Bait and Switch: Representation, Climate, and Tensions of Diversity Work in Graduate Education

Kelly E. Slay, Kimberly A. Reyes, Julie R. Posselt

Bait and Switch: Representation, Climate, and Tensions of Diversity Work in Graduate Education

Kelly E. Slay, Kimberly A. Reyes, and Julie R. Posselt

Abstract: We present findings from a case study of a psychology department that has graduated a significantly higher share of underrepresented doctoral students than national averages for its discipline. Using the campus racial climate framework, we found that organizational/structural diversity initiatives (recruitment and admissions practices), presented a positive image of

Kelly Slay is a President's Postdoctoral Fellow and Faculty Affiliate of the Center for Diversity and Inclusion in Higher Education at the University of Maryland – College Park. Her interdisciplinary program of research focuses on issues of access, diversity and equity in higher education, particularly in STEM and post-affirmative action contexts. She received her PhD in Higher Education from the University of Michigan in 2017.

Kimberly Reyes is Diversity & Inclusion Adviser at the RMIT University in Melbourne, Australia. As part of the Student Wellbeing & Inclusion unit, Kimberly designs and delivers interventions aimed at supporting university students from low socioeconomic status backgrounds. Kimberly received her MA in Higher Education at the University of Michigan in 2012, and has co-authored a range of publications investigating campus diversity efforts across undergraduate and graduate education.

Julie Posselt is Associate Professor of Education at the University of Southern California. She investigates institutionalized inequalities in graduate education and academic disciplines, working in research-practice partnerships aimed at rethinking the norms and practices by which doctoral students are admitted and educated. She received her PhD from the University of Michigan in 2013 and was a 2015 National Academy of Education/ Spencer Foundation postdoctoral fellow.

the department's commitment to diversity to prospective students that diverged considerably from the climate and mentoring relationships students experienced once they matriculated. We compared this to a "bait and switch" phenomenon and considered the consequences for students' success and wellbeing, as well as the ability to sustain diverse student enrollment.

As more and more postsecondary institutions develop plans and invest resources to reduce racial/ethnic inequities in who enrolls and graduates (McMurtrie, 2016), it is critical for leaders to anticipate tensions that can arise. For example, colleges and universities increasingly find themselves caught between pressure to take action against racial inequities and legal mandates that limit their options for doing so (Berrey, 2015; Garces, 2014). Another tension concerns the tendency for diversity efforts focused on postsecondary access (e.g., recruitment, admission) to be decoupled from those focused on wellbeing and academic success (e.g., mentoring and support). Milem, Chang, and antonio (2005) observed that when institutions focus on the numbers of students of color who enroll, they "have a tendency to focus on diversity as an end in itself, rather than as an educational *process* that—when properly implemented—has the potential to enhance many important educational outcomes" (p. 16). A third tension concerns diversity work as organizational change: "How people experience change," of any sort can diverge "from how it might have been intended," (Fullan, 1982, as cited in Henstrand, 2006, p. 4) and this disconnect has undermined many social reforms.

To provide a window into tensions like these, we used in-depth case study methods to examine a multifaceted diversity initiative in the psychology department of a prominent research university. This department lends insight into navigating the practical tensions that emerge in equity work because of the depth of its leaders' efforts and because three educational contexts the department represents—STEM disciplines, doctoral education, and selective universities—manifest some of the deepest inequities in higher education today. For example, Black, Latino, Native American, and Southeast Asian students comprise nearly a third of the U.S. residential population, but received only 7.3% of STEM doctorates awarded in 2012 (NSF, 2015; Leslie, 2015). Given the barriers posed by common graduate admissions practices (Miller & Stassun, 2014; Posselt, 2014, 2016), the lower doctoral completion rates of students from underrepresented backgrounds (Sowell, Allum, & Okahana, 2015), and urgent calls to improve diversity in the professoriate (Griffin, Muñiz, & Espinosa, 2012; Smith, 2015), educators are increasingly extending diversity initiatives to graduate education. Our goals are, therefore, twofold: to contribute to theory and literature about equity work in graduate education and STEM generally, and to provide guidance to practitioners through the cautionary tale emerging from this program.

As described in the methodology below, we identified this department for research because, after instituting a series of diversity-focused efforts, it has

enrolled and graduated a significantly higher share of graduate students of color than the national average in psychology. In examining what the department did to achieve these outcomes, we also discovered stark differences between student and faculty perceptions about the department's climate for diversity and its reasons for success enrolling students of color. To understand how individuals in the same organizational setting might see it so differently from one another, we analyzed faculty and student views using the multiple dimensions of climate in the Milem et al. (2005) framework. Our study is anchored by the following research questions:

1. How do faculty and graduate students experience department-level diversity initiatives? How do they experience the department's racial climate?
2. How do students of color in high-diversity PhD programs experience faculty-student mentoring and peer-to-peer relationships?
3. How do distinct dimensions of racial climate (Milem et al., 2005) relate to one another? In particular, how do organizational/structural diversity initiatives and compositional diversity affect the psychological and behavioral dimensions of climate?

We concluded that successful efforts to enhance structural diversity (i.e., to change the composition of the student body, may not touch the quality of everyday interactions and relationships that are so important to the wellbeing and progress of graduate students. Our analysis, therefore, supports Tienda's (2013) conclusion about undergraduate education: "Diversity≠ Inclusion" (p. 467). Both faculty and students perceived the department's diversity initiatives to be positive developments that helped recruit a diverse group of graduate students to the department. However, those same students' experiences within the department once enrolled, especially the quality of their relationships with faculty, signaled that structural diversity efforts may not be enough to sustain that diversity over time. Additional efforts are needed to permeate across the dimensions of climate that shape student wellbeing, cross-racial engagement, and their willingness to endorse the program when speaking with prospective students of color.

RECRUITMENT FOR DIVERSITY IN GRADUATE EDUCATION

Increasing racial diversity in the graduate student population is a challenge that faces many departments, particularly those in STEM. The first generation of research on diversity in higher education in the 1960's emphasized its moral and equity basis, such as the need to reduce inequality in the labor market and achieve representation that resembles the broader population. However, when the US Supreme Court ruled in 1978 that remediating the "present effects of past injustice" was unconstitutional as a basis for affirmative action and argued instead for the educational benefits of diversity,

diversity—not equity—quickly dominated the focus of social science research on race in higher education. From cognitive complexity and critical thinking, to civic engagement and degree completion, scholars found that diverse learning environments confer educational, civic, and other developmental benefits to students (e.g., Chang, 1999; Gurin, Dey, Hurtado, & Gurin, 2002; Hurtado, 2007).

Importantly for the case for diversity in graduate education, evidence from a variety of disciplinary perspectives reveal diversity has specific benefits for research quality. Page (2008), a scholar of complex systems, found that heterogeneous groups of novices tend to outperform homogenous groups of experts in tasks requiring problem solving and/or creativity. After analyzing 1.5 million published papers, economists Freeman and Huang (2014) found that papers in which the author list included (what appeared to be) ethnically diverse names were cited more often. However, innovation benefits of diversity appeared only when all members of a group affirmed the value of the diversity with which they are working (Ely & Thomas, 2001).

Today, higher education institutions seek to present themselves as diverse (Marichal, 2009), in part as a selling point when recruiting white students (Berrey, 2015). Diversity also helps attract underrepresented students of color, whose decision-making tends to place greater importance than whites on institutional commitment to diversity (Avery & McKay, 2006; Bersola, Stolzenberg, Love, & Fosnacht, 2014; Kim & Gelfand, 2003; Slay, 2017). However, in one study, faculty at a major university held inaccurate assumptions about what students of color valued in a doctoral program (Bersola et al., 2014). In an audit study of graduate programs in a wide range of universities, Milkman, Akinola, and Chugh (2015) obtained evidence that professors, especially in private universities, responded less frequently to email inquiries from prospective students whose names suggested they were women and/or from underrepresented backgrounds. The same professors took longer to respond to such students when they did reply.

