other (specify)_____

23. What type of position do you expect to hold after receiving your degree?
    a. Professor
    b. Educational Administrator at a school/university
    c. Government Official/Administrator
    d. Researcher
    e. Consultant
    f. Psychologist
    g. Other (Specify)_____

APPENDIX D

Doctoral Student Questionnaire

Please rate yourself according to the following qualities:
1: Very unlike me
2: Unlike me
3: Somewhat unlike me
4: Somewhat like me
5: Like me
6: Very like me

a) Working hard (physically witnessed by faculty members)	1	2	3	4	5	6	
b) Clinical/ counseling skills	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
c) Handling stress	1	2	3	4	5	6	
d) Engaged in ongoing research projects in addition to their dissertation	1	2	3	4	5	6	
e) Strong writing ability	1	2	3	4	5	6	
f) Establishing a relationship with one or two faculty members	1	2	3	4	5	6	
g) Ability to make faculty members feel worthwhile and rewarded for their investment in the student	1	2	3	4	5	6	
h) Being liked by the faculty	1	2	3	4	5	6	
i) Visibility in the department (during and after working hours)	1	2	3	4	5	6	
j) Reflecting program values	1	2	3	4	5	6	
k) Easy to teach	1	2	3	4	5	6	
l) Ability to receive and apply feedback	1	2	3	4	5	6	
m) Attractive physical appearance	1	2	3	4	5	6	
n) Serving on department and university committees	1	2	3	4	5	6	
o) Serving on student committees	1	2	3	4	5	6	
p) Getting along with people	1	2	3	4	5	6	
q) Discipline	1	2	3	4	5	6	
r) Empathy	1	2	3	4	5	6	

s) Good grades	1	2	3	4	5	6	
t) Getting along with peers/people	1	2	3	4	5	6	
u) Quick learners							

Now think of the qualities needed to be a successful doctoral student. Please rate the following behaviors in predicting graduate superstardom.

1: Very unimportant
2: Unimportant
3: Somewhatunimportant
4: Somewhat important
5: Important
6: Very important

a) Working hard (physically witnessed by faculty members)	1	2	3	4	5	6	

		1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
b)	Clinical/ counseling skills	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
c)	Handling stress	1	2	3	4	5	6	
d)	Engaged in ongoing research projects in addition to their dissertation	1	2	3	4	5	6	
e)	Writing ability	1	2	3	4	5	6	
f)	Establishing a relationship with one or two faculty members	1	2	3	4	5	6	
g)	Ability to make faculty members feel worthwhile and rewarded for their investment in the student	1	2	3	4	5	6	
h)	Being liked by the faculty	1	2	3	4	5	6	
i)	Visibility in the department (during and after working hours)	1	2	3	4	5	6	
j)	Reflecting program values	1	2	3	4	5	6	
k)	Easy to teach	1	2	3	4	5	6	
l)	Ability to receive and apply feedback	1	2	3	4	5	6	
m)	Attractive physical appearance	1	2	3	4	5	6	
n)	Serving on department and university committees	1	2	3	4	5	6	
o)	Serving on student committees	1	2	3	4	5	6	
p)	Getting along with people	1	2	3	4	5	6	
q)	Discipline	1	2	3	4	5	6	
r)	Empathy	1	2	3	4	5	6	
s)	Good grades	1	2	3	4	5	6	
t)	Getting along with peers/people	1	2	3	4	5	6	
u)	Quick learners							

APPENDIX E

Faculty Demographics

1. Gender
   a. Female
   b. Male

2. Please indicate your race (please circle one)
   a. African
   b. African American
   c. Black
   d. West Indian/Caribbean Black
   e. Hispanic Black
   f. Mixed
   g. Other

3. Faculty Rank (please circle one)
   a. Professor
   b. Associate Professor
   c. Assistant Professor
   d. Adjunct Professor
   e. Visiting Professor
   f. Professor of Practice

