

On Their Own Terms: Women's Pathways Into and Through Academe

Leslie D. Gonzales
Michigan State University

Aimee LaPointe Terosky
Saint Joseph's University

In this qualitative study, we highlight the stories of a diverse group of 27 women academics who rebuffed many of academia's taken-for-granted pathways and approaches for success. To share their pathways and approaches, we offer a counternarrative composed of 3 themes: challenging linearity, refusing dualism, and rejecting individualism. Given our intersectional analysis, we show that even within a powerful counternarrative, there are differences, that these differences might best be understood in connection with gender, race, and class, and that these differences yield distinct experiences and outcomes among women.

Keywords: academia, women academics, women of color, White women, counter-narratives, gender, and race in academia

It is no secret that the academic profession was designed and shaped by the experiences of White, middle-class, heterosexual cis-men. Consequently, the pathways and experiences of such White men deeply inscribe faculty socialization, preparation, and evaluation processes (Lester & Sallee, 2017; Monzó & SooHoo, 2014; Mountz et al., 2015). Given that White men of means wrote the rules of academia, women of all racial and ethnic backgrounds, working class and lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, or queer (LGBTQ) persons, and otherwise minoritized people typically report that they are not at home within the professoriate (Anzaldúa, 1987; Bernal & Villalpando, 2002; Collins, 1986; Dotson, 2011; Gay, 2004; Mountz et al., 2015; Ortega, 2015, 2016; Quarry, 2018).

Moreover, for the past two decades, researchers have shown that emerging cohorts of faculty in the United States, which are increasingly diverse, aspire to faculty careers that are qualitatively different than the careers modeled by their mostly White, mostly middle class, and predominantly men professors (Bieber & Worley, 2006; Chang, Welton, Martinez, & Cortez, 2013; Gay, 2004; Green, Pulley, Jackson, Martin, & Fasching-Varner, 2016; Johnson, Boss, Mwangi, & Garcia, 2018; Rhoades, Marquez Kiyama, McCormick, & Quiroz, 2008). For example, many aspiring and early career faculty members reject the notion that their professional work should override all other aspects of their lives (Kachchaf, Ko, Hodari, & Ong, 2015; Sallee, 2012). These scholars often voice a desire for a balanced life: time for their families and friends outside of work (Johnson et al., 2018; Mountz et al., 2015; Shahjahan, 2015). Additionally, recent literature has re-

vealed that early career faculty and advanced graduate students are interested in teaching and in conducting community engaged and interdisciplinary research rather than research bound by disciplinary conventions (Austin & McDaniels, 2006). Moreover, when the voices of historically underrepresented scholars, such as women and men of color, LGBTQ, working class people are foregrounded in these studies, one can see a clear pattern: a desire to leverage cultural ways of knowing and epistemologies that have historically been marginalized in academia (Gonzales, 2012; Anzaldúa, 1987; Delgado Bernal, 2006; Collins, 1986; Espino, Muñoz, & Marquez Kiyama, 2010; Nicolazzo, 2017; Shotton, Tachine, Nelson, Mint-horn, & Waterman, 2018).

Altogether, current research suggests graduate students and early career faculty members, especially those that come from historically marginalized and underrepresented backgrounds, crave alternative models and ways of being in academia. Thus, without minimizing that alternative models are often necessitated by neoliberalism's detrimental effects on the academy (e.g., alt-academic careers because of lack of tenure-track positions); this article highlights alternative ways of going about success in academe. Drawing from a larger project focused on women's^{1,2} academic work and trajectories, we ask: "How did the journeys of a select group of posttenure/long-term appointed women counter dominant prescriptions for success in academia?"

Before moving into a brief literature review, we want to note this article's significance. First, women, particularly Women of Color, remain underrepresented at the highest rank of the professoriate. Yet, we were fortunate to learn from the stories of several

This article was published Online First July 1, 2019.

Leslie D. Gonzales, Department of Education Administration, College of Education, Michigan State University; Aimee LaPointe Terosky, Department of Educational Leadership, Saint Joseph's University.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Leslie D. Gonzales, Department of Education Administration, College of Education, Michigan State University, 620 Farm Lane, East Lansing, MI 48824. E-mail: gonza645@msu.edu

¹ Women includes *all* women-identifying persons. We reject the biological basis for identifying or defining gender. We were interested in talking to any person that identifies as a woman, including trans* persons and cis-persons.

² Within our larger project, there were several women that did not counter, but instead happily lived their professional life according to the dominant norms and conventions of academe. We do not take up their cases here because our goal is to elevate the stories of women who have countered—for a variety of reasons—academia's mainstream prescriptions for success.

associate and full women professors, a third of whom identified as Women of Color, which, alone, makes this work significant. Second, the majority of scholarship concerning the academic profession has focused on academic careers in research universities or elite liberal arts colleges, but the academic profession spans all types of institutions. Therefore, we deliberately sought interviews with academics in various appointment types across community colleges, comprehensive universities, as well as research universities to highlight the voices of women faculty in as many places as possible. Third and finally, because of our intersectional approach, we resist a simplistic, or universal, accounting of women's experiences and instead highlight variation within the counternarrative.

Literature Review

We relied on three bodies of work to form this literature review: (a) graduate education; (b) faculty socialization and experiences; and (c) faculty evaluation. As a whole, these literatures suggest that graduate education and faculty evaluation processes transmit potent lessons about how to be a successful academic. Such lessons include focusing on research and publication, maintaining an objective, distant relation to one's work, and prioritizing individual achievement over community achievement (Austin & McDaniels, 2006; Bieber & Worley, 2006; Eddy & Hart, 2012; Gardner, 2008, 2010; Jaeger, Haley, Ampaw, & Levin, 2013; Noy & Ray, 2012; Sutherland, 2017). These lessons are reinforced as a person enters the profession, although they manifest in slightly different ways across disciplines and institutional types, as we note below.

A Preference for Narrow Approaches and Pathways

Studies on graduate education reveal a preference for linearity and narrowness, particularly in terms of one's approach to research and one's pathway into the academy. For example, graduate students are advised to identify a specific research topic that resonates with their discipline to focus on that line of research to demonstrate deep scholarly expertise (Jencks & Riesman, 1968). Jencks and Reisman penned one of the first major studies of the U.S. professoriate in the 1960s and described how, even then, graduate students were rewarded for developing focused expertise. Contemporary research suggests that faculty members continue to prefer narrowness in scholarship. Indeed, studies show that academics often refuse to legitimize research that is interdisciplinary and/or multifaceted rather than singularly focused (Leahey, Beckman, & Stanko, 2017; Rhoten & Pfirman, 2007).

In addition to prescribing linearity in research habits, aspiring faculty are also taught that the institutional pathway to a successful academic career is narrow. Specifically, graduate students, especially graduate students educated in elite research universities express concern that advisors view nonresearch positions in non-research universities as failure (Gonzales & Terosky, 2016; Jorgenson, 2013). These beliefs mount to great pressure, especially because fewer than 15% of all recent doctorate holders are hired in institutions as "prestigious"—a proxy for research productivity and selectivity—than the institution where they earned their doctorate (Clauset, Arbesman, & Larremore, 2015). In other words, the vast majority of new faculty are hired at institutions less

research intensive than the institutions in which they were trained. Moreover, with the exception of fields like engineering, education, and business, aspiring faculty are often concerned about the length of time that they spend working outside of academe (Becher, 1994). Furthermore, and also related to narrow pathways, Rhoades and colleagues (2008) pointed out that faculty advisors and mentors often encourage students to do whatever it takes to land a tenure-line position, including moving cross-country and living separate from family and friends, if need be. However, for scholars with commitments to their local community, this mobility-centered model can feel discouraging. Also discouraging is the emphasis placed on research productivity, discussed next.

A Preference for Research

Studies show that graduate students and early career faculty are advised to focus on research, research productivity, and increasingly, grant-getting (Austin & McDaniels, 2006; Bieber & Worley, 2006; Gardner, 2008, 2010, 2013; Golde & Dore, 2001). Although the specificity of this pressure varies across disciplines and institutional types, it is a constant across both dimensions. In fact, Fairweather (2005) found that all institutional types including liberal arts colleges, which are typically assumed to be more focused on teaching, research-active faculty earned higher salaries (Fairweather, 2005). Additionally, in her in-depth case study, Martinez (2018) noted that even community colleges seem to be adopting research expectations—a hunch that Braxton and Lyken-Segosebe (2015) and Gonzales and Terosky (2016) further affirmed. Meanwhile, a recent study of tenure and promotion guidelines across 129 United States and Canadian institutions revealed consistent preferences for scholarship over public-facing work, defined as teaching, service, and outreach (Alperin et al., 2019). Of course, it is important to note that while all institutional types seem to be ratcheting up research expectations, different institutional types seem to be more open to different kinds of research. Specifically, whereas research universities (and increasingly comprehensive universities) tend to privilege disciplinary-anchored research approaches, community colleges and liberal arts colleges seem to be more open to action and locally informed research (Gonzales & Terosky, 2016; Baker, Terosky, & Martinez, 2017; Braxton & Lyken-Segosebe, 2015).