Such research implies that organizational change for diversity in graduate education demands going beyond appearances and rhetoric. Organizational change requires sensitivity to the ways that diversity is encouraged (or not) in everyday practices and professors' mindsets (Harper, 2015; Harper & Hurtado, 2007). For example, Rogers and Molina's (2006) mixed methods study of "exemplary" minority student recruitment and retention practices identified several strategies that were common among psychology doctoral programs that successfully retained students of color, including: personal contact with prospective students, generous financial aid, a critical mass of faculty and students of color, and a diversity focus in the curriculum. Such graduate recruitment initiatives and strategies require "support, action, and funding from institutional leaders, faculty, staff, and students to be successful" (Griffin & Muñiz, 2011, p. 60). In practice, multifaceted diversity efforts

involving multiple constituencies can be challenging. Faculty, in particular, may see equity efforts as unrelated to the obligations associated with their role because they must navigate a promotion and tenure structure that rarely values diversity-related work and may be bound by biases that undermine their best intentions (Chang, 2000; Griffin & Muñiz, 2011; Posselt, 2016; Tierney & Bensimon, 1996).

Changing the images of universities, departments, and graduate programs, in short, is a different task than changing their faculty members' mindsets and practices. However, research to date has not examined how these two distinctive processes may play out or be perceived within the same organizational context. What is clear from the literature is that effective recruitment efforts are multifaceted, and that more and more postsecondary institutions send messages about what they prioritize or aspire to be through language and imagery of racially/ ethnically diverse students in promotional materials (Osei-Kofi, Torres, & Liu, 2013) and through targeted diversity initiatives (Hartley & Morphew, 2008; Klassen, 2001; Slay, 2017). Such cues may affect prospective doctoral students' application and matriculation decisions by priming expectations about the experiences and faculty-student relationships they are likely to have.

FACULTY-GRADUATE STUDENT RELATIONSHIPS

One-on-one faculty-student relationships are critical in graduate students' completing degrees, winning research grants and fellowships, and pursuing academic careers (Belcher, 1994; Griffin et al., 2012; Hill, Castillo, Ngu, & Pepion, 1999; Kelly & Schweitzer, 1999). Ideally, the faculty-student advising relationship includes mentoring, defined as a "dynamic process" (Davidson & Foster-Johnson, 2001, p. 551) that provides students with both psychosocial (i.e. personal/emotional) and career-related support (Girves, Zepeda, & Gwathmey, 2005; Thomas, Willis, & Davis, 2007). However, the quality of mentorship provided to graduate students can vary widely across departments, disciplines, and social demographics (Noy & Ray, 2012).

Underrepresented graduate students of color experience particular difficulty finding faculty mentors who are capable of and willing to provide the scaffolding necessary for scholarly development and/or navigating "alienating aspects of their graduate school's racial environment" (Hurtado, 1994, p. 331; Nettles, 1990; Noy & Ray, 2012; Thomas et al., 2007). Same-race mentoring relationships are often more desirable to students of color as they help alleviate problems presented by cultural differences, but it can result in an undue burden on faculty of color (Davidson & Foster-Johnson, 2001; Thomas et al., 2007; Tierney & Bensimon, 1996). Peer mentors can be an alternative source of positive psychosocial support, but these relationships do not substitute for the career-related advice and sponsorship that faculty mentors can offer

(Brill, Balcanoff, Land, Gogarty, & Turner, 2014; Girves et al., 2005; Holley & Caldwell, 2012; Thomas et al., 2007; Waddell-Terry, 2014). Indeed, the absence of strong mentoring relationships can contribute to graduate students of color doubting their belonging and/or academic abilities (Gildersleeve, Croom, & Vasquez, 2011; Hurtado, 1994), especially if they are expected to cultivate strong personal connections with their faculty advisors (Curtin, Stewart, & Ostrove, 2013; Griffin, 2013; Guiffrida, 2005; Posselt, 2018). In-depth analyses of the ties between formal diversity initiatives and everyday faculty-student relationships could, therefore, strengthen our understanding of equity and diversity in graduate contexts.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Our conceptual framework focuses on organizational climate, especially as it is applied to higher education contexts. In early studies, scholars defined organizational climate as encompassing both objective conditions and subjective interpretations of organizational characteristics (Denison, 1996), and as having multiple dimensions (Litwin & Stringer, 1968). Continuing this tradition of multidimensionality, the seminal campus climate framework developed by Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pedersen, and Allen (1998) depicted four interrelated dimensions: structural diversity, historical legacy of inclusion and exclusion, psychological, and behavioral. In 2005, Milem, Chang, and antonio extended this framework by adding an organizational/structural dimension and renaming structural diversity as compositional diversity.

In brief, compositional diversity describes the numerical representation of various racial and ethnic groups in both undergraduate and graduate student enrollment, as well as faculty and staff (Milem et al., 2005). Institutional histories of inclusion or exclusion can pattern members' behaviors and attitudes toward underrepresented groups, which have serious implications for their wellbeing, belonging, and persistence (Hurtado et al., 1998; Milem et al., 2005). The psychological climate is perceptual, and includes "individuals' views of group relations, institutional responses to diversity, perceptions of discrimination or racial conflict, and attitudes held toward others from different racial/ethnic backgrounds" (Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pedersen, & Allen, 1999, p. 25). The behavioral dimension captures the quality of intra- and inter-group interactions and relationships between individuals from different racial and ethnic backgrounds (peer-to-peer, faculty-student, etc.) as well as pedagogical approaches. Finally, the organizational/structural dimension highlights implications for racial and ethnic diversity inherent in organizational and structural processes such as admissions, hiring, and budgeting.

Campus racial climate (CRC) has since been widely studied and measured at the undergraduate level (Harper & Hurtado, 2007; Hurtado, Griffin, Arel-

lano, & Cuellar, 2008), where it bears relationships with various academic, behavioral, and social outcomes (antonio, 2004; Chang, 1999; Gurin et al., 2002; Milem et al., 2005; Park, 2013; Strayhorn, 2013). Relative to other dimensions, scholars have most frequently examined the psychological dimension (Harper & Hurtado, 2007; Hurtado et al., 2008), with studies indicating that students perceive campus very differently depending on their positionalities (i.e., the locations of their social identities within systems of power and privilege) and the representation of their communities on campus (Harper & Hurtado, 2007). Compared to their white peers, students of color perceive the psychological climate to be more hostile and negative, due to isolation and more frequent encounters with racism and discrimination (Ancis, Sedlacek, & Mohr, 2000; Rankin & Reason, 2005).

In the growing body of literature on racialized experiences of graduate students of color (Espino, 2014; Gay, 2004; Gildersleeve et al., 2011; Solem, Lee, & Schlemper, 2009; Solórzano, 1998; Truong & Museus, 2012; Truong, Museus, & McGuire, 2016), few studies have used a CRC perspective (Griffin et al., 2012; Hurtado, 1994; Ward & Zarate, 2015). One reason may be that the organizational climate for graduate students is less salient at the level of the campus than the department (Greene, Stockard, Lewis, & Richmond, 2010), where disciplinary, institutional, and professional contexts converge to shape student experiences and organizational behavior (Bersola et al., 2014; Margolis & Romero, 1998; Solem et al., 2009; Weidman & Stein, 2003). Within departments, the behavioral dimension of climate is revealed in the quality of communication and relationships between faculty and students (Barthelemy, Henderson, & Grunert, 2013), which have implications for student satisfaction and persistence.

In one of the few empirical studies to explicitly use a CRC perspective to examine graduate education, Griffin et al. (2012) found that the "stereotypical, and sometimes racist perceptions" (p. 558) encountered by current graduate students among their professors and peers undermine graduate diversity officers' (GDOs) recruitment and retention efforts. The authors suggested the necessity of communicating "a clear institutional commitment to diversity" through organizational policies and practices as "an essential first step" (p. 536) to increasing compositional diversity in graduate education. While Griffin et al. (2012) introduced racial climate in graduate education as an explicit focus of study, they relied only on the perspectives of GDOs to describe climate, rather than directly capturing views of faculty and students engaged in local recruitment and retention efforts. Moreover, to our knowledge, no prior research relates multiple dimensions of climate *within* a graduate program—either to each other or to specific recruitment, admissions, mentoring, or retention activities. Considering all five dimensions of climate and multiple points of view (e.g., students, faculty, administrators) may highlight what is most salient about racial climate in graduate education

contexts. Furthermore, in-depth analyses of the ties between formal diversity initiatives and informal faculty-student interactions and relationships within a single department could strengthen our understanding of how faculty and departments need to navigate equity and diversity efforts.

