OJED
OPEN JOURNALS IN EDUCATION

De/constructing the Academic Hood: Reflexive Considerations for Doctoral Researcher Socialization for International Research

Louise Michelle Vital
Lesley University, USA

Christina W. Yao
University of South Carolina, USA

ABSTRACT

Doctoral education is often lauded as a site of academic socialization and research training for nascent scholars. However, discussions of socialization seldom problematize the dangers of intellectual imperialism and methodological nationalism inherent in doctoral researcher socialization. As such, the traditional socialization practices for doctoral students in the United States (U.S.) must be interrogated and expanded to move towards equitable practices for research, especially for students conducting international research. Using social and spatial positioning as our conceptual framing, we problematize and question current approaches and practices to doctoral researcher training in the U.S. We use the academic hood, which is granted upon successful completion of doctoral studies, as a metaphor to reconsider how to reflect upon and navigate power dynamics and knowledge production within the U.S. academy.

Keywords: Doctoral education, socialization, research training, international research, social position, spatial position, intellectual imperialism, methodological nationalism

Doctoral education in the Minority World (i.e., First World, Western Countries, Global North) typically emphasizes a process of socialization in which nascent scholars become trained to conduct academic research and scholarship (Weidman & Stein, 2003). Early career researchers are socialized to wear what we describe as an academic hood; that is, a marker (both visible and invisible) that denotes membership

in an elite academic community that has a particular way of being, knowing, and disseminating knowledge, which is geo-political in nature (Mignolo, 2009). Mignolo (2009) explained that in the Minority World, "institutions are created that accomplish two functions: training of new (epistemic obedient) members and control of who enters and what knowledge-making is allowed, disavowed, devalued or celebrated" (p. 18). These new members begin their doctoral journeys as consumers of information, which is evidenced by course work that must reflect the language of instruction in academia. Later, as doctoral candidates, these students produce knowledge based on data they collect, analyze, and interpret within the constraints of their research training. In this sense, we understand that doctoral graduates are products of doctoral education and training. Although researchers may challenge accepted norms in their discipline as part of their research agenda, for the most part, doctoral students must demonstrate disciplinary alignment in order to successfully complete their degrees. This knowledge-making paradigm is predicated on a shared understanding between the users and producers of academic language and scholarship, which includes both the gatekeepers and the students wanting to gain entry. As a result, academic knowledge becomes a privileged domain, which is typically situated within the Minority World, and yet has permeated much of the globe through academic domination.

In moving towards equity in international higher education research and teaching, we choose to enact George Mwangi and Yao's (2020) call to de/construct terminology and concepts in an effort to move towards equity-driven international research. As such, we use the terms "Majority World" and "Minority World" to refer to countries and regions, as popularized by Alam (2008). Majority World countries are typically called the Global South, Third World, or Developing Countries that are low resourced yet are the majority of the world's population, natural resources, and land. Minority World refers to the Global North, First World, or Western Countries that are economically privileged and powerful yet represent only a small number of the world's people and resources. Although we acknowledge that a dichotomy still exists, we chose our terminology very carefully in an attempt to disrupt our commonly held assumptions. We acknowledge the many contributions and resources from the Majority World, and we seek to de-center the unequal power and oppression from the Minority World. In addition, we acknowledge that to a certain extent, the use of Majority/Minority World still contributes to a dichotomy and may serve as a mask (or hood) that conceals the imposition of European knowledge and perspectives that pervade the Majority World. Thus, when appropriate, we also name acts that are rooted in Eurocentricity throughout this paper as a way to clearly identify the pervasiveness of Eurocentric impacts as a result of colonization. As such, we seek to complicate commonly used terminology in academia, that is also embedded in doctoral researcher training, and that is greatly influenced by the effects of colonization and globalization.

Due to the increasingly globalized nature of knowledge production and academia, we argue a need to rend the academic hood to disrupt "western culture constantly reaffirm[ing] the West's view of itself as the center of legitimate knowledge" (Smith, 1999, p. 66). This is necessary as the academic enterprise is increasingly interconnected through the coexistence of the global, national, and local

– often termed as glonacal (Marginson & Rhoades, 2002). Because of the pervasiveness of both formal and informal transnational connections through academic conferences, publications, and partnerships, all researchers participate in scholarship that is situated within global contexts, which necessitates the examination of current practices in researcher preparation (Vital & Yao, 2018). As such, the traditional socialization practices for doctoral students in the United States (U.S.) must be interrogated and expanded to move towards equitable practices for research. Because of the pervasiveness of the academic hood and its potential for obfuscating dominant approaches, we problematize and question current approaches and practices for training doctoral students in the United States to conduct research in international contexts. We recognize that by focusing on doctoral education in the United States, we contribute to the assumed and enacted dominance of U.S. practices in higher education. Much of this dominance has been imposed upon and embraced by academics in the Majority World, including those who may have chosen to receive their academic training in the Minority World. To a certain extent, the academic hood exists both within the Majority and Minority World, and its Eurocentric foundations may be concealed within the Majority World. While we acknowledge that Eurocentric academic colonization is not unique to the Minority World, we do situate our particular article within the United States based on our positionalities as U.S.-trained and -based scholars.