A Preference for Ideal Workers

A final lesson that stands out in the literature is that graduate education and academia, overall, value hyper and individual approaches to productivity. Some scholars summarize these values as a preference for ideal workers (Lester & Sallee, 2017; Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2012). Lester and Sallee (2017) explain that academia's preference for ideal workers is evidence of the ways that men's lived experiences underwrite the profession. Of this, Kelly, Ammons, Chermack, and Moen (2010) argued:

... workplaces are organized as if paid work is the only, or at least the primary responsibility of employees. White-collar workers—especially managers and professionals—are expected to work long hours, arrange their outside responsibilities around their paid work, and be willing to relocate or travel . . . [Conforming to] these behaviors signal appropriate devotion to one's work . . . [and often] reinforce gender inequality in the workplace. (p. 282)

In other words, because men are not typically expected to do care labor or invest in community (Bierema, 2009; Cardozo, 2017), the professions, including academia, encourages workers to place work above home and to place distance between their private and professional spheres of life, so that care labor is unduly scrutinized when family and professional commitments collide (Clark & Corcoran, 1986; Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2012). Research has shown that such norms are especially consequential for women because they are more likely to assume greater familial responsibilities (National Academies of Science, 2006; Trower, 2012; Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2012) and more likely to invest in community or collaborative works (Mihaljević-Brandt, Santamaría, & Tullney, 2016; Suchan Bird, 2011).

In summary, the literature suggests that success in academia is contingent on one being narrowly and individually focused on particular kinds of research, landing a tenure-track position in a research university, and distancing oneself from personal connections, especially in the context of work situations. However, as noted in the introduction, there is also a contingency of aspiring and early career faculty members strategically and actively looking for alternative models of success in terms of academic careers (e.g., Rhoades et al., 2008). There is a growing legion of scholars promoting “slow scholarship” rather than hyper-productivity (Mountz et al., 2015; Shahjahan, 2015). Furthermore, there is increasing traction in efforts to challenge White, mainstream, and western scientific rules of knowledge production, so that knowledge evaluation processes are more inclusive (e.g., Gay, 2004; Green et al., 2016; Hartman & Darab, 2012). In fact, several online collectives provide communal forms of support and opportunity. Very often, these online collectives are intended to support marginalized communities, like Black women, Latinx women, Women of Color, more broadly, and women, generally (Alarcón & Bettez, 2017; Grey & Williams-Farrier, 2017; Hernandez, Ngunjiri, & Chang, 2015; Johnson et al., 2018). For instance, Drs. Laila McCloud, Brittney Williams, DaVida Anderson, Shamika Karikari, and Shetina Jones, founded *SisterPhD* in 2015 when they started their graduate programs and recognized they could benefit from an intentional space to grow together and support one another’s work (<https://www.sisterphd.com/about-us>). According to McCloud, “the *SisterPhD* model is designed to facilitate friendships and sisterhood” by connecting Black women who can talk about “research, life experiences, and opportunities for growth of self and the group.” Similarly, Chicana *M(other)work* was founded by a “group of five mother-scholars who identify as Chicana-Indigena, Chicana, Chicana/Xicana/Latina, and Afro-Chicana.” The goals of Chicana *M(other)work* are to support Chicana mothers in academia, but also amplify “mother of color voices . . . through podcasting, publication, and presentations” (<https://www.chicanamotherwork.com/>). In recognition of this resistance and desire to do academia differently, we set out to shine a light on how some women *have* created pathways to success that are not often talked about in graduate school.

Theoretical Orientation

This study was informed by intersectionality, which is a theoretical, methodological and analytical strategy for understanding and studying social problems (Harris & Patton, 2019). Although we cannot provide the kind of nuanced treatment that intersection-

ality deserves, we briefly describe the key principles of intersectionality and how they helped us think about our work. Legal scholar, Kimberle Crenshaw (1989, 1991), formally introduced the concept “intersectionality” in the 1980s to describe how Black women sat at the intersection of racist and sexist policies. Crenshaw argued that, given Black women’s intersectional location, legal efforts to remedy racial and gender injustices tended to fail Black women and Women of Color, overall. Crenshaw’s position stemmed from arguments made by many Black activists, including Ida B. Wells, scholars, like Ana Julia Cooper, and the Combahee River Collective. For example, the Combahee Collective, which is a collective of Black Feminists, wrote the following in 1977:

The most general statement of our politics at the present time would be that we are actively committed to struggling against racial, sexual, heterosexual, and class oppression, and see as our particular task the *development of integrated analysis and practice based upon the fact that the major systems of oppression are interlocking. The synthesis of these oppressions creates the conditions of our lives.* As Black women we see Black feminism as the logical political movement to *combat the manifold and simultaneous oppressions that all women of color face.* (Smith, 1983, italics added for emphasis)

The Combahee Collective articulated intersectionality’s most fundamental insight and one that became the foundation of Crenshaw’s legal treatise: lives are conditioned by various oppressions and privileges attached to varying identity markers, making it imperative to understand how power circulates within and across groups. Thus, from an intersectional perspective, “universal” claims about womanhood or Black politic are not only impossible, they are problematic desires that hide away key differences in material, political, and social experiences within groups. Although intersectionality was originally formed to account for the ways in which structural systems and processes failed Black women, other contemporary scholars and activists have taken up the core ideas of intersectionality to examine varying experiences and outcomes for groups, overall (e.g., Anzaldúa, 1987; Mitchell, Simmons, & Greyerbiehl, 2014; Museus & Griffin, 2011). We join this legion of contemporary scholars and used intersectionality to inform this project, as described below.

Counter-Narrative Methodology

Our study methodology can be described as counternarrative inquiry (Bamberg, 2004), which is intended to challenge dominant narratives. Dominant narratives create:

. . . sequences and actions and events as routine . . . [they] . . . ‘normalize’ and ‘naturalize’—with the consequence that the more we as subjects become engaged in these routines, the more we become subjected to them . . . [they] constrain and delineate the agency of subjects, seemingly reducing the range of their actions. (Bamberg, 2004, p. 360)

However, counter-narratives challenge and reveal alternatives to dominant narratives, often through the amplification of historically marginalized or silenced stories. In this spirit, we show how a diverse subset of women in academia challenged dominant narratives of success. Next, we discuss our recruitment and data collection methods.

Recruitment and Data Collection

To recruit participants, we relied on nominations obtained from several of our professional colleagues. In requesting nominations, we explained that we wanted to speak with doctorate-holding women from various racial and ethnic backgrounds, disciplinary affiliations, and institutional types. We noted that it was particularly important to us to include as many women from as many underrepresented racial and ethnic backgrounds as possible. Our intersectional orientation compelled us to account for power and privilege among differently situated women—to understand if and how women’s stories differed across and within groups. Our only other participation criterion was that the woman was tenured or employed as a long-term (e.g., at least a decade) research associate or research scientist. Some may question our interest in speaking with research associates because they are not subject to the same onboarding and evaluation systems as tenure-line faculty, but we included them for two reasons. First, as doctorate holders, research associates or scientists have been subjected to the same graduate school and disciplinary socialization processes that tenure-line peers experienced. Second, research-only faculty appointments are increasingly common in U.S. academe, and yet there is little research on their experiences and perspectives (Cantwell & Taylor, 2015). Ultimately, we invited a diverse pool of 52 women, of which 34 women agreed to participate. To safeguard participant confidentiality, we do not disclose specific disciplines (e.g., molecular biology), but instead refer to their broader fields (e.g., science). Appendix displays all participant demographics and notes participants that we excluded for the purposes of this analysis.

Interviews

Our interviews were organized into four segments. In segment one, we asked interviewees to tell us about themselves; including their racial, ethnic, class, and other identity markers. We reciprocated and shared about ourselves as well. In segment two, we asked interviewees to describe their journey from K-12 into academe and asked them to describe elements (e.g., persons, events, and actions) that shaped their trajectory into and through academia. We made the intentional choice not to ask about “success” as we wanted to learn about the qualitative nature of women’s experiences, and questions about success often signal to specific milestones (e.g., tenure), foreclosing the possibility to learn about rich, rewarding, or distressing experiences (Armstrong & Hamilton, 2013; Sutherland, 2017). About half way through, in segment three, we asked women to talk about their intellectual work, if and how it evolved over time, and why. And, in the fourth segment we asked women to describe the role of relationships in their careers. For this article, we predominantly drew from Segments 2 and 4.