CASE STUDY METHODOLOGY

This article is part of a multi-institutional study of organizational conditions supporting the enrollment and graduation of women and students of color in STEM graduate programs. To that end, we conducted in-depth case studies of four STEM doctoral programs that graduate significantly more Black and Latino PhDs than their fields overall, in spite of being located in states with bans on race-conscious admissions policy. This paper examines the largest department of the ones that we studied, psychology,[1] which was also the one in which student and faculty impressions of the climate for diversity varied the most. In other papers from this project, we engaged in substantive cross-case analysis, but our strong interest in the implications of organizational climate for student wellbeing motivated a deep study of student experiences in psychology, where students are more likely to be attuned to, as well as to have language and comfort for discussing, these matters.

As an empirical strategy, case study research involves in-depth exploration of bounded systems (Creswell, 2013; Merriam, 2009) that represent a particular phenomenon on the basis of "uniqueness, typicality, or success" (Merriam, 2009, p. 41). By leveraging multiple sources of data over a period of time, case studies facilitate in-depth, holistic understanding about social contexts (in this case, graduate programs) and a phenomenon of interest (e.g., diversity and equity efforts; Yin, 2014). Qualitative case studies help researchers capture "action, perceptions and interpretations" (Merriam, 2009, p. 44), precisely the types of knowledge that we set out to analyze when designing the study. Weiss (1995) argued that qualitative interviews, in particular, are useful for analysis of organizations.

Sampling and Data Collection

Over the course of roughly one academic year, we collected data from students, faculty, staff, and alumni through interviews and secondary data. Interviews ranged from 30–75 minutes each, using protocols developed specifically for each constituency group. Our sampling strategy entailed a

---

[1]Psychology represents a bridge between the natural and social sciences. Without making wholesale judgments about disciplines and their members, a focus on these same research questions in a discipline/department outside the human sciences, such as math or physics, might have yielded less rich data about student experiences and perceptions of the climate. We hope the evocative quotations from our participants offer clear illustrations of perceptual patterns that may be present elsewhere, albeit perhaps less vividly.

combination of criterion and snowball sampling (Merriam, 2009) wherein we first recruited faculty who had been engaged in the department's diversity efforts in recent years, then worked with those participants, particularly department leaders and senior faculty, to identify and recruit additional participants who met this criterion. The department chair and/or members of the department's administrative staff recommended students to us. Due to our interest in understanding faculty-student relationships in the context of the department's diversity efforts, our data sources for this article emphasized semi-structured interviews with nine faculty and six doctoral students, most of whom were involved in the department's diversity efforts. Table 1 provides a summary of our participants' characteristics and the data we collected.

TABLE 1.
TYPES AND SOURCES OF DATA

Data Collection Types	Sources	Number
Secondary Data	Recruitment materials, Reports to graduate school, Internal reports	N/A
Informational Interviews	Department Chair	1
Semi-structured Interviews	Faculty	9
	Students	6
Demographic Survey	Students	6

We began data collection with an informational interview with the department chair to confirm the appropriateness of the case study site and to identify potential faculty, staff, and student participants. This interview also provided us with an overview of the department's diversity initiatives and helped us contextualize the data about the PhD program's enrollment and retention of students of color that had first brought the program to our attention. Semi-structured interviews with faculty of varying seniority across seven concentration areas focused on the department's history, admissions practices, understandings of diversity, approaches to serving students, and reflections on the implications of a state-imposed affirmative action ban. Semi-structured interviews with students representing multiple concentrations, cohorts, and social identities, as summarized in Table 2, provided insight into student experiences and perceptions of the department's climate for diversity.

TABLE 2.
DESCRIPTION OF STUDENT SAMPLE

Student	Race/Ethnicity	Year in Program	Undergraduate Institution Type
Layla	Latina	3rd	Private Catholic
Shana	African American	3rd	Ivy League
Natalie	White	3rd	Women's College
Tracy	Latina	4th	Private Catholic
Christina	Latina	5th	Hispanic Serving Institution
Eric	African American	5th	Historically Black College Table 2

Data Analysis

With the objective of understanding student and faculty experiences with and perceptions of diversity initiatives and racial climate, we used constant comparative analytic methods (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). For the first round of coding, we also used the five dimensions of Milem et al.'s (2005) CRC framework as sensitizing concepts (Bowen, 2006). Using NVivo, we conducted open and axial coding of interview transcripts, inductively identifying themes relating to student and faculty perceptions and experiences of climate (both generally and the CRC dimensions specifically) within the department. For example, we analyzed participants' descriptions of student-faculty interactions, their appraisals of the department's diversity initiatives, and experiences of climate attributed to particular social identities and positionalities within the department. We carried out this analytic strategy with faculty interviews first, before following the same process with student interviews. In our final round of analysis, we compared faculty and student data. This between-group comparison of patterns uncovered inconsistencies between faculty and students' experiences and perceptions of diversity efforts as well as illuminated contradictions among climate, organizational policies and practices, and department statistics (i.e., enrollment and degree attainment) as indicators of diversity and equity. Together, these three rounds of analysis facilitated both rich description and theoretically grounded analyses. Our analytic strategy generated a major theme with three subcomponents, which we describe below in our findings.

Role of the Researchers

As researchers, we are aware that our multiple social identities and lived experiences affect the way that we carry out all aspects of the research process, especially the way that we interpret our data and construct findings. At the time of this study, our team was in the unusual situation of studying the dynamics of diversity work in graduate programs, while working within gradu-

ate programs that were actively striving to improve diversity. In a sense, we were living our research. On one hand, our experience-laden perceptions of the data represented a unique lens with which we could complicate, interrupt, and challenge existing concepts (Weick, 2016). On the other hand, that same lens produced subjectivity that had to be actively checked and interrogated throughout the research process. To construct a collective interpretation that honored the "connections between perceptions and conceptions" (Weick, 2016, p. 2), our research team intentionally engaged in regular debriefings where we voiced how our identities and experiences informed our individual interpretations. This collective construction of meaning embodied a philosophy of "strong objectivity" (Harding, 1992, 2012), in which scholars make visible their values and interests, rather than claiming spurious objectivity and neutrality. By acknowledging and voicing the experiences and identities that inform our individual epistemologies and interpretations, we can collectively identify the cultural and social assumptions that can enter into various aspects of the research (Milner, 2007).

Establishing Trustworthiness and Rigor

In addition, our research team used several strategies to enhance the trustworthiness and rigor of our findings, including triangulation, peer debriefing, and member checking (Creswell & Miller, 2000; Lincoln, 1995; Miles & Huberman, 1994). Our triangulation efforts included using interview data from participants representing different social identities, as well as different concentration areas and positions within the department. This use of multiple sources of data (Merriam, 2009) helped to ensure that we drew conclusions about the department's racial climate from a broad set of perspectives. Peer debriefing sessions provided opportunities to discuss preliminary themes with researchers not involved in the study, particularly with regard to whether an emerging theme had adequate supporting evidence from the data. In addition, multiple team members were responsible for collecting and analyzing data. Each analyst brought different social identities, intellectual backgrounds, and experiences to the work. This strategy of investigator triangulation (Merriam, 2009) helped to test our team's predilections and guard against a predisposition unduly subjective of the data (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). In terms of member checks with study participants (Merriam, 2009), we solicited feedback from the department chair on the first draft of the case to ensure that we had accurately and adequately captured the full range of the department's diversity initiatives. Finally, we increased trustworthiness by conducting a search for disconfirming evidence after establishing our preliminary themes (Creswell & Miller, 2000; Miles & Huberman, 1994). By going back to the data to search for evidence that did not align with our emerging themes, we uncovered data points that brought more nuance to the claims in our findings.

Study Limitations

Constructing a sample using criterion and snowball sampling of individuals engaged in the department's diversity initiatives was an intentional part of the research design, given our interest in how faculty and students experienced these diversity efforts. However, this group may have had perspectives that are different from those of a random sample of the department's faculty and graduate students. Moreover, inclusion of participants who were not as closely invested in the department's diversity initiatives may have yielded different but equally important perceptions of the racial climate. An additional limitation of the study was our reliance on self-reported and secondary data about diversity efforts in the department. Observational data could have added another perspective to our understanding of the subtle ways in which these efforts are related to faculty and students' experiences with the racial climate.

Setting and Case Summary

The psychology department, comprised of nine different doctoral program areas, has a strong reputation in the discipline. It is situated in a major research university that has thousands of graduate students spread across graduate degree programs in scores of departments on campus. Institutional data from the last five years showed the department enrolled and graduated 16.3% of underrepresented students of color—statistically higher than the 12.7% rate for the discipline[2] (NSF, 2013). Among recently awarded PhDs, 25% went to underrepresented students. However, this pattern was not always the case. A majority of faculty participants agreed that a state legislative ban on affirmative action has complicated the department's diversity goals. In addition to constraining admissions, the ban broadened the eligibility criteria for a diversity-focused graduate fellowship that was formerly directed at underrepresented students of color.