In an attempt to interrogate doctoral student researcher training, we problematize the academic hood. We then draw from the concepts of social and spatial positioning to unpack the problem of the academic hood in research socialization and training. After, we turn a critical gaze on our own research preparation and how that informs our work in academia given our own positions as faculty of research instruction in graduate education. Lastly, we offer suggestions for moving towards de/constructing current approaches to doctoral researcher training by rending apart the threads that weave together to form the academic hood. We recognize that completely changing research processes is a lofty goal that is difficult to define, much less achieve within a short time period. Yet we argue that we must interrogate the intellectually imperial structures of doctoral researcher socialization and training and then reconstruct the fibers of the academic hood by weaving in critical and transformative paradigms and approaches. In doing so, we can move towards disrupting the norms of doctoral education and research training in the U.S. to engage in more equitable approaches to research.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMING: SOCIAL AND SPATIAL POSITIONING

We now turn to the disciplinary scholarship of sociologists on spatial thinking and analysis. When discussing space, Logan (2012) specifically emphasized location as being, "where things are or where they happen" (p. 1). Spatial thinking, or positioning, allows for the "relative locations of social phenomena, the causes of the locational pattern, and its consequences" (Logan, 2012, p. 3) and proximity of access underscores that "being closer is regarded as a positive attribute" (p. 6). When applying this concept to doctoral education, we understand that the legitimacy of

knowledge and knowledge production is situated in a particular spatial location, which is typically the Minority World. Those who are positioned in this space have increased proximity and access to the "legitimate" because they are in the center while those in contrasting positions, such as in the Majority World, are seemingly isolated (Logan et al., 2010) because they are in the periphery.

One's spatial position can be understood in context with one's social position. Social position describes "a person's place in social hierarchy" (Lindemann, 2007, p. 54). Social position influences individuals' social status within a given society and culture, with the most important position understood as central while others are deemed to be peripheral (Lindemann, 2007). Ultimately, a person's social status "is affected by the institutional system and cultural values" (Lindemann, 2007, p. 55) in which they are situated. With this understanding, we recognize that *how* we are perceived is subjective and is often informed by *where* we are located. Likewise, doctoral education that is situated in the Minority World has historically and inherently assumed a location at the center of knowledge production and has positioned its doctoral students as legitimate producers of that knowledge. This reality is observed in academia, including the fact that "mainstream highly ranked journals primarily publish research from dominant epistemological perspectives, thereby exerting subtle influences on the types of research that are encouraged" (Shahjahan & Wagner, 2019, p. 4). In this instance, it is often the Minority World represented with those in the Majority replicating their approaches to scholarship or left out of what is seen as prestigious work all together.

Torres-Olave and Lee's (2020) work underscores how individuals contend with spatial and social positioning in their international higher education research. This understanding has implications for graduate researcher socialization. Just as novice scholars are taught key concepts such as positionality and reflexivity in their research training, they must also be taught how our "subjectivities shift and evolve as our bodies move through time and space" (Torres-Olave & Lee, 2020, p. 4). Researchers have social identities within their home countries that shape their social positioning. Their change in spatial positioning as researchers who cross borders, however, may inform how the external world confers the international researcher a social position based on this new, local country context.

The academic hood is present for those engaged in academic mobility, and emerging researchers must understand that the wearer "belong[s] simultaneously to multiple social worlds and simultaneously play social roles at the local, national, and global levels" (Torres-Olave & Lee, 2020, p. 6). Researchers with dual identities must also negotiate their ever-changing social and spatial positioning in their international research activities. That is, many researchers may have identities or beliefs that are reflected in the cultural context in which they situate and conduct their research, including language, ethnic background, religion, and daily practices, which may give them some insider knowledge. Yet the researcher can also be positioned as an outsider because of the academic markers they possess.

DECONSTRUCTING THE FIBERS OF THE ACADEMIC HOOD

Given the process of doctoral researcher socialization, we raise a critical line of inquiry on the role and effect of the academic hood: what does the hood conceal? What does it call attention to? What does it make us impervious to? Here, we extend the metaphorical contextualization of the academic hood. For instance, a hood provides protection from inclement weather and ensures that those conditions do not affect the wearer. Likewise, the academic hood can serve as a barrier ensuring that alternate worldviews and epistemologies do not penetrate. The hood as a covering also conceals and within the sterile confines of academia, the academic hood often requires one's positionality to be likewise invisible. Conversely, the hood as a covering can bring attention to the hood wearer as the hood can also serve as a connotation of distinction. It is in this metaphor that the symbolic academic hood, which is often accompanied by tassels and other regalia. The academic hood sets the individual apart from the population with whom they are conducting research. We acknowledge that in this context, the academic hood at times conveys a "studying" of a population and that when not done ethically, it tends to objectify cultural "others." These conceptualizations of the academic hood have implications for doctoral researcher socialization for international research, which we discuss further below.

When considering the activities of higher education institutions, graduate education and doctoral research are important components of academia (McCulloch, 2018). Pifer and Baker (2016) described a 3-stage model for doctoral education as "knowledge consumption, knowledge creation, and knowledge enactment" (p. 16), indicating the importance of researcher preparation. Doctoral education includes learning the values and norms of academia. Additionally, the research produced by students not only enhances the reputation of their academic departments, but also advances the body of scholarship that underpins their related academic disciplines. As a result, multiple stakeholders are invested in the socialization and training of emerging researchers, with the intention of bestowing the academic hood as a symbol of membership into an elite intellectual space.

We argue that doctoral researcher socialization includes both internalized and externally imposed philosophies and motivations that affect international research (Vital & Yao, 2018). In that spirit, we first illuminate the process and practice of doctoral researcher training that is commonly used in the U.S. We then discuss the socialization aspects of doctoral education and problematize how socialization contributes to intellectual imperialism and methodological nationalism. In a sense, we use an ecological approach on the topics, starting with more localized factors (i.e., doctoral education, training) and then broaden to institutional pressures for socialization. We sum up the section with a global perspective of how doctoral researcher socialization may contribute to inequities in international research.