Data Analysis

To conduct our analysis, we drew on the conventions of narrative analysis (Bamberg, 2004; Coulter, 2009; Green, Hibbins, Houghton, & Ruutz, 2013) as well as intersectionality (Cho, Crenshaw, & McCall, 2013; Crenshaw, 2016; Hancock, 2007; Kelly et al., 2010; Zinn & Dill, 1996). In terms of following a narrative approach, we read and reviewed transcripts holistically rather than breaking them apart. Such holistic reading allowed us to establish more familiarity with each person’s story. As we read, we first asked “Does this person’s story match the literature? If no, then, what makes this person’s story stand out as different from some of the normative pathways and prescriptions identified in the literature?” To keep track of our impressions, we typed or wrote notes in the margins. After reading and annotating each transcript, we wrote a summary that described each participant’s story. These summaries consisted of brief phrases that described the woman’s journey in and through academia (see Table 1), with particular attention to approaches, strategies, and stories that diverged from dominant professorial success stories.

In reading and summarizing participant stories, we recognized commonalities across the women’s stories. These commonalities included many women’s self-described “messy” rather than linear career pathways. Additionally, many women described multifaceted and often multidisciplinary instead of tightly focused research interests and agendas. We also noticed that participants often, but not always, talked about an interest in connecting their work to their lives or that their work had grown from their lives, challenging academia’s preference for objectivity and distance. A final commonality was that most of the women in our study relied on relationships, such as work friends, family, spouses, and friends from graduate school to make their way through academia, defying academia’s emphasis on individualism.

In addition to the conventions of narrative analysis, we used intersectionality to guide our analytical work. As noted earlier, intersectionality reminds us that people occupy various social locations that matter all at once. In this way, women academics are never marked *or* received by gender alone. Race, ethnicity, class, nativity, language, phenotype, sexual orientation, gender presentation, ability among many other markers show up in how women are read, how they are included or excluded from certain opportunities and networks, and how they are allowed to move in the world. Thus, after conducting the holistic analytic reading described above, we organized our transcripts according to four dimensions: (a) Women of Color from working or poor class background; (b) White women from working or poor class backgrounds; (c) Women of Color of upper or middle class backgrounds; and (d) White women from upper or middle class backgrounds. It is important to note that there are limits to our approach. For example, there are different privileges and oppres-

Table 1
Example of Participant Summary

Amy	White gay woman, grew up solid-middle class, professionals as parent, engaged in an interdisciplinary science research team, qualitative researcher, fell into research appointment through personal contacts, stays because of personal commitments to research team, who have become friends, prepared to defend one another/work against racist/sexist comments at conferences
-----	---

sions among Women of Color for which we did not account (Smith, 2016). Black women, and the Black community, overall, face anti-Blackness not only from White people but also from other communities of Color (Garza, 2016). Additionally, Native and Indigenous women's experience are marked by colonialism in historically specific and personal ways (Smith, 2016). Additionally, self-reported class data is not perfect, but we privileged women's understanding of their socioeconomic background and then triangulated their class background information with other evidence. For example, in stories from women that had an upper-middle class background, we noted that most of their parents were also college graduates and held professional job titles. These women also often mentioned travel, private schooling, and experiences that reflect mainstream notions of cultural capital (e.g., freedom to explore ideas in college vs. find a job, connections to professional circles, internship opportunities tied to professional circles). On the other hand, we noted that working class women described parents or families that worked multiple jobs, often in the service or hard labor sector (e.g., McDonalds, ranching). These women often reflected on lacking or poor curricular experiences in K-12, poor college preparation, and a lack of college knowledge.

As we studied the data in these different groupings, we identified a few nuances. First, we found within racial group differences stemming from class background and college generation status. For example, one of our findings is that women in our study generally took up nonlinear approaches to their careers. However, whereas White women from middle- and upper-class backgrounds spoke with few reservations about nonlinearity in their careers, White women and Women of Color from working-class backgrounds seemed highly alert to the potential consequences of noncompliance. Indeed, *all* Women of Color, despite class background, reported that any seemingly nonconventional approach they took felt and was perceived as risky. Second, we noted that whereas Women of Color almost (not always) viewed their work as inherently personal, or tied to personal experiences, White women reported personal connections to their scholarship only after a particularly salient or traumatic experience (e.g., a specific encounter of sexism, onset of illness). In line with intersectionality, we highlight these nuances within the counternarrative(s). In the end, we developed a counternarrative titled "On their own Terms," which consists of three key findings. Each finding illustrates how some women in our study often, but not always *or* only took up pathways and experiences that led them to success.

Trustworthiness

We used several measures to ensure the trustworthiness of our work. Both of us were involved in all aspects of the project, including its conceptualization, interviews, analysis, and writing; we member-checked interviews. We also presented our emerging analysis at a conference to gather feedback. Conference participants encouraged our intersectional approach. We maintained research journals to record and recall our analytical processes, allowing us to describe our process as we have done. Finally, below we share positionality statements to help readers understand how we relate to this work.

I (Leslie D. Gonzales) entered this work as a working-class, first-generation Woman of Color college student who landed in academia. I did not attend well-resourced, renowned, or presti-

gious institutions. I have often thought about the surprising and powerful freedoms I derived because I pursued academia from a place where my mentors and my program were not tightly aligned to disciplinary rules of legitimacy, or consumed with prestige games. I remember mentors telling me things like, "just do good work, be creative" and "when you are a professor, the most important thing you can do is pay it forward." Thus, I often think because I come from little "academic prestige," I was not invested in nor interested in its assumed value. This particular history matters to this study, in that it allows me to see the value and possibility of approaching things just a bit differently, but I would be dishonest to suggest that I am not now acutely aware of the power of hierarchy, or how creativity and difference can be read negatively within academe, especially when coming from a Woman of Color.

I (Aimee LaPointe Terosky) identify as a White woman. I did not grow up wealthy, but solidly middle class and in the home of two professionals. My educational experience could be described as smooth, with a pathway of increasingly selective and well-resourced institutions, ranging from an average performing, and mostly rural secondary school experience to a private, Ivy League doctoral education. When I decided to pursue a nonfaculty pathway after graduate school, I had to contend with a series of questions, concerns, and sometimes disapproval. After several years, I found my way back to academia. I now, happily, teach in a small, teaching-focused, community-engaged institution, although I continue to face questions and disapproval, especially at academic conferences, for not pursuing a research university appointment. These experiences helped me see the narrowness with which students are often asked to envision their pathway and it fuels my commitment to highlighting as many pathways as possible for current students so that they can pursue work in whatever way is meaningful to them.

Overview of Findings

As a reminder, we interviewed 34 posttenure or long-term employed women academics for a project, and in this article, we focus on the narratives of 27 women that countered the normative pathways and prescriptions for success in academia. In reflecting on these select interviews, we cast our findings as one counternarrative consisting of three themes: (a) Challenging Linearity; (b) Refusing Dualism; and (c) Rejecting Individualism. To explain each theme, we first define and contextualize it by sharing a few examples from varied participants. Then, we draw on exemplars and provide rich models for readers' consideration. Our exemplars are a diverse slate of participants, whose stories deeply *and* repeatedly reflected each theme.

On Their Own Terms

Challenging Linearity, Diversifying Pathways, and Approaches

Twenty-two women described a nonlinear trajectory into and through academia. This theme counters the dominant idea that there is one pathway into academia that starts with a student identifying a discipline-anchored topic, following that topic long-term as the student moves from graduate school into a faculty

position at a research university (Gonzales, 2018; Bieber & Worley, 2006). Indeed, several women in our study described nonlinear, multidimensional—often messy—pathways and approaches to their academic careers.

By pathway, we refer to women's journeys into the academic profession. For example, Brenda only landed in her Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics (STEM) doctoral program after realizing another STEM area was not the right fit for her. Jana not only changed doctoral programs but institutions when she realized her work would not be well-supported. Meanwhile, Carrie almost fell into academia because of a series of personal situations: marriage, relocation, divorce, a new marriage, and so forth. By approach, we refer to how these women conducted research: they sought to connect multiple disciplines and/or pursued many questions in the context of their agenda. Cassie, a White woman social scientist, noted how many of her disciplinary peers do not believe her work belongs in the discipline because she brings in topics and approaches typically studied in other disciplines. When asked to talk about her approach, Cassie, also a woman of relative class privilege, quipped she is someone who "thinks outside the box." Women of Color, as well as women from working-class backgrounds also described nonlinear approaches to their scholarship, but deemed them somewhat risky, noting how they often received more scrutiny from colleagues. For example, Lana, a Black humanities scholar, integrated multiple perspectives into her scholarship because she found that the literature base in her discipline fell short in accounting for culture, race, and class. Of this Lana said, "I worked across departments because my work has been very (pause), my interest have always been very interdisciplinary, but that doesn't necessarily sit well [in academia]." To fully illustrate this theme, we rely on Laura's case.