A watershed moment. A few years after the ban passed, the faculty discovered at the end of an admissions cycle that among the 20+ students whom they planned to admit, not a single one was a student of color. This realization had "a certain shock value that got people's attention," and ultimately catalyzed a variety of diversity-related efforts. A longstanding member of the faculty reflected:

> . . . we sort of quickly recognized there was an issue and had a faculty meeting around that . . . We could have just said that's kind of a blip and we don't need to worry about it. But we actually sort of substantively talked about it.

---

[2]This percentage represents the number of doctorate recipients from African American, Hispanic/Latino, and American Indian or Alaska Native backgrounds who are also U.S. citizens and permanent legal residents.

Other faculty concurred, reporting that since then, diversity has "become very much part of our consciousness" and "very present in our conversations as a faculty."

Faculty informed us that this particular moment also led to "a policy shift towards seeking out underrepresented groups." The department reinvented and convened a diversity committee, which has played a critical role in examining their graduate admissions policy and which now reviews all applications of students from underrepresented groups. They created a curricular initiative, prominently advertised on a new and improved website, that has become an important recruiting tool for both prospective faculty and graduate students who are interested in pursuing empirical questions related to diversity. A student organization created by and for underrepresented students of all types within the department helps lead outreach and recruitment and has become "a coalition of support" and activism within the department.

The department chair's office and the dean's office have both shown enthusiasm for diversity-related initiatives, including hiring staff members who are dedicated to ensuring positive educational experiences for all students. Upon our asking what factors have supported increased enrollment of students of color, several faculty members noted an increasing "institutional commitment to diversity at all levels." The department chair, as well as other faculty, described a new dean and campus leadership as "extremely committed to diversity," noting "a sense of urgency here that's not common" because the surrounding community is racially and ethnically diverse.

FINDINGS

Were one to statistically model the PhD program's improved enrollment and graduation outcomes with underrepresented students, no doubt the developments mentioned above would emerge as positive, significant factors. Structures such as the curricular diversity initiative, the diversity committee, and admissions reforms are department-level efforts that reflect the department's commitment to make structural changes that enhance its compositional diversity. However, in what we characterize as a "bait and switch" phenomenon, the formal initiatives that increased the department's representation of students of color did not result in positive changes in the micro-level contexts where graduate student life takes shape: the classroom, the lab, and in faculty relationships. In the findings that follow, we argue that using the five dimensions of the CRC framework clarifies how divergent conceptions of climate among students and faculty are primarily grounded in their attention to different dimensions: Faculty emphasized progress on the structural and compositional dimensions, while students emphasized to us the urgency of improving the behavioral and psychological dimensions.

Bait and Switch

The rosy image of diversity conveyed in the program's updated recruitment materials diverged from underrepresented students' perceptions of the program's climate for diversity once they arrived. Within the department, "there's been quite an effort in the last four to five years to enhance the racial diversity of the student body as well as the faculty." Student recruitment and admissions practices, in particular, were at the core of each of the diversity initiatives, including the diversity committee, diverse faculty hires, and the department's graduate minor in diversity related courses. Yet as we learned in our conversations with students, and which some faculty in our sample affirmed, the commitment to enhancing the compositional dimension of climate, communicated in recruitment efforts that changed the department's image and processes for obtaining access, does not ensure high-quality faculty-student relationships or an inclusive psychosocial climate for learning among those who matriculate.

Expectations of diversity: Changing the organizational/structural and compositional dimensions of diversity. A notable recruitment development that faculty referenced repeatedly was a redesign of the department's new website to highlight faculty members engaged in research related to diversity. Recognizing there were "a lot of faculty who were studying underrepresented populations," the department chair explained that faculty wanted to "do more on our website and in our admissions materials to feature what we're doing." They knew, and one member of the diversity committee explicitly stated, that a precursor of "bringing in underrepresented students is having someone who is doing research that would be of interest." The redesigned website also advertised a new curricular initiative wherein graduate students could minor in diversity-relevant courses. The former chair recounted this as a "major priority":

> So the first step really was to add to the website . . . the [curricular initiative]. And then we started getting inquiries from prospective students saying, 'I'm really interested in your [curricular initiative]. What are the courses? What's the nature of your program?'

Members of the faculty hoped that developing the website and graduate minor would give them "something tangible" to discuss in recruiting graduate students.

Indeed, these measures did make a difference in students' decision to enroll in the department. Almost every student we spoke with mentioned the website as a positive factor in the impression they developed of the department's commitment to diversity. As Eric,[3] an African American student, stated:

---

[3]All participants and organizations that appear in the findings have been given pseudonyms to protect anonymity.

> Diversity was a huge part of the application process from what I remember. I think they were starting the [curricular initiative] at the time. I feel one of the things we had to address in our essays . . . was diversity. There was a website . . . devoted to diversity . . . so it seemed, like I said, on paper to be something that was really important to the school.

Without any prompting from interviewers about specific recruitment strategies, the department's diversity website was mentioned by each student, illuminating its importance in the impressions of diversity in the department that students formed.

In addition to the website, each of our participants' conceptions of the department's commitment to diversity was also shaped by additional factors, including the diverse geographical area in which the university was located as well as positive interactions with faculty—particularly faculty with whom students wanted to work—before, during, and after the admissions/recruitment process. Eric's first encounters with the department came at a research conference when he met an African American professor whom he described as "very warm and welcoming" and who encouraged him to apply to the program. Subsequent correspondence with this faculty member and a few others was "really important in making me at least think that the program was interested in me coming." Other students, like Layla, a 3rd year Latina, similarly described positive interactions, recalling that while she had been admitted to five programs, the faculty member whom she initially met from the department "was the only one that kept emailing me, 'Do you have any questions?'" Consequently, this feeling that she "was really recruiting me" gave Layla a sense that the department was a place where she would be valued.

For a few students in our sample, the department's coordinated campus visit—one of its core, long-standing recruitment strategies—helped reinforce their expectations of the department's commitment to diversity. The visit involved interviews with potential Principal Investigators (PIs), meetings with lab-mates and other faculty in one of the concentration areas, and a social gathering with incoming and currently enrolled students. Tracy described her campus visit as a "great" experience and Eric, a 5th year candidate, who was hosted by two students of color (an Asian American woman and a Latino man), recalled feeling that "everyone . . . was kind of supportive. It seemed like a really good atmosphere." As for Natalie, a 3rd year student, who was unable to participate in the campus visit weekend, efforts that her prospective mentor made to arrange an alternative visit were critical in making her feel like she belonged. Compared to another top-ranked program where she had been admitted, she thought this department had done a much better job of attending to racial and gender diversity.

Experiences in the department: Behavioral and psychological dimensions of climate left relatively untouched. However, according to students,

recruitment strategies aimed at increasing diverse enrollment did little to improve interactions across race and perceptions of inclusiveness. (i.e., behavioral and psychological dimensions of climate). Students worried that there seemed to be more "talk" about diversity than anything—"more image than content" as Natalie put it. Students of color expressed that they had been optimistic about enrolling in a department whose application materials, website, and curriculum signaled a strong commitment to diversity, but then found their experiences "terribly mismatched." Shana, an African American student and engaged leader on campus, described the mismatch as a difference between "rhetoric at the university-level or the department-level" and the "action [that] happens at a more individual level, faculty or administrators or both." Comparing the department with another program in the field she had considered attending, Tracy, a Latina in her 4th year, remembered, "So I just . . . contrasted [institution] with coming here, where there was a diversity web page . . . so that's really important to me. It just seemed like the right fit. And now I'm here. Well, you all just have a really nice web page [*laughs*]." Other students also noticed the contradiction between their experiences in the department and what was conveyed during the recruitment process. We highlight three students' comments:

> "When I came in it was like 'diversity-diversity-diversity' on the website and when I came here there was nothing."
> "When I was doing my research on departments and I found their . . . website I was like, 'Wow . . . like amazing!' . . . And it is so diverse, but there are these weird climate issues which are very jarring."
> "It is really good on paper, then when you come here it is . . . shocking what you see."