Doctoral Education and Research Training

Dating back to colleges in the colonial period, modern day academic regalia (i.e., gown, cap, tassel, cords, colors) in U.S. higher education reflects the academic institution, degree, and discipline of the graduate. At the doctoral level, the academic

hood represents the epitome of academic training. Metaphorically, visible markers of the academic hood refer to an individual's academic credentials that are automatically conferred upon being "hooded" at the completion of doctoral work. This metaphorical hood speaks to credentials that serve as a proxy, fully based on foundations and perspectives of the Minority World, that grants access to people, environments, and cultures as a part of research activity, all of which is bounded within a dominant national container (Shahjahan & Kezar, 2013). Simultaneously, the Minority World researcher who conducts research in the Majority World carries invisible markers as an outsider who enacts academic practices that may prove to be colonizing in nature, ultimately imposing Minority World ways of knowing that simultaneously "crowded out other epistemological and ontological possibilities" while naturalizing "dominant political and economic systems" (Stein, 2019, p. 144) in their research projects.

Social and spatial positioning influences the researcher's experience in all aspects of their research activities (Entwisle, 2007). With respect to academic scholarship, "epistemological implications assign southern knowledge to the status of 'data' for the use of northern 'theory'" (Ergin & Alkan, 2019, p. 259). The placement of the Minority World in the global academic community means that often, as researchers design research projects with the Majority World in mind, they determine what is most appropriate to their research activities while also deciding what of the data collected is worth being reported, which is undoubtedly shaped by their gaze on the studied population and how they interpret their observations. With regard to spatial inequality, groups in the Majority World often have unequal access or exposure to what is perceived as the center (Lobao et al., 2008), which in the context of this work refers to where academic knowledge and knowledge production is centered. In Minority to Majority world research projects, those who are members of the studied population often "do not have sufficient opportunities to improve their position in the stratification system, because generally they are not able to change their ascribed characteristics" (Lindemann, 2007, p. 65). Incorporating these understandings in researcher training is critical. It will help to ensure that doctoral students in U.S. graduate education who conduct internationally focused research projects adjust their research activities to lessen the potentially imperial nature of their intellectual pursuits.

Doctoral Student Academic Socialization

Weidman, Twale, and Stein's (2001) framework for graduate and professional student socialization discusses the characteristics of graduate students, their educational background, and their intrinsic motivation for professional success as factors in their academic socialization at the graduate level. An important component of the framework is the university environment, the academic and peer culture (Weidman & Stein, 2003), in which the graduate student is situated. In this context, the student experiences the three components of socialization: "interaction with others, integration into or sense of fit with the expectations of faculty and peers and learning of knowledge and skills necessary for effective professional practice" (Weidman & Stein, 2003, p. 643). From this framework we understand that academic socialization is a multi-pronged process that requires students to adopt behaviors and

practices that prepare them for academic discourse and entry into their desired academic discipline. The performative actions embedded in academic socialization reflect the academic hood; it signals to academic gatekeepers that said graduate student has demonstrated both the requisite academic preparation (knowledge and knowledge production capabilities) and disposition to enter the profession.

The notion of academic socialization, however, has been problematized when applied to traditionally underrepresented student groups in higher education. For instance, Mishra (2020) highlights a combination of social networks, social capital, and social support as strategic factors for success among underrepresented student groups in higher education. However, often these student groups experience discrimination and segregation in the collegiate environment. Without purposeful integration of this student group into the academy, the perceived benefits of academic socialization do not occur. González (2006) discussed academic socialization in his research on the experiences of Latina doctoral students in the U.S. He drew from the work of Freire (1970) to conceptualize academic socialization as the "imposition of the oppressor's choices over those of the oppressed for purposes of transforming the consciousness of the oppressed" (p. 348). This "imposition" speaks to the need to deconstruct the academic enterprise for both the student groups who experience minoritized status in the U.S. academy and for those whose research moves them from the Minority World to the Majority World.

Intellectual Imperialism and Methodological Nationalism

Intellectual imperialism as a result of academic socialization can occur as students move from places viewed as the "center" to conduct research in places considered to be in the "periphery" (Altbach, 2016). Intellectual imperialism is defined simply as the "domination of one people by another in their world of thinking" (Alatas, 2000, p. 24). Yet the simplicity of the definition belies the power of how pervasive and damaging intellectual imperialism can be on peoples, cultures, and places, particularly through education and research. Education and research are industries that enact, impose, and contribute to intellectual imperialism through both explicit and covert ways in contemporary practice (George Mwangi & Yao, 2020). Global pressures, specifically through globalization, exert forces that both explicitly and covertly enact imperialistic practices in research, including "both consensual and coercive interaction" (Rhee & Sagaria, 2004, p. 81).

Intellectual imperialism is rife in higher education, due to the privileging and dominance of Eurocentric knowledge, especially related to research, ideas, and practices. For example, Hereniko (2000) described the tensions of his Indigenous Rotuman upbringing with his educational training as a Minority World academic, emphasizing the Minority World privileging of written word over oral knowledges. He argued that the "written word encourages the view that there is but one truth, and this truth can be discovered through rigorous research" (p. 84-85). As a result, the Minority World ideation of truth becomes synonymous with rigor and validity, contributing to unequal power structures rooted in intellectual imperialism that permeates education and research training.