Laura. Laura is a Woman of Color and first-generation college student. In her own words, Laura "grew up extremely poor." Although Laura's parents never attended college and the family lived in poverty, it was always assumed that Laura would attend college. Therefore, after earning a college scholarship, Laura followed her parents' advice and set out to become a medical doctor. She entered college and immediately declared a major in a natural science field. However, Laura shared with us, "I did not persist in that aspiration." Laura described how she suddenly realized that she had not been prepared for college-level work—that her K-12 experience had not given her the skills or knowledge she would need to succeed in science.

After failing out of her science courses, Laura was saddened and said that she "gave up and was not sure what else to do." By chance, she enrolled in a social science course, where the professor happened to study student access. Laura recalled her slow realization that, even if she was not a medical doctor, she could remain connected to STEM through other types of research. Laura's professor noticed her keen interest and invited her to work as a research assistant. Quite luckily, this research assistantship involved the study of first-generation Students of Color with interests in the sciences.

This undergraduate research experience enhanced Laura's self-efficacy. She started to envision herself as a professor who could research minoritized students' access to science. With the help of a few key professors, Laura continued to graduate school. Upon graduation, Laura received several tenure-track offers from major research universities. Against the advice of all but one of her

professors, Laura accepted a faculty position at a liberal arts college. When asked to discuss this choice, Laura said she wanted to be a faculty member in a place where she could "shift the climate of an institution or shift the demographics." Laura knew some of her mentors were disappointed in her choice to pursue a more teaching and student-centered career.

Laura's career is also an excellent example of nonlinearity. Like many working-class students, who are also often racially minoritized, Laura started a science degree and then left when she realized that her working class K-12 school failed to prepare her. Also, like many first-generation Women of Color, Laura stumbled into a field and then figured out how to use it to serve others, particularly underrepresented students. Finally, against the advice of all but one of her mentors, she chose a career that would allow her to bring STEM professors, policy audiences, and student success professionals together through her work. Laura explained that, given the culture of her liberal arts institution, she had the freedom to design projects and programs that bridged social and natural sciences as well as high-level administrators. Through this work, she armed science faculty with knowledge about inclusivity, mentoring, and diversity and connected them to student success programs and offices, on and off campus. In talking about her potential to engage these varied audiences in her liberal arts college, Laura doubted that such work was possible in deeply bifurcated research universities. Moreover, Laura believed her multidisciplinary work would not have been well-received at a research university. All in all, Laura was satisfied with the life she was making at her liberal arts institution. And many others have recognized Laura's efforts as well: today, Laura is a nationally renowned, grant-funded scholar, often asked to give talks pertaining to Students of Color in STEM fields. At the time of our interview, Laura was shifting into administrative roles to use her research to develop "systemic institutional" reforms. Although cognizant that some of her mentors did not agree with her career path, Laura was unapologetically happy with her career and there seemed to be many exciting turns ahead.

Refusing Dualism, Embracing the Whole

Twenty-one participants refused to accept or work according to the dualistic boundaries that academia upholds (Kelly et al., 2010; Lester, 2008). As discussed earlier, the academic profession expects dualism in two ways. First, there is an expectation that one should unbuckle from their home life once they enter the professional space. There is also an expectation that academics distance themselves from their research. In this way, academia privileges dualism in at least two ways: between personal and professional lives and between an academic and their knowledge production.

However, for many of the women in our study, separating or pretending that their personal life and their work as a professor was not somehow connected was impossible. These connections varied: some of the women described juggling demands from home and work at the same time; others described how insights from and ideas taught within their home spheres grounded their research. For example, Reina, Karla, Margarita, and Jana, all Women of Color, and Tara and Brenda, two White women, described how their research agendas stemmed from familial lessons and observations. Jana noted that her interest in examining family dynamics stemmed from some of her childhood experiences and interactions

with her father. Tara traced her interest in gender inequity to the clear family favoritism shown toward her younger brother. For all of these women, it was impossible to untangle their research agendas from the larger stories of their lives. Others referenced how specific traumatic or life-changing events in their personal life triggered them to radically revise not only their trajectory but also the approach that they took with their work.

When we considered if and how this finding held across gender, race, and class, we found that 11 of the 13 Women of Color described entering the academy to examine issues that impacted their communities. These Women of Color reflected on the absence of studies that elevated the interests and perspectives of Communities of Color and noted that their academic work is inherently personal and political work. In contrast, White women and women from financially privileged backgrounds often pointed to a particular event, like discrimination, sexual harassment, or an illness in the family as the critical incident that helped them see how their personal and professional lives were connected or how they could be connected in productive ways. To illustrate this theme, we draw on Andrea's case.

Andrea. Andrea is a White woman who grew up "solidly middle class." It was "a given" that she would attend college based on her parents' expectations and siblings' previous attendance, and Andrea reported a lifelong affinity for school and schooling. When Andrea started college, she thought she would study something in the area of the social sciences, but Andrea's interests "shifted" when a science professor inspired her. Andrea began doing fieldwork with her science professor. When Andrea started to look at graduate schools, she found two "ideal" programs that focused on the species that she had learned about as an undergraduate researcher. However, personal constraints kept Andrea from enrolling in either of these programs. With support from her undergraduate professors and field colleagues, Andrea applied for and was accepted to a graduate program that studied different species. When reflecting on this process, Andrea noted that, although she would have to learn a new species, she felt confident about her ability to make the transition. As noted above, Andrea had always felt comfortable in school, and the mentoring she received had only improved her sense of efficacy for doctoral work.

While completing her doctoral work, Andrea became a mother, which was atypical for people in her program. After obtaining her doctoral degree, despite severe, repeat warnings from her colleagues, Andrea decided to stay home for the first few years of her children's lives. When talking about this decision, Andrea admitted that she was concerned that her peers would not take her seriously. However, Andrea stated that "being with my kids was more important at that time." Andrea started to see that her home life and work were inextricably intertwined, in that her career would now be judged based on her decision to stay home with her children.

After 2 years as a "stay-at-home mom," Andrea accepted a visiting professor position at a "publish or perish research university," but left the post after a short time. Andrea reflected and shared that the research university experience was invaluable because "it helped me clarify what I wanted in two ways." First, Andrea recognized that she did not want a career in a research university. In fact, Andrea realized that she did not want a research-focused career, but a career where she could bring her science knowledge to bear on teaching and practice. Second,

Andrea realized that she could not be "in the field for 14 hr to gather quality data," which was typical for scientists focused on species research like Andrea's. Andrea noted that such research demands were not conducive to spending time with her family. With these two realizations in hand, Andrea left her university post and accepted a full-time faculty position at a community college.

As Andrea transitioned to her community college post, she strived to balance teaching, service, and motherhood. For Andrea, the most difficult was reimagining her research agenda.

Although her graduate school training was helpful, she did not have the same infrastructure, and she wanted to ensure that any research she did was linked to teaching and practice. While Andrea was exploring how to more concretely connect her work to teaching and practice, a new research agenda "landed in her lap" through the unfortunate experience of a family illness. After watching two family members become ill, she started an entirely new agenda focused on the prevention of this illness, community education, and advocacy.

In Andrea's words, her research now fulfills "two needs": (a) a desire to produce knowledge for the scientific purposes and (b) the genuine need to understand the disease "impacting my family." As such, Andrea blends the science knowledge she gained via graduate school with the commitment she has to educate and advocate on behalf of her family members and others who are stricken with the same illness. Today, Andrea regularly integrates fieldwork into her courses, is viewed as an expert on this disease, and has the frequent opportunity to share her research with state and national advocacy groups. In sharing her work, Andrea speaks simultaneously as a scientist, an educator, and a family steward. Although she spent a great deal of time trying to manage and balance two roles early on (e.g., stepping away from school and work to attend to her children), she now pulls them together and believes her work is better for it. Andrea's story is one of refusal. She refused to center research at the cost of her family life. She also refused the idea that personal and professional spheres cannot have productive overlap. Today, Andrea produces critically needed information for both the science and public health communities, all while working as a community college professor.

Rejecting Individualism, Advancing With and for Others

The most prevalent theme among our findings was the centrality of relationships and community in women's lives. This finding was not surprising. Extant research has documented the tendency for women to organize and work in collectives (Espino et al., 2010; Fries-Britt & Kelly, 2005; Johnson et al., 2018). Indeed, all 27 women discussed long-term, reciprocal relationships that helped them navigate academia. The idea that women advanced, not alone but with the support of others, counters academia's individualistic culture.