4. What percentage of your faculty appointment is research?
   a. 0%
   b. 1-10%
   c. 11-20%
   d. 21-30%
   e. 31-40%
   f. 41-50%
   g. 50% +

5. What percentage of your faculty appointment is teaching?
   a. 0%
   b. 1-10%
   c. 11-20%
   d. 21-30%
   e. 31-40%
   f. 41-50%

g. 50% +

6. What percentage of your faculty appointment is supervision?
    a. 0%
    b. 1-10%
    c. 11-20%
    d. 21-30%
    e. 31-40%
    f. 41-50%
    g. 50% +

7. What percentage of your faculty appointment is grant writing?
    a. 0%
    b. 1-10%
    c. 11-20%
    d. 21-30%
    e. 31-40%
    f. 41-50%
    g. 50% +

8. What percentage of your faculty appointment is other (specify)? _____
    a. 0%
    b. 1-10%
    c. 11-20%
    d. 21-30%
    e. 31-40%
    f. 41-50%
    g. 50% +

9. Name of Institution_____

10. What is the racial composition of the school listed in question #4?
    a. Predominantly Black
    b. Mixed
    c. Predominantly White

11. Number of years of doctoral supervisory experience (clinical and nonclinical)
    a. 0-1
    b. 2-4
    c. 5-7
    d. 7+

12. Number of African American/Black doctoral students supervised
   a. 0-5
   b. 6-10
   c. 10-15
   d. 15+

13. Number of years of graduate (doctoral) teaching experience
   a. 0-1
   b. 2-4
   c. 5-7
   d. 7+

14. Number of African American/Black doctoral students taught
   a. 0-5
   b. 6-10
   c. 10-15
   d. 15+

Faculty Questionnaire

Please describe a successful doctoral student by ranking the top 10 following items (1=most important; 10=least important):

a) Working hard (physically witnessed by faculty members)								
b) Clinical/ counseling skills								
c) Handling stress								
d) Engaged in ongoing research projects in addition to their dissertation								
e) Writing ability								
f) Establishing a relationship with one or two faculty members								
g) Ability to make faculty members feel worthwhile and rewarded for their investment in the student								
h) Being liked by the faculty								
i) Visibility in the department (during and after working hours)								
j) Reflecting program values								
k) Easy to teach								
l) Ability to receive and apply feedback								

m) Attractive physical appearance							
n) Serving on department and university committees							
o) Serving on student committees							
p) Getting along with people							
q) Discipline							
r) Empathy							
s) Good grades							
t) Getting along with peers/people							
u) Quick learners							

Now think of the BEST doctoral student you ever worked with and reflect on what behaviors he/she emitted to deserve your praises? Please rank the following top 10 behaviors in predicting graduate superstardom (1=most important; 10=least important):

a) Working hard (physically witnessed by faculty members)							
b) Clinical/ counseling skills							
c) Handling stress							
d) Engaged in ongoing research projects in addition to their dissertation							
e) Writing ability							
f) Establishing a relationship with one or two faculty members							
g) Ability to make faculty members feel worthwhile and rewarded for their investment in the student							
h) Being liked by the faculty							
i) Visibility in the department (during and after working hours)							
j) Reflecting program values							
k) Easy to teach							
l) Ability to receive and apply feedback							
m) Attractive physical appearance							
n) Serving on department and university committees							
o) Serving on student committees							
p) Getting along with people							
q) Discipline							
r) Empathy							

s) Good grades							
t) Getting along with peers/people							
u) Quick learners							

APPENDIX F

Questionnaire (Original Version Developed in 1989) Used for Study Published In:

Weidman, John C. and Elizabeth L. Stein. "Socialization of Graduate Students to Academic Norms." *Research in Higher Education, 44* (No. 6, December, 2003): 641-656.

The following questions are designed to elicit your opinion about some aspects of your graduate school experience at the University of Pittsburgh. When you are answering the questions, please consider your reactions toward your experience as a whole and not about isolated incidents. For each of the following items, circle the number on the scale that most nearly expresses your level of agreement.