Intellectual imperialism is dangerous because it contributes to multiple harms, including methodological nationalism, which is a concept in which the observer of a phenomenon focuses only on the boundaries of one's nation-state (Chernilo, 2006; Shahjahan & Kezar, 2013). Methodological nationalism could lead to an imbalance of power, particularly as researchers engage with different cultural groups while utilizing epistemologies that may be based on their national origin. Mignolo (2007) cautioned against methodological nationalism, stating that "the question of racism and epistemology" (p. 1) is at stake when considering the geo-politics of knowledge, particularly in and out of the Minority World. Specifically, he illustrated his cautions with these examples:

> Once upon a time scholars assumed that if you 'come' from Latin America you have to 'talk about' Latin America; that in such a case you have to be a token of your culture. Such expectation will not arise if the author 'comes' from Germany, France, England or the US. As we know: the first world has knowledge, the third world has culture; Native Americans have wisdom, Anglo Americans have science. The need for political and epistemic de-linking here comes to the fore, as well as decolonializing and de-colonial knowledges, necessary steps for imagining and building democratic, just, and non-imperial/colonial societies. (Mignolo, 2009, p. 2)

These ideations of "truth" permeate much of the current doctoral socialization and training practices in the Minority World. In addition, Mignolo (2009) articulates a push for decolonizing knowledge, which is a lofty goal that sits in tension with Tuck and Yang's (2012) warning of care in using and conceptualizing decolonization. We do support Mignolo's (2009) push to imagine a decolonized practice; however, acknowledge that at this moment in time, we cannot fully realize a true decolonization although we should move towards this goal. In moving towards an anti-imperial approach to scholarship, doctoral students in the U.S. need to be intentional in their research designs and must understand how their academic hood influences the process and interactions with research populations in international contexts. Because traditional doctoral socialization practices may promote intellectual imperialism, it is imperative to interrogate how the academic hood can contribute to academic colonization of people, places, and practices when engaging in research. We discuss further the complexities of navigating the academic hood given one's social and spatial positioning and the power dynamics inherent in the international research process in our critical narratives below.

A CRITICAL REFLEXIVE GAZE ON OUR ACADEMIC HOODS

To better understand the implications of research training within doctoral education in the Minority World, we interrogated our own preparation to conduct research beyond our U.S.-bounded contexts. As children of immigrants to the U.S, we have been academically trained and socialized within the U.S. context that is rooted in Eurocentric foundations. However, our doctoral research provided us an opportunity

to conduct research with participants who shared an ethnic background with us: Haiti-based Haitian university students and Chinese international students in U.S. higher education. Our insider and outsider perspective during the research process allowed us to be reflexive about how we designed and interpreted our internationally focused research activities given our dual identities (Yao & Vital, 2018), which we will further remark upon in this space.

To make sense of how our dual identities influenced our research activities it was critical for us to consider the historical and contemporary connections between the U.S. and China and Haiti, which informs the conceptualization of our own dual-identities. Within the U.S. context, both China and Haiti are constructed as cultural 'others.' Yet, the two countries' spatial positionings are not the same. Fears of the 'Yellow Peril' emerged in the United States around the mid-nineteenth century in response to the increase in transnational employment and labor of individuals of East Asian descent, including those from China (Lee, 2007). This xenophobic sentiment influenced discrimination in legislation, policy, depictions in the media, and acts of violence against Chinese immigrants (McClain, 1984). Nearly 200 years later, China has risen to become a world economic power rivaling the United States and high-profile political tensions exist between China and the U.S. Despite this change in spatial positioning for China, the social positioning for those assumed to be of Chinese descent within the United States was once again met with xenophobic rhetoric from the U.S. administration with the emergence of COVID-19. This 'othering' mentality (Reny & Barret, 2020) coincided with COVID-19 being labeled as the "China virus" by the U.S. president, leading to discrimination and acts of violence against those perceived to be Chinese.

Haiti became the first Black republic to declare its independence in 1804 after a successful revolt by enslaved individuals. It is the second independent republic in the Americas, only behind the U.S. At the time of its independence, Haiti was considered the richest colony of the French empire. However, after successfully earning its independence, Haiti was not formally recognized as a republic by France until 1826 after   Haiti agreed to compensate French enslavers and colonizers for their economic losses following the revolution, which took Haiti until 1947 to complete. Haiti's shutout from the broader international community and the debt it incurred borrowing funds to pay France back for its freedom severely impacted its economy (Marquand, 2010). Haiti's history with the U.S. has long been troubled, due in part to the U.S. not recognizing Haiti as a free republic until 1862, occupying Haiti between 1915-1934, and being a looming presence in Haiti's political environment (Buschschluter, 2010). Additionally, Haiti's extreme poverty and political instability led to a rise in Haitian nationals immigrating to the U.S. since the 1970's given the proximity of the two countries. Haitian immigrants in the U.S. have experienced consistent xenophobic and racial discrimination, and most recently Haiti was alleged to have been referred to as a "shi*thole country" by the sitting U.S. president.

Undoubtedly, the racialized discourses on immigration and nationhood and the diplomatic relationships between the U.S. and our ancestral countries of origin has influenced our hyphen American social positioning in the U.S. and informed our spatial positioning as U.S. citizens with our international research participants. We recognize that identifying as Chinese American results in different meanings and

privileges than identifying as Haitian American and at the same time, being viewed as Americans with Chinese and Haitian origin brings on different assumptions of who we are in our international research activities. This understanding underscores the fluidity of our social and spatial positions as a result of the intersection of our identities while engaged in our international research endeavors (Torres-Olave & Lee, 2020). Despite our ethnic, linguistic, and cultural connections to our immigrant parent's home countries, our U.S. citizenship and native English proficiency set us apart from our international research participants. Those distinctions were salient and viewed as advantageous in our international research activities. Our social positions as daughters of U.S. immigrants shifted in contrast to the spatial positioning of our research participants and concurrently, we were re-positioned socially from insider to outsider statuses.