The "shocking" experiences that students of color encountered varied greatly. In some concentration areas, students characterized discussions about diversity as perfunctory. A Latina student observed that faculty in her concentration area treated diversity as "something that we have to do, the check-off thing." Other times, "no one brought it up, like it doesn't exist." Eric seemed particularly frustrated by the department's "colorblind" mentality. For him, it reinforced the idea that "we're all the same so nobody has issues, so don't talk about them. And if you talk about them, you're the issue and not the issue itself." In an environment where "race doesn't exist," Eric suggested that explicit conversations about race and how it differentially contributes to students' experiences were silenced.

> The ways in which we interact is not really something we talk about. But I feel that's a big part of it; it's not just I'm a Black man in this program. For me, being a Black man means I interact in a certain way; and I'm educated in a certain way.

Christina agreed that "race issues are never discussed" and both Natalie and Eric perceived that the university's location in a racially/ethnically and socio-economically diverse area had contributed to an idea in the department that "we're post-racial." In sum, for some participants the mismatch between expectations and experiences concerned an *absence* of conversation and capacity to engage a topic that promotional materials communicated as one of the department's strengths. For other students, the mismatch was made plain through interactions that explicitly *contradicted* the positive climate for diversity suggested during the recruitment phase. For both groups, the experience was one of unmet expectations.

Unmet expectations and tensions around diversity in the department. A confluence of factors shaped students' initial expectations of the experiences with race they were likely to have within the graduate program. The emphasis on diversity in the recruitment process gave students the impression that diversity was of "considerable" importance. Four students in our sample also attended undergraduate institutions they described as either racially diverse and/or where there was a strong sense of community among students and between students and faculty. Their collegiate experiences likely contributed to their positive perceptions of the program's portrayal of diversity as well as conditioned their needs for an environment that was similarly diverse and inclusive. Natalie's experience at a small women's college had socialized her to an environment where "everyone collaborated on everything," while Eric, who attended a historically black college, characterized his alma mater as a diverse place that was "created for me to succeed." Half of our sample was also excited by the prospect of working with faculty of color—Black faculty, in particular—with whom they had positive interactions during the recruitment process and had critical intersections for their intended area of research. Collectively, students' undergraduate institutions and their positive recruitment experiences created an expectation that they would receive quality mentorship and social support once enrolled.

However, tensions in the department surrounding its growing racial diversity created a very difficult environment. For example, underrepresented students were keenly aware that the admission of diverse applicants was often a source of contention. Several students found out that applicants from underrepresented backgrounds with lower GRE scores often required special advocacy by a faculty member in the admissions committee. One student even recalled how certain faculty members had shared their frustrations with the admissions process with members of the underrepresented graduate student organization:

> So I know when they come and speak they mention, 'Yes, there is a quota that we need to fill.' We're always looking for diverse applicants but the problem is like [pause] the rest of the committee that is not concerned about that is

> obviously going to look at an application and judge by numbers. Like, 'Okay, they didn't make it and that's it.'

This informal knowledge suggested that despite the department's efforts, some faculty members still held "these preconceived notions of how [an underrepresented] student is going to do." Additionally, students often described receiving subtle messages from both faculty and other students that they were the beneficiaries of unfair advantage. Natalie described one particularly hurtful example in the context of the annual National Science Foundation (NSF) fellowships:

> So like NSFs, a couple years ago, when they were announced—almost everyone in an entire cohort got it except for three students and they all were white. And then the narrative was like, 'You only got NSF because you're Black.'

Despite the ostensible commitment to diversity in the department, underrepresented students were aware that at least some faculty members and students believed their presence in the department was not based on merit but on a begrudging nod to diversity efforts.

Poor mentoring, microaggressions, and "vicarious trauma" compromise student wellbeing. After being aggressively recruited to the program, students were also directly affected by mentoring difficulties. Shana for example, was an Ivy-league graduate, an alumna of a well-regarded undergraduate summer research program on the campus, and had also done quite well on the GRE. Similar to Natalie who was unable to participate in the campus visit weekend, arrangements were made for Shana to visit during a different time with a potential mentor who was "super committed to diversity" and "deliberate" about making prospective students feel like "he cared." However, once she enrolled, the nature of this relationship was complicated by racial and political dynamics between her mentor and other faculty that, in her words, "affected my feeling of community and belonging." In the wake of it all, finding the same level of trust and support in other faculty in the department was difficult. She felt she needed to find multiple advisors, describing the "labor" she had endured in cultivating these relationships as "the most exhausting experience" of her life. She seriously contemplated leaving the program, saying of the environment, " . . . it was just so negative . . . I was having very terrible physical responses to all of this, and anxiety like I've never felt in my life before." In addition, every student we interviewed mentioned their involvement in a student-led organization they created out of a need for a trusting, "safe space" where students could discuss "what it is like to be a minority in this type of environment." But even this organization could not replace a secure faculty relationship and did not protect students from negative interactions and experiences.

As researchers, we were struck by the clarity and volume of evidence that students' unmet expectations negatively affected their wellbeing. Students of color in the department suffered under the cumulative weight of frequent, discriminatory experiences, which they often felt forced to suppress. Even in instances in which they did not experience racial micro-aggressions directly, Eric noted that the mere awareness of racist comments targeted at students as well as some faculty of color was still "vicariously traumatic." A common combination of responses was helplessness and anger about instances in class, large group settings, or lab meetings with mentors where deficit-based remarks about communities of color by students or faculty went unchallenged. Christina, on the verge of tears, expressed her frustration:

> How are you okay with saying those things in front of me? . . . And I don't know whether to speak up . . . because then I'm going to be the crazy Latina that . . . reinforces some of the things that you already thought. Or like not say anything and just carry that weight that gets bigger and bigger . . . I'm going to choose not to take action on that because I have to see this person for the next five years in my lab. And at some point that makes me guilty. But I know there are repercussions about bringing this up.

Like Christina, a few other students made the calculation that it was advantageous to avoid confronting these matters when they arose. Sharing a recent conversation with a white lab-mate, Tracy elaborated on her response to racial microaggressions in the lab:

> A student recently came up to me and was like, 'I think that in lab when white students . . . speak up our ideas are, you know, everyone likes them. But then we notice that when minority students speak up, it is like 'No, that's not a good idea." I thought it was so great she was going to bring it up to the professor . . . I feel like I'm more at risk for being misperceived than she would be.

This suppression is a form of emotional labor (Hochschild, 1979) that creates a psychic burden affecting students' emotional wellbeing (Porter, Posselt, Reyes, Slay, & Kamimura, 2018). Perhaps this is why many of our participants mentioned how important it was to have mentors with whom they could have honest conversations about how to cope. However, contrary to what they expected, such mentors were few and far between. Students and some professors acknowledged that the quality of mentorship "varies widely on who the faculty member is," and that while the department has "some very strong mentors," not all of them may be safe individuals for underrepresented students to confide in. One participant noted, "the department as a whole "is not built to support the [student] struggles that [faculty] are probably unaware of." Indeed, the tension was acute in this department between communicating a deep commitment to increasing enrollment of students of color, while lacking a robust network of relationships through which enrolled students could obtain the support they needed.

Consequences of bait and switch for the sustainability of diverse enrollments. The mismatch between student expectations and their experiences with faculty affected not only their educational satisfaction and wellbeing, but it also affected their ability to speak positively about the department to prospective students of color. Some felt compelled to "keep it real" and to offer applicants a more accurate account of "what they're getting into" than the message about diversity that the website sends. Others, even at the risk of prospective students choosing to enroll elsewhere, wanted to share with applicants that PhD programs in psychology at other universities may present "better options" or "a safer space." From this standpoint, the department's emphasis on strategies to increase diversity (reflecting the structural and compositional dimensions of climate), paired with their relative neglect of racialized dynamics shaping enrolled student experiences (reflecting the racial climate's psychological and behavioral dimensions), threatened to undermine their ability to recruit underrepresented students in the future.

Faculty Perspectives on Bait and Switch

The students we interviewed held very similar views about the quality of interactions and experiences with discrimination in the department. However, there was some variation in how faculty perceived student experiences and the department's progress. A few professors, notably several of color and involved with the department's diversity committee, were well aware of the "bait and switch" phenomenon that students of color experienced. While "there are a lot of wonderful people working on this issue," one faculty member new to the department noted, "climate is not good for students." He observed that they are "recruited here aggressively and then [pause] kind of left to their own devices." A professor of color alluded to the mismatch:

> You know the lip service was there, but students weren't feeling that they were getting served in a way that was genuine. You know, the heart was in the right place but not really following through. And I hope—I really hope that sentiment is changing.

