

INTEGRACJA INKLUZYWNOŚCI, RÓWNOŚCI, RÓŻNORODNOŚCI ORAZ SPRAWIEDLIWOŚCI SPOŁECZNEJ JAKO WARTOŚCI EDUKACJI DOKTORSKIEJ: ANALIZA WSPÓLCZESNEGO DYSKURSU NAUKOWEGO

Tetyana Martynyuk

Docent Pracy Socjalnej i Pedagogiki Wyższej Edukacji

Wschodnioeuropejski Uniwersytet Narodowy im. Łesi Ukrainki (Łuck, Ukraina)

e-mail: martynyuk.t@gmail.com

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-9288-8179

Streszczenie. Celem niniejszej pracy było zbadanie funkcje i sposoby integracji ważnych społecznie wartości, w szczególności sprawiedliwości, różnorodności, także włączenie inkluzji i sprawiedliwości społecznej w kształcenie przyszłych doktorów filozofii. Ze względu na zrozumienie, że doktoranci naśladują zachowania i wartości swoich nauczycieli, mentorów i doświadczonych nauczycieli, badanie doświadczeń organizacji procesu kształcenia na poziomie doktoranckim do realizacji wartości sprawiedliwości, różnorodności, integracji i sprawiedliwości społecznej, pozostają ważnym aspektem zrozumienia aspect tego, jak nierówność społeczna może trwać lub nasilać się w środowisku akademickim i poza nim. Logika instytucjonalna i logika dyscyplinarna posłużyły jako baza analityczna dla zrozumienie, w jaki sposób czynniki instytucjonalne i dyscyplinarne wpływają na integrację nauczycieli w zakresie równości, różnorodności, integracji i sprawiedliwości społecznej.

Słowa kluczowe: sprawiedliwość, różnorodność, inkluzja i sprawiedliwość społeczna, socjalizacja, edukacja doktorska, czynniki instytucjonalne i dyscyplinarne.

INTEGRATION OF INCLUSION, EQUITY, DIVERSITY, AND SOCIAL JUSTICE IN DOCTORAL EDUCATION: MODERN RESEARCH DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

Tetiana Martyniuk

Candidate of Pedagogy Science, Associate Professor,

Associate Professor Faculty of Pedagogical Education and Social Work,

Lesya Ukrainka Eastern European National University

(Lutsk, Ukraine)

e-mail: martynyuk.t@gmail.com

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-9288-8179

Abstract. The purpose of this study was to examine how faculty can integrate equity, diversity, inclusion, and social justice within their work with doctoral education within different disciplines. Due to the understanding that doctoral students imitate and emulate behaviors and values of close advisers, mentors, and experienced faculty, examining what faculty do within the work with doctoral education regarding equity, diversity, inclusion, and social justice remains an important aspect to understanding how social inequalities may be perpetuated or disrupted within and beyond the academy.

Institutional logics and disciplinary logics served as analytical frameworks to understand how institutional and disciplinary factors influence faculty integration of equity, diversity, inclusion, and social justice. Several scholars broadly define institutional logics as generalized rules that dictate the degree of appropriateness of behavior through legitimizing particular forms of identities, interests, values, and practices.

Keywords: equity, diversity, inclusion, and social justice, socialization, doctoral education, institutional and disciplinary factors.

ІНТЕГРАЦІЯ ІНКЛЮЗИВНОСТІ, РІВНОСТІ, РІЗНОМАНІТНОСТІ ТА СОЦІАЛЬНОЇ СПРАВЕДЛИВОСТІ ЯК ЦІННОСТЕЙ ДОКТОРСЬКОЇ ОСВІТИ: АНАЛІЗ СУЧАСНОГО НАУКОВОГО ДИСКУРСУ