		Agreement				
		Lowest			Highest	
1.	I can depend on the faculty to give me good academic advice.	1	2	3	4	5
2.	My department offers sufficient enrichment activities (seminars, colloquia, social events, etc.) in addition to regular classes.	1	2	3	4	5
3.	1 feel free to call on the faculty for academic help.	1	2	3	4	5
4.	The faculty are aware of student problems and concerns.	1	2	3	4	5
5.	The faculty are accessible for scholarly discussions outside of class.	1	2	3	4	5
6.	I am treated as a colleague by the faculty.	1	2	3	4	5
7.	In my conversation with faculty I consider myself to be more of a student than a scholar.	1	2	3	4	5
8.	The faculty see me as a serious scholar.	1	2	3	4	5
9.	This department emphasizes engaging students in scholarly activities (research, writing other than dissertation/thesis, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5

		Lowest		Agreement		Highest

10. This department is oriented toward scholarly
activities (research, writing, etc.) by the
by the faculty   1   2   3   4   5

11. I have a clear idea of what is expected
of me as a student in this department.   1   2   3   4   5

12. Other students are the best source of
information about the academic requirements
of this department.   1   2   3   4   5

13. The faculty seem to treat each other as
colleagues.   1   2   3   4   5

14. Faculty encourage students to join
professional organizations.   1   2   3   4   5

15. I identify more with my professors than
with my fellow students.   1   2   3   4   5

Check any of the following activities in which you are/were involved while enrolled as a student in your department.

16. _____ Held membership in a professional organization.

17. _____Attended convention of a professional organization.

18. _____ Presented a paper at a conference or convention.

19. _____Participated in a professor's research project.

20. _____Performed research of your own which was not required by your program of studies.

21. _____Authored, alone or with others, an unpublished manuscript (not part of a course).

22. _____Authored, alone or with others, a paper submitted for publication.

23. _____Authored, alone or with others, a paper accepted for publication.

24. _____Asked a fellow student to critique your work.

25. ____Been asked by a fellow student to critique his/her work.

26. ____Called or written to a scholar at another institution to exchange views on scholarly work.

27. ____Written, alone or with others, a grant proposal.

Please indicate the appropriate answer for the following questions:

28. Is there any professor in your department with whom you:

	Yes	No
Ever talk about personal matters	___	___
Often discuss other topics of intellectual interest	___	___
Often discuss topics in his field	___	___
Sometimes engage in social conversation	___	___

29. Is there another student in your department with whom you:

	Yes	No
Ever talk about personal matters	___	___
Often discuss other topics of intellectual interest	___	___
Often discuss topics in his field	___	___
Sometimes engage in social conversation	___	___

The following is a list of various advantages and disadvantages of academic departments. Please indicate how true each one is (or seems to be) in your department.

	Very True	Somewhat True	Not True At All
30. An environment that promotes long-lasting friendships and associations among students.	___	___	___
31. An educational climate that encourages the scholarly aspirations of all students.	___	___	___

32. An environment that promotes scholarly
     interchange between students and
     faculty.   ___   ___   ___

33. An overemphasis on grades by the
     students.   ___   ___   ___

34. An overemphasis of grades by the
     faculty.   ___   ___   ___

35. An environment that fosters and develops
     scholarly self-confidence in students.   ___   ___   ___

36. Sufficient opportunities for students
     to participate in the scholarly activities
     of the faculty.   ___   ___   ___

37. A competitive atmosphere among the
     students for grades.   ___   ___   ___

38. A rivalry among students for the
     attention of faculty.   ___   ___   ___

39. Have you sat for the Preliminary Examination or completed other departmental
requirements for admission to full doctoral student status?
     ____ Yes   ____No   ____ Not applicable

40. Have you completed a Comprehensive Examination?
     ____ Yes   ____No   ____ Not applicable

41. Are you currently writing a dissertation/thesis?
     ____Yes   ____No

APPENDIX G

CROSS SOCIAL ATTITUDE SCALE
Beverly J. Vandiver, William E. Cross, Jr., Peony E. Fhagen-Smith, Frank C. Worrell, Janet K. Swim, & Leon D. Caldwell.