We noted the prevalence of this theme among all groups of women in our study, but also recognized that women relied on these relationships in slightly different ways. For example, Emma and Lisa, two White social scientists, and Faith, a White scientist, described how relationships with colleagues, especially women, helped them process their academic ideas. In addition to academic inspiration and collaboration, Women of Color commonly described how relationships with others—and more specifically, with

other Women of Color as well as with their families—provided the fuel they needed to survive hostile work contexts. Sarita described heavily leaning on her spouse, child, and students for support while Reina, Dianne, and Sylvia pointed to key people, particularly Women of Color, as central to their academic survival. To illustrate this nuance within our most salient finding, we draw on the cases of Amy and Karla.

Amy. Amy is a gay, White qualitative social scientist with expertise in diversity. After completing her graduate degree, Amy spent years working as an adjunct and in industry. About the time she started to grow tired of adjunct work, an old colleague-friend of Amy's introduced her to a team of STEM faculty. The team, according to Amy, was interested in exploring the experience of minoritized students within STEM fields but did not have the subject matter expertise or qualitative skill set to do so. In our interview, Amy noted the importance of her colleague-friend and remained thankful for the connection. When asked to discuss the nature of the team and their work, Amy recalled that when she joined the team, they created some "ground rules and practices" to ensure everyone's success.

The team met weekly and started with informal conversation to "check-in and catch up" on health, family happenings, and other news. As a result of the team's commitment to getting to know one another, they became friends, and as friends, they often helped one another. For example, at the beginning of a project, the team lists the potential papers that they want to write, and one or two people take the lead on different papers. However, Amy explained that there had been times when one of the team members ran into a crisis so that another team member had to "step in" and always did so without question. Additionally, the team always pitched into writing papers. Amy noted that after the lead authors get "words on paper," the full team "tears it apart and puts it back together again." Amy quickly noted, "no one gets their feelings hurt" because in "critiquing" the work, the team knows they are developing a stronger contribution. In fact, one of the group's rules was that all papers had to be collectively, rather than individually, authored.

Finally, Amy explained one of the most critical functions of the team is taking care of one another in potentially hostile academic settings (e.g., publishing, conferences). Amy explained that because the team's scholarly agenda centers equity and identity issues in the context of STEM fields, their work tends to receive heightened critique. However, before conference presentations, the team meets up and talks about anticipated critiques. During conferences, they always "have each other's backs." Amy stressed that this preparation is crucial when presenting "to a 99.9% White male audience," which often doubts the legitimacy of their work. Amy's success story started with an old friend who was willing to make an introduction for her. She noted that her continued success continues to grow through the collective. The group is committed to developing one another as scholars and ensuring that they do not face hostile audiences and critiques alone. Next, we introduce Karla, a Black woman, who also relied heavily on relationships, but in a slightly different way.

Karla. Karla is a Black social scientist who assumed a tenure-line position straight out of graduate school. Karla has always understood her academic work to be part of a tradition of community uplift. For instance, when describing her academic interests, Karla recalled an incident in high school where she "got

called down to the counselor's office" after speaking out against a history teacher's racist comments about Muslims. Karla reflected, "I remember him saying something about Muslims . . . very negative, I do not remember exactly what it was, but I argued with him." Speaking out against her history teacher's racist comments is just one example of the way that Karla saw her academic knowledge and platform in connection with community.

When we talked, Karla noted that she held some privilege relative to other Peers of Color. Karla shared, "I am the daughter of two formally educated parents." Karla also noted that her parents encouraged her to use her voice and speak out against racial injustices. Since she was a young person, Karla understood that it was essential to use any privilege she might have and engage in work that benefitted Black communities, or Communities of Color, in general. In this way, even Karla's academic relations were familial, communal in nature, and grounded in a larger project of racial justice. And although Karla noted that she and friends wrote together, read one another's work, and celebrated one another's academic milestones, she stressed that her most important relationships were those she held with other Black women and provided a sustenance she needed to survive the Whiteness and, thus, racism, of academia. Of this, Karla said:

My race is a master narrative in my life, and so it is often around issues of race where I need to be able to go to my crew and be like, 'You have got to hear this. Or you have got to see this.' And that is fortifying; it is validating, it is comforting, it is necessary for psychological sustenance to be able to release . . . it's like pressure balance.

Thus, Amy and Karla both described their work in connection to and as a result of collectives. However, Karla described colleagues not only as collaborators but as sustenance for surviving racism within academe. Both women's cases illustrate how relationships with others, not competition, fueled their success.

Discussion

In this article, we highlighted the stories of women who have rebuffed many of academia's taken-for-granted prescriptions for success. Despite nuances, we were struck by how often women in our study worked around or flat-out rejected the standard prescriptions for success in academia. Before moving into our discussion and implications, we offer three framing statements. First, we celebrate the resistance, resilience, and creativity of these women. Their stories, as a whole, but also individually, represent the kinds of stories—counterstories, to be more specific—that we believe, many graduate students and early career faculty want to learn more about. Second and relatedly, these are also the kind of stories that are increasingly necessary in a profession that is overwhelmed by neoliberal logics, where there are fewer tenure-secure positions and where posts in research universities are often reserved for those educated in a small number of highly elite research institutions. Simply put, these findings show how women have developed ways of navigating and thriving in academe. Third, and finally, given our intersectional approach, it is critical to note that the experiences and approaches that women took seemed to be conditioned by their varying social location (e.g., race, gender, class, or college generation). For example, although the majority of women in this study described their research as interdisciplinary, multithreaded, and often connected to their personal lives, middle-

or upper-class women of all backgrounds seemed to describe their approach as creative risks, whereas women of working-class backgrounds, especially Women of Color did not view their approach as a creative choice, but simply as the way that they approached the world, and an approach that others viewed with skepticism. Holding these three statements in mind, we now reflect on our findings, generally, while also attending to differences. Following each thematic finding, we offer implications for advisors, mentors, and anyone involved in faculty preparation.

On Challenging Linearity

Challenging the linearity and narrowness that is often privileged in faculty preparation and professional development, 22 women characterized their pathway and approach to academia as nonlinear—filled with twists and turns that took them inside nonresearch university settings and into interdisciplinary kinds of work. Exemplifying this finding are Laura, Amy, and Andrea. These women described nonconventional, and perhaps even surprising, pathways. For example, despite advice from many of her mentors, Laura chose to work at a liberal arts college because she believed it would allow her to work more closely with students and engage faculty across social science and science fields. After becoming a mother while in graduate school, Andrea left a research university post because it was not conducive to the kind of life that she wanted to lead. Relatedly, Andrea did not believe it would be possible to connect her research to practice, policy, and advocacy while working on the tenure-track in a research university setting. Therefore, she left the research university post and took on a community college teaching job, which has allowed her to develop a deeply fulfilling teaching and research career. Meanwhile, after a long stint as an adjunct professor and time working in a nonrelated industry, Amy landed in an exciting multidisciplinary team where she served as the social science and diversity expert for her colleagues.

While these women carved nonconventional, nonlinear pathways into and through academia, there were some differences in the fundamental nature of their pathways. We attribute these differences primarily to class, but acknowledge that class and race come together in powerful ways here. For example, both Amy and Andrea are White women who described growing up in middle or upper-middle class homes. Both had parents who had attended college. Andrea noted that her spouse's economic security enabled her to make decisions that she may not have otherwise have made. Although Amy did not speak about a partner, she did note that had it not been for her social capital—specifically, a friend of the family's with connections to academia—she likely could not have made her way back into academia.

Meanwhile, Laura, a Woman of Color who grew up extremely poor, did not have the security of a middle-class, college educated family or a spouse, to fall back on as she made meaning of the academy. Laura “failed out” of science—an outcome that cannot be untangled from the fact that Laura attended underfunded K-12 schools that lacked adequate opportunities and materials to prepare her for science. Once enrolled in science classes, Laura confronted a STEM culture that privileges White, middle-class, male experiences and dispositions (Griffin, Gibbs, Bennett, Staples, & Robinson, 2015). All in all, Laura's nonconventional pathway came with a level of risk and discomfort not reflected in Andrea and

Amy's narratives. In fact, both Andrea and Amy described their schooling experiences with joy and satisfaction—unmarked by the kind of discomforts and marginality that Laura experienced as a poor student of color.