Тетяна Мартинюк

кандидат педагогічних наук, доцент,

доцент кафедри соціальної роботи та педагогіки вищої школи

Східноєвропейського національного університету

імені Лесі Українки (Луцьк, Україна)

e-mail: martynyuk.t@gmail.com

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-9288-8179

Анотація. Метою цього дослідження було вивчити особливості та шляхи інтеграції соціально важливих цінностей, зокрема справедливості, різноманітності, інклюзії та соціальної справедливості у підготовку майбутніх докторів філософії. Через розуміння того, що аспіранти наслідують поведінку та цінності наукових керівників, наставників та досвідчених викладачів, вивчення досвіду організації освітнього процесу на докторському рівні щодо імплементації цінностей справедливості, різноманітності, інклюзії та соціальної справедливості, залишається важливим аспектом розуміння того, як соціальна нерівність може продовжуватися або активізовуватися в академічних середовищах та поза ними. Інституційна логіка та дисциплінарна логіка слугували аналітичною основою для розуміння того, як інституційні та дисциплінарні фактори впливають на інтеграцію викладачами рівності, різноманітності, включеності та соціальної справедливості.

Ключові слова: справедливість, різноманітність, інклюзія та соціальна справедливість, соціалізація, докторська освіта, інституційні та дисциплінарні фактори.

Introduction. Many scholars in higher education have written about the purposes of doctoral education. Since its early history, a connection between graduate education and society has been well-documented (Cassuto, 2016). Doctoral degree recipients have had a general responsibility to improve society. First, they contribute their expertise in the production of knowledge and technologies; second, they have developed professionally as “t-shaped” public intellectuals – those with both an expertise in a particular academic field and broad knowledge across a range of interwoven topics (Gardner & Mendoza, 2010).

Society needs highly educated people from doctoral programs to fill a wide variety of positions both inside and outside of academe. Golde et al. (2006), through the Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate, captured and synthesized these conversation

towards viewing doctoral education as a means to develop stewards of the discipline – «someone who can imaginatively generate new knowledge, critically conserve valuable and useful ideas, and responsibly transform those understandings through writing, teaching, and application» (Grono W. 2006, 73). These stewards are asked to embrace the personality, character, habits of mind and heart, and general scholarly dispositions of their disciplinary community. Understanding and bettering this call for stewards is vital; for example, this call can help yield positive and generational impacts onto individuals and societies by evaluating and reimagining the ways knowledge is created and transformed, how it is taught, who it is taught to, and what perspectives and worldviews make up sustainable disciplinary communities.

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

In some ways, how people enact their power or contribute to social reproduction is reflective of what they learned during doctoral education. Doctoral education programs are viewed as selective and prestigious educational spaces (Cassuto, 2016) where a few are welcomed due to resource limitations and sense to one's ability to succeed during and after their program. This perpetuates the selection bias into who has access to these positions of power and privilege. Due to the commitments towards meritocracy (Posselt; 2016), disparities persist in who are welcomed across identity groups. Once in the program, students experience and weigh the norms, values, and expectations of their behavior towards success, and impactful scholarship; often these standards are in effort to maintain recognition and prestige to match elite programs' reputations.

Students live in this education space that has been controlled prior to admission largely by faculty – from financial support, to core curriculum and electives, and the requirements for degree completion.

Embedded in these programmatic elements are faculty standards that students must abide by enough to the point to persist and graduate or attrite out of the program; this provides endless moments for students to be shaped by their faculty. Knowing that doctoral students imitate and emulate behaviors and values of close advisers, mentors, and experienced faculty (Lovitts, 2001), understanding what faculty do within the work

with doctoral education regarding equity, diversity, inclusion, and social justice remains an important aspect to understanding how social inequalities may be perpetuated or disrupted within the academy and beyond. This study inquiries into how faculty can integrate equity, diversity, inclusion, and social justice within their work with doctoral education.

Social Issues in Doctoral Education

Equity

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

Diversity

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

Inclusion

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

Social Justice

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

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

For future stewards of the discipline, they need to look no further than the current academic environment for examples on how to interact with equity, diversity, inclusion, and social justice within their practice – for better or worse. Damrosch (2006) noted that some faculty advisers would believe in an ideal world personal differences – such as

age, race, ethnicity, nationality, and gender – would go away in the clear light of the intellect within doctoral education. Even upon consideration of differences, most higher education discussions of diversity, in particular, focus heavily on structural diversity which focuses on number counts that tend to overshadow the actual experience of students and faculty (Bender, 2006).