Engaging in this intersectional reflexivity (Jones, 2010) helps us to reveal the layers of nuance embedded in our identities, which is initially concealed by our academic hoods in research contexts. When discussing the tension caused by his conflicting and competing self-identities Jones (2010) explained that "engaging in intersectional reflexivity requires one to acknowledge one's intersecting identities, both marginalized and privileged, and then employ self-reflexivity, which moves one beyond self-reflection to the often, uncomfortable level of self-implication" (p. 122). It is with this in mind that we consider how we may have been complicit in the perpetuation of oppression in our own research just as we call for an examination and disruption of the status quo in doctoral education in the U.S. Conducting research on topics beyond our own lived experiences in academia presented a dichotomy in our research approach such that we were both the colonized and the colonizer. In our reflexive writing below we examine our experiences as children of U.S. immigrants, how that identity was reflected in our doctoral research experiences, and how our researcher preparation and doctoral research experiences inform our current roles as graduate research faculty.

Louise Michelle Vital

I am a daughter of Haitian immigrants to the United States (U.S.) and identify as Haitian-American. My formative years were shaped by both the political realities in Haiti and the hostile social climate towards Haitians in the U.S. During this time period, in the 1980's, I recall my second-grade teacher announcing to my class that the Duvalier dictator regime had ended and what that meant for the Haitian students in my school. In retrospect, it was clearly a meaningful moment for me to be seen and for my family's circumstances to be understood by my teacher as it is one of the few memories I have from my childhood academic experiences. I remember that Haitians were referred to as "boat people" and being surprised to learn from my mother that she had, in fact, taken a plane to arrive to the United States. I also remember the rise of the HIV/AIDS crisis and what I understand now to be the xenophobic responses to that pandemic. Then, I was hearing that "Haitians had AIDS" and later learned the contextual backdrop to those statements: Haitians were part of the 4H club, also comprised of hemophiliacs, heroin users, and homosexuals because the U.S. Centers for Disease Control labeled these four groups as risk factors for contracting

HIV/AIDs. This labeling of an entire ethnic group further stigmatized my hyphenated identity. I share these moments to convey that I had a strong cultural connection to my parent's country of birth, which was strengthened by my parents' teachings of Haiti and Haitian history, attending a Haitian church, being a member of Haitian youth groups, and having been raised in a community with a large Haitian immigrant presence. Growing up I felt American because I was born in the U.S., but I also felt an otherness because of my Haitian identity despite never having visited Haiti until I was a doctoral student.

Soon after entering my doctoral program, I decided to focus my dissertation research on the Haitian higher education system. It was an opportunity to bring together my personal interest in Haiti and my research training on a topic that would allow me to share a narrative that was counter to the pervasive, deficit stories I had consumed about the country. Because of my Haitian-American identity and *Kreyòl Ayisyen* language proficiency I felt confident to immerse myself in Haiti for a month to learn from higher education stakeholders there. I did not, however, fully take into account that I was a doctoral student researcher who was born, raised, and entirely academically trained in the U.S. I also did not fully consider that I was a U.S. based scholar who was conducting research on the Haitian higher education system despite never having, myself, been a student or educator in a Haiti context. On my second day in Haiti I was quickly reminded of my social positioning that was switched because of my new spatial position. During a meeting with Haitian university students, I proudly exclaimed in *Kreyol* that I was happy to be in Haiti with fellow Haitians. While looking at the few skeptical faces that faced me a student asked me in English, "Madame Vital, you were born in America, right?" After responding, "yes" the student followed with, "then what makes you Haitian?" This short exchange, thankfully early on in my research activities, was a necessary reminder of the imperial assumptions that are often made in transnational research activities. I believed my ethnic "insider identity" provided a lens for understanding the Haitian educational experiences in Haiti, yet I was reminded that my "outsider identity" actually obstructed my lens and perhaps served as a barrier for my research participants. I completely missed the nuance of how my American identity, and all that it entailed, was perceived by my Haiti-based, Haitian research participants and how that reality would shape my research experiences.

Now, as a professor who teaches a research course in an internationally focused graduate program, I am intentional about incorporating material and discussion on positionality, critical reflexivity, representation, and power dynamics in research contexts. I ask my students to consider cultural contexts at each step of their research design and to anticipate, to the extent possible, when cultural rubs may occur. My students spend time reflecting on the potential for ethical dilemmas and how they plan for it given their epistemological, ontological, and axiological stances and worldviews. The course concludes with students developing a scholar-practitioner statement that is reflexive of all they have learned in the course and how that learning will inform their future professional practice.

Christina W. Yao

I identify as a daughter of immigrants who grew up in colonial Hong Kong during the British occupation. Born in the Deep South, it took me many years to come to an understanding of who I was and how I fit into the world. As an Asian American woman, I committed to addressing issues of diversity and inclusion during my collegiate years. When choosing a doctoral program, I made my choice based on the opportunities for research engagement and international study tours. For my dissertation, I was inspired by the experiences of my mother (an international student from Hong Kong to the U.S.) and chose to examine the transition experiences of Chinese international students, leading me to engage in transnational dimensions of educational research.