Moreover, while Laura reflected on her choice to pursue a career at a liberal arts college, she remained somewhat troubled by her mentors' disappointment. Yet, Andrea actually left a research university post, but was never overly concerned with her mentors' reactions. Our point in highlighting these differences is to show how class manifested in quite distinctive ways for women who are differently racialized. Andrea, as well as Amy, are White women, and we suggest that their Whiteness allowed them access to resources, networks, and a freedom of mind, which made it easier to be bold, to lean into risk rather than to be worried about one's decisions, like Laura.

In other words, an intersectional analysis reminds us to consider how class and race seemed to come together for these women. However, racialized class differences are not contemporary manifestations; they are anchored in the history of the United States. White colonizers stole land from Indigenous peoples, enslaved Black women and men, and created exploitative barriers for immigrant communities, and in doing so, established White, patriarchal, capitalism as the foundation of the United States. Over and over, this system locked People, and especially Women of Color, out of opportunity. In this sense, White women, who were the spouses, daughters, and sisters of White men have had access to key institutions, like school, voting, and even marriage, before Women of Color. Having access to political, educational, and other resources, it is not surprising that White and financially stable women in our study described their messy pathways as creative, out-of-the-box approaches while working class Women of Color in our study framed their interdisciplinary or messy approaches as necessary, but sometimes scary or worrisome approaches that yielded them additional scrutiny.

Implications. In terms of implications for practice, we urge faculty advisors to be cognizant of all the ways that their influence and power weighs on advisees, especially when an advisee is without the kind of financial resources and social capital that is crucial to academia (e.g., such as resources that allow one to wait or search for a research university job). Moreover, advisees are not only students. They carry all their identities (e.g., gender, class, and race) and responsibilities (e.g., family, community, and work) into doctoral programs, and taken together, these identities and responsibilities may point them toward career trajectories that are wildly different than the models that professors have in mind when they advise students. Supporting creative, seemingly nonconventional pathways is as important as supporting students who seek traditional academic careers. Advisors and mentors should consider the weight of their words in advising, as graduate students may fear the reprisal or disappointment of their advisors, which becomes especially worrisome when graduate students' academic and professional trajectories are intertwined with financial resources that a mentor is providing. One way that graduate school professors and advisors can elevate nonlinear pathways in academia is through programming that highlights diverse pathways and profiles into academia, such as the Center for the Integration of Research, Teaching, and Learning (CIRTL) webinar series.

On Refusing Dualism

Our second finding concerned women's refusal to bifurcate their academic and personal lives. Twenty-one of the women in this study rejected boundaries that govern the academic profession. These normalized boundaries elevate detachment and suggest that to produce knowledge; one has to assume a neutral, almost disembodied position. Women's refusal manifested in a few ways. For example, Emma and Dana described how their minds (and time) constantly darted between home life and work life, even when they were at the office. Unlike the ideal worker, they could not "unbuckle" from their responsibilities as caregivers and household managers once they were at work. On the other hand, sometimes women in our study discussed how the personal shaped their work as professors. Women of Color tended to describe this approach almost as a default position—as if they always understood their work as both personal and political. However, we found that White and economically privileged women usually experienced a tragic or critical incident before they were willing, or perhaps able to see, how the personal came into and could enrich their work as professors. For example, among Women of Color, Karla, Reina, Sarita, and Loretta all explained that the epistemological resources they inherited as women marked not only by gender, but also by race, class, and sometimes language, only strengthened their work. Karla noted that race was "the master narrative of [her] life" and she could not set it aside in going about her scholarly work. We noted that Brenda, a White middle-class woman, Tara, a working-class White woman, and Amy, a gay White woman who had grown up solidly middle class, were among the White women who talked similarly and personally about their work. However, Andrea did not make connections between her work and her personal life until she became a mom and illness struck in her family. The refusal to bifurcate one's life in favor of dualism was not surprising to us. Critical scholars, including feminists, critical race feminists, and Indigenous scholars, have long shown the powerful affordances that positionality offers to research and knowledge production—although the admission of positionality remains taboo in most traditional disciplines (Anzaldúa, 1987; Bernal, 2002; Collins, 1986; Shotton et al., 2018; Smith, 1987; Spelman, 1988).

In refusing dualism, women pursued research agendas that stemmed from their personal lives and interests. And yet, there were differences in how such approaches were received. The women who engaged in race-related research tended to be Women of Color and often remarked that they and their scholarship were at the "fringes" of their disciplines. Indeed, Dianne, as well as Lana and Loretta, noted how their work would probably never be published in their discipline's top journals because they foregrounded race. Tara and Sara, both White social scientists in the same discipline, foregrounded gender in their research and did not believe they faced additional scrutiny for the content of their work.

Implications. Rather than urge scholars to separate work life and personal life, it may be valuable for chairs, advisors, mentors, or faculty developers to consider how personal-professional links provide richer inroads into one's scholarly work and to be willing to talk about these links. In our view, this particular finding is especially important to and should be considered as faculty members develop methods coursework. Additionally, leaders within disciplinary organizations, journal editorial boards, and confer-

ences could request that scholars discuss their positionality in their research, thereby recognizing the influential role of scholars' identities in research. While this recommendation might seem somewhat removed from our study, we argue that such actions offer legitimacy to scholars whose work is questioned or because of its attachment to personal biography.

On Rejecting Individualism

The final and most prevalent occurrence across women's stories was the centrality of relationships. Rather than individual achievement and accomplishment, almost all of the women described how they depended on and worked with others to achieve success. Their success was not an individual accomplishment, but something that they molded with, because of, and on behalf of others. Across many cases, including both Amy and Karla's, participants described how colleagues helped them prepare for research conferences. Amy's example was particularly interesting because her research team is situated in the STEM field, where they tended to receive harsh critiques on their diversity and equity work. Amy's team fostered what Martínez Alemán (1997) described as the "educative value" of women's friendships: spaces where they relied on their relationships to try out ideas and formulate knowledge claims before testing them out in a broader, potentially less affirming context. Karla's narrative also reflected the importance of relationships in her academic career. Like Amy, Karla also talked about studying or writing with friends, but she stressed the centrality of friend-colleagueship with Black women. She noted that these friendships were essential to her survival in an institution not made for Black intellectuals, and more specifically, Black women intellectuals. Karla's entire educational trajectory was grounded in her commitment to Black community uplift, so much so that Karla stated that her academic career was not about her advancement, but about the advancement of the Black community. This finding again hints at the different experiences that Women of Color and White women have in the academy and how and why relationships may play very different roles for these groups.

Implications. Regarding implications, faculty advisors, as well as individuals involved in graduate student support, generally, should invest in strategies where graduate students can connect with others. Although the women in our study suggested that most of their relationships evolved casually, departments and graduate schools can intentionally create opportunities for people to build community. Graduate professors and advisors could support more collaborative cultures in their classrooms by designing communities of learners, promoting study and writing groups among students, and actively drawing student groups together through their research and writing. Academic leaders could promote such collectives by providing resources (i.e., physical space, time, course releases or service credit, or seed grants) to foster communities of learners related to teaching, conference preparation groups, or for faculty writing groups. We acknowledge that working in collectives is challenging given the neoliberal, high-speed bent of higher education. Collective work requires time to build trust among people, and such activities do not always yield tangible outcomes, even if they do provide the kind of antecedent supports that are key to productivity. However, there is extensive research that shows how vital collective space is for underrepresented scholars. Park and Millora's (2010) work has shown how affinity groups and

spaces provide opportunities for nondominant groups to refuel and persist in higher education. While institutions often promote affinity groups for undergraduate students, the stories of these women suggest that there is value in also extending these opportunities to graduate students and faculty as well. Efforts like the National Science Foundation's Alliance for Graduate Education and Professoriate offer one model for consideration.

Today's graduate students and early career faculty are seeking models and approaches that defy established prescriptions for success. They are hungry for careers that recognize the value of connecting research and practice to communities, the rich possibility of interdisciplinary work, and epistemological stances that marry rather than divorce one's subjectivities. In this article, we highlighted the stories of women who enacted and modeled many of these values and practices, and thereby, rebuffed dominant prescriptions for success. We see such counterapproaches as powerful, but also note that they should be understood through an intersectional lens. Our analysis suggests that some Women of Color, White women, and/or working-class women, overall, rebuffed norms in ways, for reasons, and with risks that did not emerge among White and/or financially stable women academics—an insight to keep in mind for both practice and future research.