Posselt (2015) found even when diversity was introduced into the latter stages of graduate admissions decision making, faculty were hesitant and reluctant in speaking openly about race, gender, or socioeconomic status. In spite of reports of increased percentages of underrepresented racial and ethnic enrollees and women in male-dominated fields (Posselt, 2016), widespread issues around discrimination (Gardner, 2010), isolation (Lovitts, 2001), and two track advising (e.g. research intensive versus teaching intensive or non-academic career guidance) still occur (Cassuto, 2016). Enrollment and graduation rates of doctoral students from racially minoritized populations have seen little growth in comparison across all demographics in the last few decades (Posselt, 2016).

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

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

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

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

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

Finally, calls for action address the programmatic elements of doctoral programs. Golde (2005) outlined that admissions decisions, financial support, the requirements for degree completion, and the curriculum are all determined and controlled by the department or program faculty. Doctoral programs are often more decentralized resulting in much of the decision making process led by faculty regarding milestones, achievements, and proficiency (Gardner, 2010). Faculty are the actors who admit students into these prestigious and selective programs (Posselt, 2016), and are the ones who have the most influence in helping them stay or leave (Cassuto, 2016). Program requirements like coursework, comprehensive exams, and dissertations tend to be overspecialized, outdated, and nontransferable outside of intensive research experiences (Cassuto, 2016).

Scaffolding milestones and having purposeful and realistic requirements through student-centered processes lowers time-to-degree expectations (Cassuto, 2016). Reduction in timeline extends students' opportunity to implement their skills and knowledge in greater and more beneficial career capacities while also reducing student-accumulated debt (Bok, 2013). Further emphasis into the outlining the purpose and structure of a graduate program can reduce unneeded ambiguity in terms of expected directions and expectations for students (Gardner, 2007).

Additional calls for programmatic changes have been made for greater coordination between administrators and faculty to increase their understanding of what underrepresented students seek in graduate programs. For faculty to question and ultimately change normative standards and structure of programs, different stages of life can be represented in doctoral programs outside of the students largely benefitting who are single, in their mid-twenties, and male (Stacy, 2006).

Even including those with career experience in industry, policy, or business who are in the middle of their careers can achieve growth in student diversity (Stacy, 2006). By faculty aligning programs to find “potential” within a broader understanding of students today, it allows those from varying paths in life to receive an education that would be of benefit to them and to society.

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

Departments and doctoral programs promote their own schools of thought at the onset of orientation programs (Gardner & Mendoza, 2010). This allows departments to create future stewards who similarly reflect the values of the department. This reality of faculty leading the socialization of students from time of application to graduation shows the importance that any incorporation may have on whether these future stewards challenge or perpetuate existing inequalities in academia and beyond.

Labaree (2004) described how a community of scholars forms by including some and excluding others to create shared definitions, values, and standards.

These standards are then taught and rewarded to future scholars and members of these communities as means of finding success and survivability (Gopaul, 2011). These shared ideals center narratives and subtleties around key concepts like merit, hard work, productivity and fairness (Pasque et al., 2009). Values, like someone’s merit and quality, are contested issues debated upon, established by the more prestigious and elite doctoral programs, and replicated across many striving institutions (Labaree, 2004).

When enacted, these values – like merit, quality, and rigor – help shape higher education and society. For example, forms of segregation, wealth gap disparities, environmental racism, discrimination practices in hiring, and criminal justice failures can be viewed as good fortune for some or the failure of others – or they can be viewed through societal systems and structures of historical oppression and marginalization. Thus, exists a real possibility to shift individual interactions with each other towards understanding power, inequality, and the historical events of exclusion (Learner, 2009). Faculty can utilize their role as educators to have future scholars develop for themselves a sense of these narratives as well as juxtapose student thinking with the dominant narratives of their academic and disciplinary communities.

In addition to developing students’ dispositions, faculty can also teach skills that future students need. Many of the skills and knowledge faculty desire to be gained by

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

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

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

Overall, the influence of the disciplinary force, in these cases, sets the boundaries for the personality, character, habits of mind and heart, and general scholarly dispositions of their disciplinary community in which tension or conflicts of multiple logics exist.

Opportunities for integration of equity, diversity, inclusion, and social justice are possible throughout all of doctoral education although not equally attainable. A majority of doctoral education processes are maintained through the collective decision-making processes of faculty colleagues resulting in boundary setting to maintain collegiality and realistic expectations.