During my doctoral coursework, I felt very confident that I was well prepared to engage in independent research. However, I soon found myself navigating new territory in regard to language, academic jargon, and participant engagement. I became painfully aware of my social positioning when a participant said to me, "you have the best situation-- you look Chinese but speak perfect English" when sharing her difficult experiences in college as a result of her English language skills. It was at this moment that I realized my status as a native English speaker allowed for both opportunity and limitations within my spatial positioning in this research study.

This was an awareness that I carried with me after graduation when I did field work in Vietnam. As someone who cannot read or speak Vietnamese, I assumed that I would continually feel like an outsider and have to scramble to establish trust and access to participants. However, I quickly realized that my title of Assistant Professor gave me more social positioning that I had ever experienced on my own campus. Because of the Ph.D. behind my name, I was able to gain access to participants who were eager to "practice speaking American English" with me and who greatly respected my doctorate. It was during my first trip to Vietnam post-graduation that I realized the power that my academic hood gave to me. Over the years, I have engaged in reflexive practice in my own research work as well as expounding upon the need for reflection when teaching research methods to doctoral students. I struggle internally with how to engage in equitable research practices while trying to meet the demands of a neoliberal academy that prioritizes publications and grants, which makes me feel like I need to rush through processes. I know that although I am committed to anti/decolonial research practices, I am also complicit in reifying academic colonization in the teaching that I do.

Our Collective Gaze Towards Doctoral Researcher Socialization

Our examination of spatial and social positioning brings us full circle to critical deliberations of how our doctoral researcher training stayed with us currently as faculty members. The social context of our positionalities in a U.S. context brings to mind our minoritized identities yet our academic training provides us with a certain privilege. While interrogating our preparation for international research, we also implicate ourselves in our reflexivity. How might we have advanced intellectual

imperialism in our internationally focused research and how might we uphold those ideals in our work as scholars and educators who now train graduate students?

As described in our narratives, we were guilty of being bound by the dominant U.S.-focused "national container" (Shahjahan & Kezar, 2013) within which we received our research training. We both wore our academic hoods proudly when we first started our interviews and interactions with participants, and yet, we did not even realize that our academic hoods were so prevalent and imposing. However, after a short time, we both realized the metaphoric academic hoods that we wore throughout our doctoral education allowed for unequal relationships with our studies' participants and contexts. As current faculty who teach graduate-level research courses, we have come to realize that in practicing traditional researcher socialization and training, we reify the intellectual imperialism and methodological nationalism inherent in doctoral education in the U.S. It is from this perspective that we question doctoral researcher preparation for conducting research in international contexts.

We do want to acknowledge that we chose to move away from promoting decolonization of doctoral researcher training because we ascribe to Tuck and Yang's (2012) assertion that "decolonization is not a metaphor" (p.1) and full decolonization requires a repatriation of Indigenous lands, ideas, and lives. We situate our study within the concepts of social and spatial positioning as a way to deconstruct, analyze, and reconstruct the academic hood, yet we recognize that we are fully complicit in enacting colonial habits through our teaching and training of junior scholars. Thus, as subjects and participants of the Minority World, we realize that we cannot fully imagine a decolonized doctoral researcher socialization because we are entrenched in the colonial mind state. However, although we cannot fully realize a decolonized doctoral education as colonized academics, we are committed to working towards the goal of true decolonization.

RECONSTRUCTING THE ACADEMIC HOOD: FUTURE DIRECTIONS FOR DOCTORAL RESEARCHER SOCIALIZATION

The relationship between researchers in the Minority World and research sites in the Majority World is fraught with tensions of power and coloniality within an unequal playing field (George Mwangi, 2017). Nascent researchers should be taught how to interrogate the historical legacy of imperialism that is foundational to the contemporary phenomenon of methodological nationalism through research socialization. We argue that it is the responsibility of doctoral education and research faculty to take shears to the academic hood and re-mend it as a new metaphorical marker that takes into account the imperialistic nature of academia in the Minority World. We wrestle with the depth to which this can occur. Below, we discuss implications for practice, research, and theory in response to the points we raised as opportunities for discussion.

Implications for Practice

Faculty are entrenched in academia and the academic hood is ever present. As such, it is important that faculty are critically reflexive about their pedagogical

approaches in their training of doctoral students and consider the tensions that exist in their roles. For us, we had to reconcile the epiphanies we experienced that suggested that we might be both the oppressor and the oppressed (Freire, 1970) during our research activities. Presently, we strive to deconstruct our own doctoral training as scholars and current research faculty. Though we believe in the importance of this deconstruction process in theory, in practice, it is a dynamic process. We respond to shifting dynamics in the world with the understanding that ultimately, we are situated in the Minority World and that we inherently will bring that privilege into our internationally focused research projects.

From our critical reflexive stances we question, are we teaching to transgress (hooks, 1994) and more importantly, do we *want* to? Just as we prepare our Minority World-centered doctoral students for all aspects of their internationally focused research activities (e.g., design, implementation, post), we must also incorporate discussion on the oppression that is embedded in their research pursuits, namely intellectual imperialism and methodological nationalism. This is especially important as our individual classes are a microcosm of the larger institution. Although we may draw from concepts of social and spatial positioning to help our students understand their roles and responsibilities as researchers in international contexts, we know they also take courses with colleagues in our institutions who may not have similar dispositions. Despite tenets of social justice ideals becoming an increasing part of the academic lexicon, there is not always faculty commitments to a social justice focus in individual classes that reflect the social justice norms on the institutional level.