References

- Alarcón, J. D., & Bettez, S. (2017). Feeling brown in the academy: Decolonizing mentoring through a disidentification muxerista approach. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 50*, 25–40.
- Alperin, J. P., Muñoz Nieves, C., Schimanski, L. A., Fischman, G. E., Niles, M. T., & McKiernan, E. C. (2019). How significant are the public dimensions of faculty work in review, promotion and tenure documents? *eLife, 8*, e42254. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7554/eLife.42254>
- Anzaldúa, G. (1987). *Borderlands: La Frontera*. San Francisco, CA: Aunt Lute.
- Armstrong, E. A., & Hamilton, L. T. (2013). *Paying for the party*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4159/harvard.9780674073517>
- 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* (Vol. 21, pp. 397–456). Netherlands: Springer. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/1-4020-4512-3_8
- Baker, V. L., Terosky, A. L., & Martinez, E. (2017). *Faculty members' scholarly learning across institutional types*. Association for the Study of Higher Education's Monograph Series. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Bamberg, M. (2004). Considering counter-narratives. In M. Bamberg & M. Andrews (Eds.), *Considering counter-narratives: Narrating, resisting, making sense* (Vol. 4, pp. 351–371). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1075/sin.4.43bam>
- Becher, T. (1994). The significance of disciplinary differences. *Studies in Higher Education, 19*, 151–161. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03075079412331382007>
- Bernal, D. (2006). *Chicana/Latina education in everyday life: Feminista perspectives on pedagogy and epistemology*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Bernal, D. D. (2002). Critical race theory, Latino critical theory, and critical raced-gendered epistemologies: Recognizing students of color as holders and creators of knowledge. *Qualitative Inquiry, 8*, 105–126. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/107780040200800107>
- Bernal, D. D., & Villalpando, O. (2002). An apartheid of knowledge in academia: The struggle over the “legitimate” knowledge of faculty of color. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 35*, 169–180. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/713845282>
- Bieber, J. P., & Worley, L. K. (2006). Conceptualizing the academic life: Graduate students' perspectives. *The Journal of Higher Education, 77*, 1009–1035. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/jhe.2006.0046>
- Bierema, L. L. (2009). Critiquing human resource development's dominant masculine rationality and evaluating its impact. *Human Resource Development Review, 8*, 68–96. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1534484308330020>
- Braxton, J. M., & Lyken-Segosebe, D. (2015). Community college faculty engagement in Boyer's domains of scholarship. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 2015*, 7–14. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/cc.20150>
- Cantwell, B., & Taylor, B. J. (2015). Rise of the science and engineering postdoctorate and the restructuring of academic research. *The Journal of Higher Education, 86*, 667–696. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/jhe.2015.0028>
- Cardozo, K. M. (2017). Academic labor: Who cares? *Critical Sociology, 43*, 405–428. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0896920516641733>
- Chang, A., Welton, A. D., Martinez, M. A., & Cortez, L. (2013). Becoming academicians: An ethnographic analysis of the figured worlds of racially underrepresented female faculty. *Negro Educational Review, 64*, 97–118.
- Cho, S., Crenshaw, K., & McCall, L. (2013). Toward a field of intersectionality studies: Theory, applications, and praxis. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 38*, 785–810. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/669608>
- Clark, S. M., & Corcoran, M. (1986). Perspectives on the professional socialization of women faculty: A case of accumulative disadvantage? *Journal of Higher Education, 57*, 20–43. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00221546.1986.11778747>
- Clauset, A., Arbesman, S., & Larremore, D. B. (2015). Systematic inequality and hierarchy in faculty hiring networks. *Science Advances, 1*, e1400005. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.1400005>
- Collins, P. H. (1986). Learning from the outsider within: The sociological significance of Black feminist thought. *Social Problems, 33*, s14–s32. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/800672>
- Coulter, C. A. (2009). Finding the narrative in narrative research. *Educational Researcher, 38*, 608–611. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/0013189X09354124>
- Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A Black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist theory. *University of Chicago Legal Forum, 1989*, 139–167.
- Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review, 43*, 1241–1299. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1229039>
- Crenshaw, K. (2016). *On intersectionality—Keynote at WOW*. Retrieved from <https://youtu.be/DW4HLgYPIA>
- Dotson, K. (2011). Concrete flowers: Contemplating the profession of philosophy. *Hypatia, 26*, 403–409. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1527-2001.2011.01176.x>
- Eddy, P. L., & Hart, J. (2012). Faculty in the hinterlands: Cultural anticipation and cultural reality. *Higher Education, 63*, 751–769. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10734-011-9475-2>
- Espino, M. M., Muñoz, S. M., & Marquez Kiyama, J. (2010). Transitioning from doctoral study to the academy: Theorizing trenzas of identity for Latina sister scholars. *Qualitative Inquiry, 16*, 804–818. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1077800410383123>
- Fairweather, J. S. (2005). Beyond the rhetoric: Trends in the relative value of teaching and research in faculty salaries. *The Journal of Higher Education, 76*, 401–422. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/jhe.2005.0027>
- Fries-Britt, S., & Kelly, B. T. (2005). Retaining each other: Narratives of two African American women in the academy. *The Urban Review, 37*, 221–242. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11256-005-0006-2>

- Gardner, S. K. (2008). Fitting the mold of graduate school: A qualitative study of socialization in doctoral education. *Innovative Higher Education*, 33, 125–138. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10755-008-9068-x>
- Gardner, S. K. (2010). Keeping up with the Joneses: Socialization and culture in doctoral education at one striving institution. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 81, 658–679. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2010.11779076>
- Gardner, S. K. (2013). Women faculty departures from a striving institution: Between a rock and a hard place. *The Review of Higher Education*, 36, 349–370. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2013.0025>
- Garza, A. (2016). A herstory of the #BlackLivesMatter movement. In J. Hobson (Ed.), *Are all the women still White? Rethinking race, expanding feminism* (pp. 35–48). New York, NY: SUNY Press.
- 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, 265–288. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09518390310001653907>
- Golde, C. M., & Dore, T. M. (2001). *At cross purposes: What the experiences of today's doctoral students reveal about doctoral education*. Philadelphia, PA: Pew Charitable Trusts.
- Gonzales, L. D. (2012). Responding to mission creep: Faculty members as cosmopolitan agents. *Higher Education*, 64, 337–353.
- Gonzales, L. D. (2018). Subverting and minding boundaries: The intellectual work of women. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 89, 677–701.
- Gonzales, L. D., & Terosky, A. L. (2016). From the faculty perspective: Defining, earning, and maintaining legitimacy across academia. *Teachers College Record*, 118, 1–44.
- Green, D., Pulley, T., Jackson, M., Martin, L., & Fasching-Varner, K. J. (2016). Mapping the margins and searching for higher ground: Examining the marginalisation of Black female graduate students at PWIs. *Gender and Education*, 30, 295–309.
- Green, W., Hibbins, R., Houghton, L., & Ruutz, A. (2013). Reviving praxis: Stories of continual professional learning and practice architectures in a faculty-based teaching community of practice. *Oxford Review of Education*, 39, 247–266. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03054985.2013.791266>
- Grey, T. G., & Williams-Farrier, B. J. (2017). # Sippingtea: Two Black female literacy scholars sharing counter-stories to redefine our roles in the academy. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 49, 503–525.
- Griffin, K., Gibbs, K. D., Jr., Bennett, J., Staples, C., & Robinson, T. (2015). Respect me for my science: A Bourdieuan analysis of women scientists' interactions with faculty and socialization into science. *Journal of Women and Minorities in Science and Engineering*, 21, 159–179. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1615/JWomenMinorScienEng.2015011143>
- Hancock, A. M. (2007). Intersectionality as a normative and empirical paradigm. *Politics & Gender*, 3, 248–254. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S1743923X07000062>
- Harris, J. C., & Patton, L. D. (2019). Un/doing intersectionality through higher education research. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 90, 347–372. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2018.1536936>
- Hartman, Y., & Darab, S. (2012). A call for slow scholarship: A case study on the intensification of academic life and its implications for pedagogy. *Review of Education, Pedagogy & Cultural Studies*, 34, 49–60. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10714413.2012.643740>
- Hernandez, K. A. C., Ngunjiri, F. W., & Chang, H. (2015). Exploiting the margins in higher education: A collaborative autoethnography of three foreign-born female faculty of color. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 28, 533–551.
- Jaeger, A. J., Haley, K. J., Ampaw, F. D., & Levin, J. S. (2013). Understanding the career choice for underrepresented minority doctoral students in science and engineering. *Journal of Women and Minorities in Science and Engineering*, 19, 1–16. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1615/JWomenMinorScienEng.2013005361>
- Jencks, C., & Riesman, D. (1968). *The academic revolution*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Johnson, J. M., Boss, G., Mwangi, C. G., & Garcia, G. A. (2018). Resisting, rejecting, and redefining normative pathways to the professoriate: Faculty of color in higher education. *The Urban Review*, 50, 630–647. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11256-018-0459-8>
- Jorgenson, J. (2013). *Internal and external ways to validate adjuncts*. Retrieved from <https://conditionallyaccepted.com/2013/08/08/validation-adjunct-experience/>
- Kachchaf, R., Ko, L., Hodari, A., & Ong, M. (2015). Career–life balance for women of color: Experiences in science and engineering academia. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 8, 175–191. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0039068>
- Kelly, E. L., Ammons, S. K., Chermack, K., & Moen, P. (2010). Gendered challenge, gendered response: Confronting the ideal worker norm in a White-collar organization. *Gender & Society*, 24, 281–303. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0891243210372073>
- Leahey, E., Beckman, C. M., & Stanko, T. L. (2017). Prominent but less productive: The impact of interdisciplinarity on scientists' research. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 62, 105–139. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0001839216665364>
- Lester, J. (2008). Performing gender in the workplace: Gender socialization, power, and identity among women faculty members. *Community College Review*, 35, 277–305. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0091552108314756>
- Lester, J., & Sallee, M. W. (2017). Troubling gender norms and the ideal worker in academic life. In P. Eddy, K. Ward, & T. Khwaja (Eds.), *Critical approaches to women and gender in higher education* (pp. 115–138). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan. http://dx.doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-59285-9_6
- Martinez, E. (2018). Changes, challenges, and opportunities for student services at one baccalaureate degree–granting community college. *Community College Review*, 46, 82–103. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0091552117744049>
- Martínez Alemán, A. M. (1997). Understanding and investigating female friendship's educative value. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 68, 119–159. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2959954>
- Mihaljević-Brandt, H., Santamaría, L., & Tullney, M. (2016). The effect of gender in the publication patterns in mathematics. *PLoS ONE*, 11, e0165367. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0165367>
- Mitchell, J. D., Simmons, C. Y., & Greyerbiehl, L. A. (2014). *Intersectionality & higher education*. New York, NY: Peter Lang. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3726/978-1-4539-1407-6>
- Monzó, L. D., & SooHoo, S. (2014). Translating the academy: Learning the racialized languages of academia. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 7, 147–165. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0037400>
- Mountz, A., Bonds, A., Mansfield, B., Loyd, J., Hyndman, J., Walton-Roberts, M., & Curran, W. (2015). For slow scholarship: A feminist politics of resistance through collective action in the neoliberal university. *ACME: An International E-Journal for Critical Geographies*, 14, 1235–1259.
- Museus, S. D., & Griffin, K. A. (2011). Mapping the margins in higher education: On the promise of intersectionality frameworks in research and discourse. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 2011, 5–13. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ir.395>
- National Academies of Science. (2006). *Beyond bias and barriers: Fulfilling the potential of women in academic science and engineering*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press. Retrieved from www.nap.edu/catalog/11741.html
- Nicolazzo, Z. (2017). Imagining a trans* epistemology: What liberation thinks like in postsecondary education. *Urban Education*. [Advance online publication.] <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0042085917697203>
- Noy, S., & Ray, R. (2012). Graduate students' perceptions of their advisors: Is there systematic disadvantage in mentorship? *The Journal of*