Instructions: Read each item and indicate to what degree it reflects your own thoughts and feelings, using the 7-point scale below. There are no right or wrong answers. Base your responses on your opinion at the present time. **To ensure that your answers can be used, please respond to the statements as written**, and place your numerical response on the line provided to the left of each question**.**

1: Strongly disagree
2: Disagree
3: Somewhat disagree
4: Neither agree nor disagree
5: Somewhat agree
6: Agree
7: Strongly agree

_____1. As an African American, life in America is good for me.

_____2. I think of myself primarily as an American, and seldom as a member of a racial group.

_____3. Too many Blacks "glamorize" the drug trade and fail to see opportunities that don't involve crime.

_____4. I go through periods when I am down on myself because I am Black.

_____5. As a multiculturalist, I am connected to many groups (Hispanics, Asian-Americans, Whites, Jews, gays & lesbians, etc.).

_____6. I have a strong feeling of hatred and disdain for all White people.

_____7. I see and think about things from an Afrocentric perspective.
_____8. When I walk into a room, I always take note of the racial make-up of the people around me.
_____9. I am not so much a member of a racial group, as I am an American.

_____10. I sometimes struggle with negative feelings about being Black.

____11. My relationship with God plays an important role in my life.

____12. Blacks place more emphasis on having a good time than on hard work.

____13. I believe that only those Black people who accept an Afrocentric perspective can truly solve the race problem in America.

____14. I hate the White community and all that it represents.

____15. When I have a chance to make a new friend, issues of race and ethnicity seldom play a role in who that person might be.

____16. I believe it is important to have both a Black identity and a multicultural perspective, which is inclusive of everyone (e.g., Asians, Latinos, gays & lesbians, Jews, Whites, etc.).

____17. When I look in the mirror at my Black image, sometimes I do not feel good about what I see.

____18. If I had to put a label on my identity, it would be "American," and not African American.

____19. When I read the newspaper or a magazine, I always look for articles and stories that deal with race and ethnic issues.

____20. Many African Americans are too lazy to see opportunities that are right in front of them.

____21. As far as I am concerned, affirmative action will be needed for a long time.

____22. Black people cannot truly be free until our daily lives are guided by Afrocentric values and principles.

____23. White people should be destroyed.

____24. I embrace my own Black identity, but I also respect and celebrate the cultural identities of other groups (e.g., Native Americans, Whites, Latinos, Jews, Asian Americans, gays & lesbians, etc.).

____25. Privately, I sometimes have negative feelings about being Black.

____26. If I had to put myself into categories, first I would say I am an American, and second I am a member of a racial group.

____27. My feelings and thoughts about God are very important to me.

____28. African Americans are too quick to turn to crime to solve their problems.

____29. When I have a chance to decorate a room, I tend to select pictures, posters, or works of art that express strong racial-cultural themes.

____30. I hate White people.

____31. I respect the ideas that other Black people hold, but I believe that the best way to solve our problems is to think Afrocentrically.

____32. When I vote in an election, the first thing I think about is the candidate's record on racial and cultural issues.

____33. I believe it is important to have both a Black identity and a multicultural perspective, because this connects me to other groups (Hispanics, Asian-Americans, Whites, Jews, gays & lesbians, etc.).

____34. I have developed an identity that stresses my experiences as an American more than my experiences as a member of a racial group.

____35. During a typical week in my life, I think about racial and cultural issues many, many times.

____36. Blacks place too much importance on racial protest and not enough on hard work and education.

____37. Black people will never be free until we embrace an Afrocentric perspective.

____38. My negative feelings toward White people are very intense.

____39. I sometimes have negative feelings about being Black.

____40. As a multiculturalist, it is important for me to be connected with individuals from all cultural backgrounds (Latinos, gays & lesbians, Jews, Native Americans, Asian-Americans , etc.).