Although there may be disconnects between institutional level missions and individual courses taught, changes can be made at the program and department level to align courses with the realities of our increasingly globalized academic community. Adopting concepts like social and spatial positioning enhances research instruction. Likewise, infusing material and discussion on Minority and Majority World orientations and the resulting implications across programs of study strengthen comprehension on intellectual imperialism and methodological nationalism. Without this diffusion of ideas and framing, students may reject that these concepts are essential to their scholarship and practice. Thus, programmatic and department-level conversations must occur to determine if the changes we suggest to doctoral education, researcher training, indeed doctoral student academic socialization, are an ideal and priority.

Implications for Theory and Future Research

We offer several suggestions for expanding current theories and future research related to doctoral student research socialization and training. First, we recommend that the idea of socialization must be questioned in order to move towards more equitable approaches to doctoral training. The concept of socialization tends to be situated within neutral ideas and practices that appear to be relevant to the demands and expectations of academia. However, we argue that socialization cannot be neutral because it is conducted within an environment that is rife with unequal power dynamics, specifically in regard to race, gender, and citizenship. Thus, we must reconsider and reconceptualize how we train doctoral students and why we choose to

enact certain practices that we know may be harmful to some individuals. Perhaps there needs to be a shift in terminology away from socialization, which we know can be problematic, to other words such as training, preparation, and coaching.

We drew from the sociology scholarship to examine social and spatial positioning in researcher training. Although these concepts are applicable to a variety of disciplines, they have only been framed in a small number of academic domains. We suggest that these concepts be further theorized alongside a variety of academic orientations. Examination and analysis of these ideas will reveal the appropriateness of these notions in a variety of scholarly areas.

One area for future research includes an empirical review of current doctoral research socialization practices. Possible studies could include interviewing academic advisors and faculty to gain a better understanding of what and how doctoral students are socialized to conduct international research. Although some current studies exist on international research training from the student perspective (e.g., Vital & Yao, 2018; Yao & Vital, 2016, 2018), we know that true reform of doctoral training requires insights from advisors and faculty who enact the socialization processes. Additionally, scholarship on the topic can examine the implications of academic knowledge that is centered on the worldviews embedded in knowledge that is produced in the Minority World. Likewise, future research can examine the implications of centering or unveiling the academic knowledge and practice of the Majority World as influenced by the Minority World.

An additional area for research includes expanding the study in multiple ways. First, we represent a limited view from the perspective of two U.S.-born and U.S.-trained academics. We recommend that a study can be conducted to gain the perspectives of international students studying in U.S. doctoral programs to get a sense of their transition and experiences within the U.S. context. Another option would be to expand the study to different disciplines. For example, how do doctoral students in agriculture get socialized to do international research? Or archaeology and anthropology students who often do fieldwork around the world?

Finally, although this work was centered on doctoral education, we recognize that doctoral students experience academic socialization in locations outside of the ivory tower. For instance, scholarly and professional organizations also serve as sites of socialization. Further, students who incorporate global dimensions in their doctoral education may have encounters with transnational entities such as the United Nations, World Bank, and the Fulbright Scholarship Program. The work of some of these institutional types have been problematized by scholars and have been implicated by their membership and in self-evaluations as sites of oppression. Given the power dynamics that are inherent in these organizations, and how they inform doctoral student research experiences requires, a deeper analysis of their work is warranted.

CONCLUSION

In our examination of doctoral education, we problematized the academic hood and its implications for research training, student academic socialization, intellectual imperialism, and methodological nationalism. However, as research faculty, we continue to navigate the gray area between our espoused ideals and the realities of

academia in the Minority World. We, too, are complicit in advancing academic norms. Individual faculty may choose to completely disregard academic norms in their teaching; however, we work in rigid structures of academia, which presents opportunities and limitations. We recognize that we cannot teach our students to completely reject academic norms because our doctoral students are entering scholarly spaces with expected ways of knowing and being that assume that doctoral graduates have received the required socialization to be permitted access. As such, we are not simply advocating for a rejection of traditional doctoral researcher socialization. But rather, we are suggesting deeper dimensions of researcher training and academic socialization that incorporate the realities and implications of the power dynamics embedded in the Majority World/Minority World dichotomy.

REFERENCES

Alam, S. (2008). Majority world: Challenging the West's rhetoric of democracy. *Amerasia Journal, 34(1*), 87-98.

Altbach, P. G. (2016). *Global perspectives on higher education*. JHU Press.

Alatas, S. H. (2000). Intellectual imperialism: Definition, traits, and problems. *Asian Journal of Social Science, 28*(1), 23-45.

Buschschluter, V. (2010, January 16). The long history of troubled ties between Haiti and the US. *BBC*. http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/8460185.stm

Chernilo, D. (2006). Social theory's methodological nationalism: Myth and reality. *European Journal of Social Theory*, *9*(1), 5-22.

Crenshaw, K. (1990). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *The Standford Law Review, 43*, 1241-1299.

Dillard, C. (2019). On intersectionality and allyship. *Teaching Tolerance*. https://www.tolerance.org/magazine/on-intersectionality-and-allyship

Entwisle, B. (2007). Putting people into place. *Demography, 44*(4), 687-703.

Ergin, M., & Alkan, A. (2019). Academic neo-colonialism in writing practices: Geographic markers in three journals from Japan, Turkey and the US. *Geoforum, 104*, 259-266.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Continuum Publishing

George Mwangi, C. A. (2017). Partner positioning: Examining international higher education partnerships through a mutuality lens. *Review of Higher Education, 41*(1), 33-60.

George Mwangi, C.A., & Yao, C.W. (2020). U.S. higher education internationalization through an equity driven lens: An analysis of concepts, history, and research. In M. B. Paulsen & L. W. Perna (Eds) *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research* (Vol. 35). Springer.