One faculty member relayed that students "have expressed certainly that the climate could be better, and more specifically in terms of mentoring." Several faculty members acknowledged, "the faculty who are really successful take a personal interest in the students" in that they strive to create "more than just an academic, we'll-meet-with-the-desk-between-us-relationship." They agreed that this type of mentorship "makes an incredible difference" in retaining underrepresented students of color, but it was also common knowledge that developing these types of relationships "is something that not all faculty are either willing or able to do." In fact, one faculty member intimated that it was common practice to send students to work with faculty members who had a reputation for poor mentorship skills:

> I think there are a couple of people in the department—of all colors and persuasions—who are just known by faculty to have trouble working with graduate students. So it doesn't surprise people when a new student comes in and at some point they start looking around.

The department's complacency with these gaps in faculty mentorship may be the crux of the "switch" in the bait and switch phenomenon. To knowingly recruit underrepresented students to a department where only some faculty members provide excellent mentorship creates the conditions for students to feel as if they have been intentionally misled. With this growing awareness in mind—both the importance of mentoring to underrepresented student experiences and the PhD program's need to grow in this regard—department leaders made it clear to us that it was no accident that some of the department's most recent faculty hires came from searches specifically geared to providing mentorship to underrepresented students.

A second group of faculty perceived the climate more positively. Their perspectives about departmental climate were framed in terms of progress made with respect to diversity initiatives, and they emphasized "things to be proud of:"

> I think it is not as good as it could be certainly, the climate. But I think that the increased attention to it at least ameliorates some feelings that it is just a back-burner issue, because it certainly is not.
>
> I think generally speaking the climate is positive. There are some areas in which there's some level of contention . . . but generally speaking because of the new faculty and the kinds of recruitments that are coming back, it is now becoming a no-brainer.

Also alluding to improvement with time, one professor stated that diversity is "becoming more and more a consideration" compared to "say five to six years ago." The department chair compared their department to the broader field of psychology, arguing that there was "more awareness" and "more effort than is typical" in his department than elsewhere in the field.

In the minds of some faculty members and students, there were indeed reasons to believe things are, in fact, "getting better." One diversity committee member expressed optimism that the department's initiatives were helping to "get a sense of what some of the undercurrents might be that you might not hear about." She pointed to a recent example where comments from prospective students of color that the department "wasn't welcoming diversity and minorities" sparked a new effort during recruitment weekend to " . . . talk specifically about climate issues" and the department's efforts to "try to improve the climate."

While the department remains, as one put it, "vigilant" in its recruitment of graduate students of color, an initiative to hire racially diverse professors

seemed to be the step that has engendered the most optimism among current faculty. Led by the dean's office, the initiative required faculty candidates to show expertise and commitment to mentoring as well as focused on recruiting candidates who either studied some aspect of diversity to support the PhD program's diversity curricular initiative or were from an underrepresented minority group. Students were excited to learn that the three finalists were faculty of color. Eric shared, "So I think we're catching up with the claims that are made . . . We still have a way to go but I think we're catching up." Students had expectations for a welcoming climate based on the department's well-publicized diversity website and other initiatives. Now fully aware of the limitations of such efforts for improving faculty mentorship, increasing the faculty's diversity also held promise for over half of the students in our sample, who named it as the department's "number one" priority. They hope those new faculty will provide for future students the mentoring relationships and supportive climate that they desperately wanted and needed.

DISCUSSION

By applying the campus racial climate framework to our case study of a PhD program that has substantially increased its racial/ethnic diversity, this study provides a multi-level understanding of the graduate student experience. We offered a window into tensions that can emerge in the course of departmental and PhD program diversity efforts, revealing that differences in how various constituents perceive and experience diversity initiatives—and the climate for diversity that results—may threaten the sustainability of diversity goals.

Our analysis uncovered relationships among multiple dimensions of the climate for diversity, as well as a clear pattern: The initiatives implemented to bring more students of color through the door cannot be depended upon to improve the quality of faculty-student relationships, nor to reduce the likelihood that students will experience overt and subtle forms of discrimination. This finding is consistent with research on organizational change for diversity at the campus level, which concludes that efforts that are successful over the long term tend to balance attention to access *and* success, attending to both program design and building collective responsibility (Smith, 2015). Too often, institutional efforts emphasize the former, but programs "provide only one thread of support" (Smith, 2015, p. 224). Pull the thread, and institutional capacity to serve students may unravel. Universities and the units within them also need a strong foundation of institutional capacity and equitable structures, relationships, and individual mindsets that encourage racial equity (Dowd & Bensimon, 2015).

Designing admissions policies and improving a department's public image are important steps in facilitating matriculation—and thus representa-

tion—in graduate programs (Griffin et al., 2012). Representation, however, is a necessary but insufficient condition for producing the positive climate that, at the undergraduate level, has strong associations with student outcomes including sense of belonging and degree completion (Milem et al., 2005). The broader organizational climate for diversity is affected by representation (e.g., compositional diversity dimension) and policies and practices (e.g., organizational/structural dimension), but our findings suggest that failing to attend to advising and mentoring (e.g., behavioral dimension) as well as students' subjective perceptions of support, competition, and/or hostility (e.g., psychological dimension) could undermine diversity as a long-term project. This conclusion aligns with that of Griffin et al. (2012), that faculty and staff working with graduate students must become more sensitive to the perceptions of their interactions with students of color, further enabling faculty to better support students of color, "which in turn will support recruitment" (p. 561). Graduate students quietly suffering under frequent racism or insufficient support are less likely to succeed academically (Truong et al., 2016, and they can hardly be counted upon as ambassadors who will recruit future students themselves (Griffin et al., 2012).

Students of color in our sample perceived their experience within the psychology program as a bait and switch. They reasonably held high expectations for the quality of their educational experience, based on the department's portrayal of itself and the commitment to diversity that it implied. But in graduate education, especially doctoral programs in decentralized departments, the student experience is largely constructed in micro-contexts: the concentration, the research lab or group, and the advisor-student relationship. Experiences and perceptions at these levels, therefore, matter much when attending to representation and climate. If students experience frequent microaggressions in their classes, struggle to receive the support they need from their advisors, lack opportunities to connect with faculty who share their racial/ethnic background, and/or are isolated and marginalized in their concentrations or among their peers, it will not matter much that faculty are actively engaged in research related to diversity or that the department has shifted its admissions and recruitment policies.

Dimensions of Climate in Graduate Education

The multi-dimensional campus climate framework facilitated our analysis on two levels. First, it provided a conceptual apparatus that enabled a more fine-grained analysis of what faculty and students meant when they said "climate." Relatedly, this specificity allowed us to make sense of what might otherwise have seemed to be strangely different perceptions of the same organization on the part of professors and graduate students. By contextualizing "climate" with the surrounding comments, and then relating those comments to the five specific dimensions (i.e., compositional diversity,

behavioral, psychological, historical legacy, and organizational/structural), it became clear that professors and students both had reasonable grounds for their largely divergent perceptions of climate.[4]

Faculty, most of whom focused on compositional diversity (i.e., representation) and the organizational/ structural dimensions when mentioning climate, were arguably right that climate has improved. Policies supporting diversity have expanded and institutionalized, they are doing more to consciously attend to access for students of color, and they have shifted the profile of who enrolls and graduates from their program. Professors also have the perspective to see organizational change over time that students may not. However, about one-third of the faculty participants, including faculty of color, saw the climate more negatively or as "mixed." They acknowledged the difficulties that many students of color have in their advising relationships and in the department community. Their views were more consistent with the prevailing sentiment among students.

Graduate students, whose comments about climate were associated more often with its behavioral (i.e., interpersonal) and psychological dimensions, were also arguably right that climate remains a serious cause for concern in the department. Its website portrayed the department and its members as collectively engaged with diversity through their research and curricular offerings. Once students enrolled, however, it became clear that the apparently collective commitment to diversity did not extend to the quality of individual relationships and interactions, especially with faculty. From these findings, we can infer that "climate" is primarily experienced and defined by students at the local level of interpersonal interactions, especially with faculty—not the broader department or organizational level.

CONTRIBUTIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

In addition to building the literature about racial climate and diversity efforts in graduate education, our findings offer a cautionary tale to graduate programs. Programs seeking to enhance diversity need to attend both to *structural, objective* factors shaping access and to *cultural, subjective* factors shaping student experience. For departments such as the one we studied, whose diversity efforts have focused on increasing African American, Latino, and Native American students' representation, the second generation of diversity efforts in graduate education should include mechanisms for building individual professors' capacity for working with diverse students and holding those professors accountable for their contributions to diverse students' learning. Department leaders should specifically attend to the qual-

---

[4]The dimension of climate that came up least frequently in our data was the historical legacy of inclusion/exclusion.

ity of relationships within their department and strive to see that they are characterized by trust, mutual respect, and support—by care, at the most basic level. This work may require professional development on the part of faculty, to build their advising and mentoring skills and to develop their ability and sensitivity in working with students across gender, race, age, and other social identities. Faculty may also need to shift their mindsets about student ability and the cultural norms around what advising and mentoring actually entail. Graduate programs should also consider whether the expertise of the students they graduate includes these important relational and intercultural competencies.

Second, our research has implications for discourse about diversity in graduate education, and the locus of responsibility for improving access and inclusion of underrepresented graduate students. In many respects, our findings support a general trend in the literature that inclusion is missing from diversity conversations at the graduate level—conversations which often focus on broadening access. Our findings, thus, corroborate Tienda's (2013) conclusion, developed through analyses of undergraduate education, that diversity and inclusion are not equivalent. Recognizing that these can be slippery terms, she defined inclusion as "organizational strategies and practices that promote meaningful social and academic interactions among persons and groups who differ in their experiences, their views, and their traits" (p. 467). An important question for graduate education becomes: Who is responsible for carrying out these "organizational strategies and practices"?

Research universities' graduate schools are increasingly making available a broad-based suite of support for graduate and professional students' academic success and personal wellbeing. However, at no institution, of which we are aware, do these supports compare to the size of the vast academic and student affairs apparatus present in undergraduate education, which seamlessly integrates "diversity work" (Ahmed, 2012) into everyday activity. Given the decentralized organizational structure of graduate education (i.e., departments, labs, and individual mentoring dyads), much of student experience occurs within contexts where departments and their faculty have primary responsibility. Professors, therefore, have a greater opportunity to facilitate inclusion at the graduate level than they do with undergraduates. Yet, this decentralization also means that inclusion is less likely to occur if faculty do *not* conceptualize their role as including "strategies and practices" that encourage and support diverse students' learning. As the enrollment of students of color in graduate education grows, we need more research into what shapes their full inclusion in departments with a history of exclusion. We also need more evidence about the ties between inclusion and wellbeing, and practical understanding about the organizational behavior that encourages these outcomes.

Third, we offer insight into tensions of "diversity work" that many graduate programs face as they strive to represent a commitment to diversity to prospective graduate students when the work is still very much in progress. While there is a risk associated with painting a realistic portrait about the challenges of recruiting and supporting students of color, our data made clear that overselling the centrality of diversity as a strength of one's department also carries risk. The students of color in our sample viewed the rosy images the department portrayed for the sake of recruitment as "terribly mismatched" with their personal realities, which often included multiple forms of discrimination and everyday indignities. This dissonance has had implications for students' satisfaction, and in a few cases, with their wellbeing and academic progress. One of our participants was on the verge of leaving for this reason, and another told us through tears that she had recently made the decision to stay.

Finally, a major implication of this study is that, given current graduate students' role in recruitment, the painful experience of bait and switch could undermine any department or university's emerging record enrolling underrepresented students. Patterns of negative experiences create an impulse for "truth-telling" about diversity—sharing with prospective students the "real" story about what a program is like, so that they are not similarly mesmerized by all the diversity talk. Our data showed that the obligation to warn prospective students created internal conflicts for students of color in our sample. On one hand, they want other students of color to enroll. On the other hand, they want to honestly depict the program and what it was like for them, after having been recruited under the diversity and inclusion banner. The program's online image set high expectations in the minds of prospective students, and the distance between those expectations and the harsh realities they faced may have exacerbated their disappointment and sense of a bait and switch. For other graduate programs that are earnestly engaged in improving the climate for diversity, our data demonstrate the importance of portraying their efforts as work in progress.

Conclusion

Can progress toward equity be gauged through statistics highlighting various groups' representation? Should we expect academic departments to establish systems that represent a commitment to diversity, or should the ultimate measure of equity be in the satisfaction and wellbeing of students who for many years have been excluded? For speaking into such questions, this article has broad significance for equity efforts in graduate education. We illustrate two common challenges faced by higher education institutions: 1) Increasing and maintaining diversity in the absence of an organizational climate that consistently supports it and 2) Cultivating a collective commitment to diversity that goes deeper than appearances and messaging, one

that extends to the quality of mentoring relationships that are so formative to graduate student development.

The more that a higher education institution or graduate program within it positions itself as diverse, the more that prospective students of color have reason to expect an environment that will differ from a stereotypical "predominantly white institution" (Rosenbaum, Becker, Cepa, & Zapati-Gietl, 2016). Students may be more likely to expect not only that they will find community with other students of color, but also that racial discrimination will be rare, that they will receive adequate support for their scholarly development, and, more abstractly, that diversity will resonate as a shared commitment.

The department we examined has successfully enhanced two dimensions of the racial climate by developing a few key structures. However, structural interventions that increased compositional diversity did little to touch the behavioral and psychological dimensions of climate. Consistent with previous research on graduate students' experiences (e.g., Truong et al., 2016), students' read of the organizational climate occurred not at the department level, but through the support and respect they experienced (or did not) in interactions with faculty in their labs, their classrooms, and within their concentrations generally. If the students whom we interviewed are right, academic departments' ability to sustain diverse enrollments depends on attending to *all* dimensions of the racial climate, particularly the interactions with faculty and perceptions of inclusiveness that play a defining a role in education at the graduate level.

REFERENCES

Ahmed, S. (2012). *On being included: Racism and diversity in institutional life.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Ancis, J. R., Sedlacek, W. E., & Mohr, J. J. (2000). Student perceptions of campus cultural climate by race. *Journal of Counseling and Counseling Development, 78*(2), 180–185.

antonio, A. L. (2004). When does race matter in college friendships? Exploring the role of race within men's diverse and homogeneous friendship groups. *Review of Higher Education 27*(4): 553–75.

Avery, D. R. & McKay, P. F. (2006). Target practice: An organizational impression management approach to attracting minority and female job applicants. *Personnel Psychology, 59,* 157–187.

Barthelemy, R. S., Henderson, C., & Grunert, M. L. (2013). How do they get here?: Paths into physics education research. *Physical Review Special Topics-Physics Education Research, 9*(2), 020107(1–14).

Belcher, D. (1994). The apprenticeship approach to advanced academic literacy: Graduate students and their mentors. *English for Specific Purposes, 13(1),* 23–34.

Berrey, E. (2015). *The enigma of diversity: The language of race and the limits of racial justice.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Bersola, S. H., Stolzenberg, E. B., Love, J., & Fosnacht, K. (2014). Understanding admitted doctoral students' institutional choices: Student experiences versus faculty and staff perceptions. *American Journal of Education, 120*(4), 515–543.

Brill, J. L., Balcanoff, K. K., Land, D., Gogarty, M., & Turner, F. (2014). Best practices in doctoral retention: mentoring. *Higher Learning Research Communications, 4*(2), 26–37.

Bowen, G. (2006). Grounded theory and sensitizing concepts. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 5*(3), 12–23.

Chang, M. J. (1999). Does racial diversity matter?: The educational impact of a racially diverse undergraduate population. *Journal of College Student Development, 40*(4), 377–395.

Chang, M. J. (2000). Improving campus racial dynamics: A balancing act among competing interests. *The Review of Higher Education, 23*(2), 153–175.

Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2008). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory.* Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications.

Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications.

Creswell, J. W., & Miller, D. (2000). Determining validity in qualitative research. *Theory into Practice, 39*(3), 124–130.

Curtin, N., Stewart, A. J., & Ostrove, J. M. (2013). Fostering academic self-concept: Advisor support and sense of belonging among international and domestic graduate students. *American Educational Research Journal, 50*(1), 108–137.

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

Denison, D. R. (1996). What is the difference between organizational culture and organizational climate? A native's point of view on a decade of paradigm wars. *Academy of Management Review, 21*(3), 619–654.