References:

1. Association of American Colleges and Universities. (2013). Making excellence inclusive. Retrieved from http://www.aacu.org/compass/inclusive_excellence.cfm.
2. Banks, J. A. (Ed.). (2012). *Encyclopedia of diversity in education*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
3. Bender, T. (2006). *Expanding the domain of history*. In C. M. Golde & G. E. Walker (Eds.), *Envisioning the future of doctoral education preparing stewards of the discipline: Carnegie essays on the doctorate* (pp. 295 - 310). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
4. Cassuto, L. (2015). *The graduate school mess: What caused it and how we can fix it*. Boston, MA. Harvard University Press.

5. Chan, T.F. (2006). A time for change? The mathematics doctorate. In C. M. Golde & G. E. Walker (Eds.), *Envisioning the future of doctoral education preparing stewards of the discipline: Carnegie essays on the doctorate* (pp. 120 - 134). San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
6. Damrosch, D. (2006). Vectors of change. In C. M. Golde & G. E. Walker (Eds.), *Envisioning the future of doctoral education preparing stewards of the discipline: Carnegie essays on the doctorate* (pp. 34 - 45). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
7. Davis, T., & Harrison, L. M. (2013). *Advancing social justice: Tools, pedagogies, and strategies to transform your campus*. John Wiley & Sons.
8. Elkana, Y. (2006). Unmasking uncertainties and embracing contradictions: Graduate education in the sciences. In C. M. Golde & G. E. Walker (Eds.), *Envisioning the future of doctoral education preparing stewards of the discipline: Carnegie essays on the doctorate* (pp. 65 - 96). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
9. Gardner, S., & Mendoza, P. (2010). *On becoming a scholar*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.
10. Gibson, S., & Haynes, J. (Eds.). (2009). *Perspectives on Participation and Inclusion: Engaging Education*. A&C Black.
11. Golde, C. M. (2005). *The role of the department and discipline in doctoral student attrition: Lessons from four departments*. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 76(6), 669-700.
12. Cronon, W. (2006). Getting ready to do history. In C. M. Golde & G. E. Walker (Eds.), *Envisioning the future of doctoral education preparing stewards of the discipline: Carnegie essays on the doctorate*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass., p.73).
13. Gopaul, B. (2011). *Distinction in doctoral education: Using Bourdieu's tools to assess the socialization of doctoral students*. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 44(1), 10-21.
14. Kwiram, A.L. (2006). Time for reform?. In C. M. Golde & G. E. Walker (Eds.), *Envisioning the future of doctoral education preparing stewards of the discipline: Carnegie essays on the doctorate* (pp. 141 - 166). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
15. Labaree, D. F. (2004). *The trouble with ed schools*. Yale University Press.
16. Learner, J.E. (2009). Diversity and social justice in higher education. In P.A. Pasque, N.A. Bowman, & M. Martinez. *Critical issues in higher education for the public good: Qualitative, quantitative & historical research perspectives*. (pp. 179 – 200). Kennesaw, GA. Kennesaw State University Press.
17. Lovitts, B. E. (2001). *Leaving the ivory tower: The causes and consequences of departure from doctoral study*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield.
18. Noy, S., & Ray, R. (2012). *Graduate students' perceptions of their advisors: Is there systematic disadvantage in mentorship?*. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 83(6), 876-914.
19. Pasque, P., Carducci, R., Kuntz, A., & Gildersleeve, R. (2012). *Qualitative Inquiry for Equity in Higher Education: Methodological Innovations, Implications, and Interventions: AEHE*. 37(6). Hoboken, NJ. John Wiley & Sons.
20. Posselt, J. R. (2014). *Toward inclusive excellence in graduate education: Constructing merit and diversity in PhD admissions*. *American Journal of Education*, 120(4), 481-514.
21. Stacy, A.M. (2006). *Training future leaders*. In C.M. Golde & G.E. Walker (Eds.), *Envisioning the future of doctoral education preparing stewards of the discipline: Carnegie essays on the doctorate* (pp. 187 – 206). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
22. Zine, J. (2001). *Negotiating equity: The dynamics of minority community engagement in constructing inclusive education policy*. *The Cambridge Journal of Education*, 31(2), 239-269.