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

Hereniko, V. (2000). Indigenous knowledge and academic imperialism. In R. Borofsky's (Ed.), *Remembrance of Pacific pasts: An invitation to remake history* (pp. 78-91). University of Hawaii Press.

hooks, b. (2014). *Teaching to transgress*. Routledge.

Jones, R. G. (2010). Putting privilege into practice through "intersectional reflexivity:" Ruminations, interventions, and possibilities. *Reflections: Narratives of Professional Helping*, 122-125.

Lee, E. (2007). The "Yellow Peril" and Asian exclusion in the Americas. *Pacific Historical Review, 76*(4), 537-562.

Lindemann, K. (2007). The impact of objective characteristics on subjective social position. *Trames, 11*(1), 54-68.

Lobao, L. M., Hooks, G., & Tickamyer, A. R. (2008). Poverty and inequality across space: Sociological reflections on the missing-middle subnational scale. *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society, 1*(1), 89-113.

Logan, J. R. (2012). Making a place for space: Spatial thinking in social science. *Annual Review of Sociology, 38*, 507-524.

Marginson, S., & Rhoades, G. (2002). Beyond national states, markets, and systems of higher education: A glonacal agency heuristic. *Higher Education, 43*(3), 281-309.

Marquand (2010, August 17). France dismisses petition for it to pay $17 billion in Haiti reparations. *The Christian Science Monitor*. https://www.csmonitor.com/World/Europe/2010/0817/France-dismisses-petition-for-it-to-pay-17-billion-in-Haiti-reparations

McClain Jr, C. J. (1984). The Chinese struggle for civil rights in Nineteenth Century America: The first phase, 1850-1870. *California Law Review, 72*, 529-568.

McCulloch, A. (2018). The disciplinary status of doctoral education. *Higher Education Review, 50*(2) 86-104.

Mignolo, W. D. (2009). Epistemic disobedience, independent thought and decolonial freedom. *Theory, Culture & Society, 26*(7-8), 159-181.

Mishra, S. (2020). Social networks, social capital, social support and academic success in higher education: A systematic review with a special focus on 'underrepresented' students. *Educational Research Review, 29,* 1-24.

Pifer, M. J., & Baker, V. L. (2016). Stage-based challenges and strategies for support in doctoral education: A practical guide for students, faculty members, and program administrators. *International Journal of Doctoral Studies, 11*(1), 15-34.

Reny, T. T., & Barreto, M. A. (2020). Xenophobia in the time of pandemic: Othering, anti-Asian attitudes, and COVID-19. *Politics, Groups, and Identities*, 1-24.

Rhee, J. E., & Sagaria, M. A. D. (2004). International students: Constructions of imperialism in the Chronicle of Higher Education. *The Review of Higher Education*, *28*(1), 77-96.

Shahjahan, R. A. & Kezar, A. J. (2013). Beyond the "national container": Addressing methodological nationalism in higher education research. *Educational Researcher 42*(1), 20-29.

Shahjahan, R. A., & Wagner, A. E. (2019). Unpacking ontological security: A decolonial reading of scholarly impact. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 51*(8), 779-791.

Shin, J. C., Kehm, B. M., & Jones, G. A. (2018). The increasing importance, growth, and evolution of doctoral education. *In Doctoral education for the knowledge society* (pp. 1-10). Springer.

Smith, L.T. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples.* Zed Books.

Stein, S. (2019). Beyond higher education as we know it: Gesturing towards decolonial horizons of possibility. *Studies in Philosophy and Education, 38*(2), 143-161.

Torres-Olave, B., & Lee, J. J. (2020). Shifting positionalities across international locations: Embodied knowledge, time-geography, and the polyvalence of privilege. *Higher Education Quarterly, 74*(2), 136-148.

Tuck, E., & Yang, K. W. (2012). Decolonization is not a metaphor. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society, 1*(1) 1-40.

Weidman, J. C., & Stein, E. L. (2003). Socialization of doctoral students to academic norms. *Research in Higher Education, 44*(6), 641-656.

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

Vital, L. M. & Yao, C. W. (2018). Future directions for internationalization in higher education: Ecological considerations for doctoral research training. In D. Proctor & L. E. Rumbley (Eds.), *The future agenda for internationalization in higher education: Next generation insights into research, policy, and practice.* Routledge.

Yao, C. W. & Vital, L. M. (2016). "I don't think I'm prepared": Perceptions of U.S. higher education doctoral students on international research preparation. *Journal for the Study of Postsecondary and Tertiary Education, I,* 197-214.

Yao, C. W., & Vital, L. M. (2018). Reflexivity in international contexts: Implications for U.S. doctoral students' international research preparation. *International Journal of Doctoral Studies, 13,* 193-210.

LOUISE MICHELLE VITAL, Ph.D., is an Assistant Professor of International Higher Education at Lesley University. Her primary line of inquiry is related to the global dimensions of higher education and her research centers on a regional focus on Haiti, international perspectives of education practice, and student experiences in higher education. Email: louisemichellevital@gmail.com
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6305-7088

CHRISTINA W. YAO, Ph.D. is an Assistant Professor of Higher Education and Program Coordinator for the Higher Education and Student Affairs Master's program at the University of South Carolina. She is a qualitative researcher who primarily studies student engagement and learning in higher education. She operationalizes her research focus through three connected topical areas, including: international student mobility, scholar-practitioner preparation, and transnational education. Email: cy9@mailbox.sc.edu
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7572-0318