- Higher Education*, 83, 876–914. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/jhe.2012.0036>
- Ortega, M. (2015). Latina feminism, experience and the self. *Philosophy Compass*, 10, 244–254. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/phc3.12211>
- Ortega, M. (2016). *In-between: Latina feminist phenomenology, multiplicity, and the self*. New York, NY: SUNY Press.
- Park, J. J., & Millora, M. (2010). Psychological well-being for White, Black, Latino/a, and Asian American Students: Considering spirituality and religion. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, 47, 445–461. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2202/1949-6605.6143>
- Quarry, J. (2018, October 25). Coming out as working class in academia. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <https://www.chronicle.com/article/Coming-Out-as-Working-Class/244917>
- Rhoades, G., Marquez Kiyama, J., McCormick, R., & Quiroz, M. (2008). Local cosmopolitans and cosmopolitan locals: New models of professionals in the academy. *The Review of Higher Education*, 31, 209–235. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2007.0079>
- Rhoten, D., & Pfirman, S. (2007). Women in interdisciplinary science: Exploring preferences and consequences. *Research Policy*, 36, 56–75. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2006.08.001>
- Sallee, M. W. (2012). The ideal worker or the ideal father: Organizational structures and culture in the gendered university. *Research in Higher Education*, 53, 782–802. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11162-012-9256-5>
- Shahjahan, R. A. (2015). Being ‘lazy’ and slowing down: Toward decolonizing time, our body, and pedagogy. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 47, 488–501. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00131857.2014.880645>
- Shotton, H. J., Tachine, A. R., Nelson, C. A., Minthorn, R., & Waterman, S. J. (2018). Living our research through indigenous scholar sisterhood practices. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 24, 636–645. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1077800417744578>
- Smith, A. (2016). Heteropatriarchy and the three pillars of White supremacy: Rethinking women of color organizing. In J. Hobson (Ed.), *Are all the women still White? Rethinking race, expanding feminisms* (pp. 264–275). Albany, NY: SUNY Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1215/9780822373445-007>
- Smith, B. (Ed.). (1983). *Home girls: A Black feminist anthology*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Smith, D. E. (1987). *The everyday world as problematic: A feminist sociology*. Toronto, CA: University of Toronto Press.
- Spelman, E. V. (1988). *Inessential woman: Problems of exclusion in feminist thought*. New York, NY: Beacon Press.
- Suchan Bird, K. (2011). Do women publish fewer journal articles than men? Sex differences in publication productivity in the social sciences. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 32, 921–937. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01425692.2011.596387>
- Sutherland, K. A. (2017). Constructions of success in academia: An early career perspective. *Studies in Higher Education*, 42, 743–759.
- Trower, C. A. (2012). *Success on the tenure track: Five keys to faculty job satisfaction*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Ward, K., & Wolf-Wendel, L. (2012). *Academic motherhood: How faculty manage work and family*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Zinn, M. B., & Dill, B. T. (1996). Theorizing difference from multiracial feminism. *Feminist Studies*, 22, 321–331. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3178416>

(Appendix follows)

Appendix

Participant Demographics

Name	Race and ethnicity	Socioeconomic status during youth	Discipline	Institutional type where employed	Appointment type
Amanda	White, Jewish	Middle class	Humanities	Community college	Tenured
Amy	White	Upper middle class	Social sciences	Research university	Research associate
Andrea	White	Middle class	Science	Community college	Tenured
Brenda	White	Working class	Science	Research university	Tenured
Carrie	White	Working class	Science	Research university	Tenured
Cassie	White	Middle class	Social science	Research university	Tenured
Dana	White	Working class	Science	Research university	Tenured
Danielle	White	Middle class	Science	Comprehensive	Tenured
Dianne	African American	Middle class	Social science	Research university	Tenured
Elaine	Hispanic/Mestiza	Middle class	Humanities	Liberal arts college	Tenured
Emma	White, Jewish	Middle class	Social science	Research university	Tenured
Faith	White	Middle class	Science	Research university	Tenured
Jana	Asian	Working class	Humanities	Research university	Tenured
Janice ^a	White	Middle class	Science	Liberal arts college	Tenured
Judy	African American	Middle class	Social science	Research university	Tenured
Julia	Latina	Working class	Social science	Research university	Tenured
Karen	White, Jewish	Middle class	Humanities	Community college	Tenured
Karla	Black	Middle class	Social science	Research university	Tenured
Kim ^a	White	Upper middle class	Social science	Research university	Tenured
Lana	African American	Working class	Humanities	Research university	Tenured
Laura	Asian	Working class	Social science	Liberal arts college	Tenured
Lisa	White	Working class	Social science	Research university	Tenured
Loretta	Chicana	Working class	Humanities	Research university	Tenured
Marie ^a	White	Middle class	Social science	Liberal arts college	Tenured
Margarita	Latina	Working class	Humanities	Research university	Tenured
Reina	Chicana	Working class	Social science	Research university	Tenured
Rosemary	White	Upper middle class	Social science	Research university	Tenured
Sara ^a	White	Middle class	Social science	Research university	Tenured
Sarita	Black Latina	Upper middle class	Humanities	Research university	Adjunct, then tenured
Stacey ^a	White	Working class	Humanities	Research university	Tenured
Sylvia	Chicana	Working class	Social science	Research university	Tenured
Tara	White	Working class	Social science	Research university	Tenured
Trisha ^a	White, Jewish	Upper middle	Humanities	Liberal arts college	Tenured
Tracey ^a	White	Middle class	Social science	Research university	Tenured

^a Were not included in this analysis, as they described and modeled approaches and pathways that largely aligned with dominant model of profession. Their stories and experiences are important, but not relevant to this analysis. We have said more about their cases in other papers.

Received May 10, 2018

Revision received May 20, 2019

Accepted May 23, 2019 ■