Dowd, A. C., & Bensimon, E. M. (2015). *Engaging the "race question": Accountability and equity in US higher education.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Ely, R. J., & Thomas, D. A. (2001). Cultural diversity at work: The effects of diversity perspectives on work group processes and outcomes. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 46*(2), 229–273.

Espino, M. M. (2014). Exploring the role of community cultural wealth in graduate school access and persistence for Mexican American PhDs. *American Journal of Education, 120*(4), 545–574.

Freeman, R. B., & Huang, W. (2014). Strength in diversity: Richard B. Freeman and Wei Huang reflect on a link between a team's ethnic mix and highly cited papers. *Nature, 513*(7518), 305–306.

Garces, L. M. (2014). Aligning diversity, quality, and equity: The implications of legal and public policy developments for promoting racial diversity in graduate studies. *American Journal of Education, 120*(4), 457–480.

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

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

Girves, J. E., Zepeda, Y., & Gwathmey, J. K. (2005). Mentoring in a post-affirmative action world. *Journal of Social Issues, 61*(3), 449–479.

Greene, J., Stockard, J., Lewis, P., & Richmond, G. (2010). Is the academic climate chilly? The views of women academic chemists. *Journal of Chemical Education, 87*(4), 381–385.

Griffin, K. A. (2013). Voices of the "othermothers": Reconsidering Black professors' relationships with Black students as a form of social exchange. *The Journal of Negro Education, 82*(2), 169–183.

Griffin, K. A., & Muñiz, M. M. (2011). The strategies and struggles of graduate diversity officers in the recruitment of doctoral students of color. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 44*(1), 57–76.

Griffin, K. A., Muniz, M. M., & Espinosa, L. (2012). The influence of campus racial climate on diversity in graduate education. *The Review of Higher Education, 35*(4), 535–566.

Guiffrida, D. A. (2005). Othermothering as a framework for understanding African American students' definitions of student-centered faculty. *The Journal of Higher Education, 76*(6), 701–723.

Gurin, P., Dey, E. L., Hurtado, S., & Gurin, G. (2002). Diversity and higher education: Theory and impact on educational outcomes. *Harvard Educational Review, 72*(3), 330–366.

Harding, S. G. (1992). After the neutrality ideal: Science, politics, and "strong objectivity". *Social Research, 59*(3), 567.

Harding, S. G. (2012). Objectivity and diversity. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of diversity in education* (Vol. 4, pp. 1625–1630). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Harper, S. R. (2015, December 10). Paying to ignore racism. *Inside Higher Ed.* Retrieved from https://www.insidehighered.com/views/2015/12/10/colleges-should-stop-paying-money-ignore-racial-problems-essay

Harper, S. R., & Hurtado, S. (2007). Nine themes in campus racial climates and implications for institutional transformation. *New Directions for Student Services, 120,* 7–24.

Hartley, M., & Morphew, C. C. (2008). What's being sold and to what end?: A content analysis of college viewbooks. *The Journal of Higher Education, 79*(6), 671–691.

Henstrand, J. L. (2006). Seeking an understanding of school culture: Using theory as a framework for observation and analysis. In V. A. Anfara & N. T. Mertz (Eds.), *Theoretical frameworks in qualitative research* (pp. 1–22). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hill, R. D., Castillo, L. G., Ngu, L. Q., & Pepion, K. (1999). Mentoring ethnic minority students for careers in academia: The WICHE doctoral scholars program. *The Counseling Psychologist, 27(6),* 827–845.

Hochschild, A. R. (1979). Emotion work, feeling rules, and social structure. *American Journal of Sociology, 85*(3), 551–575.

Holley, K. A., & Caldwell, M. L. (2012). The challenges of designing and implementing a doctoral student mentoring program. *Innovative Higher Education, 37*(3), 243–253.

Hurtado, S. (1994). Graduate school racial climates and academic self-concept among minority graduate students in the 1970s. *American Journal of Education, 102(3),* 330–351.

Hurtado, S. (2007). Linking diversity with the educational and civic missions of higher education. *The Review of Higher Education, 30*(2), 185–196.

Hurtado, S., Milem, J. F., Clayton-Pedersen, A., & Allen, W. R. (1998). Enhancing campus climates for racial/ethnic diversity: Educational policy and practice. *Review of Higher Education, 21*(3), 279–302.

Hurtado, S., Milem, J., Clayton-Pedersen, A., & Allen, W. (1999). *Enacting diverse learning environments: Improving the climate for racial/ethnic diversity in higher education.* ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report 26(8). Washington, DC: The George Washington University, Graduate School of Education and Human Development.

Hurtado, S., Griffin, K. A., Arellano, L., & Cuellar, M. (2008). Assessing the value of climate assessments: Progress and future directions. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 1*(4), 204–221.

Kelly, S., & Schweitzer, J. H. (1999). Mentoring within a graduate school setting. *College Student Journal, 33(1),* 130–148.

Kim, S. S., & Gelfand, M. J. (2003). The influence of ethnic identity on perceptions of organizational recruitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 63*(3), 396–416.

Klassen, M. L. (2001). Lots of fun, not much work, and no hassles: Marketing images of higher education. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education, 10(2),* 11–26.

Leslie, F. (2015, May 11). Minority Ph. D.'s find career success in STEM. *Chronicle of Higher Education.* Retrieved from http://chronicle.com/article/Minority-PhD-s-Find-Career/230043/?cid=at&utm_source=at&utm_medium=en

Lincoln, Y. S. (1995). Emerging criteria for quality in qualitative and interpretive research. *Qualitative Inquiry, 1*(3), 275–289.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Litwin, G. H., & Stringer Jr., R. A. (1968). *Motivation and organizational climate.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Margolis, E., & Romero, M. (1998). "The department is very male, very white, very old, and very conservative": The functioning of the hidden curriculum in graduate sociology departments. *Harvard Educational Review, 68*(1), 1–33.

Marichal, J. (2009). Frame evolution: A new approach to understanding changes in diversity reforms at public universities in the United States. *The Social Science Journal, 46*(1), 171–191.

McMurtrie, B. (2016, May 15). How do you create a diversity agenda? *Chronicle of Higher Education.* Retrieved from http://chronicle.com/article/How-Do-You-Create-a-Diversity/236427

Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Milem, J., Chang, M., & antonio, A. L. (2005). *Making diversity work on campus: A research-based perspective.* Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges & Universities.

Miles, M. B. & Huberman, A. M. (1994) *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Milkman, K. L., Akinola, M. & Chugh, D. (2015). What happens before? A field experiment exploring how pay and representation differentially shape bias on the pathway into organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 100*(6), 1678–1712.

Miller, C., & Stassun, K. (2014). A test that fails. *Nature, 510*(7504), 303–304.

Milner, R. (2007). Race, culture, and researcher positionality: Working through dangers seen, unseen, and unforeseen. *Educational Researcher, 36*(7), 388–400.

National Science Foundation [NSF] (2013). Doctorate recipients, by citizenship, race, ethnicity, and subfield of study: 2012. [Table 22]. NSF 14–305. *Science and Engineering Doctorates*. Retrieved from http://www.nsf.gov/statistics/srvydoctorates/#tools&tabs-3&infdsts

National Science Foundation. [NSF] (2015). Doctorate recipients from U. S. universities. NSF 15–304. Arlington, VA: National Center for Science and Engineering Statistics. Retrieved from http://www.nsf.gov/statistics/sed/2013/digest/nsf15304a.pdf

Nettles, M. T. (1990). Success in doctoral programs: Experiences of minority and White students. *American Journal of Education, 98*(4), 494–522.

Noy, S., & Ray, R. (2012). Graduate students' perceptions of their advisors: Is there systematic disadvantage in mentorship? *The Journal of Higher Education, 83*(6), 876–914.

Osei-Kofi, N., Torres, L. E., & Liu, J. (2013). Practices of whiteness: Racialization in college viewbooks. *Race, Ethnicity & Education, 16*(3), 386–405.

Page, S. E. (2008). *The difference: How the power of diversity creates better groups, firms, schools, and societies*. Princeton University Press.

Park, J. (2013). *When diversity drops: Race, religion, and affirmative action in higher education*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Porter, K. B., Posselt, J. R., Reyes, K., Slay, K. E., & Kamimura, A. (2018). Burdens and benefits of diversity work: Emotion management in STEM doctoral students. *Studies in Graduate and Postdoctoral Education, 9*(2), 127–143.

Posselt, J. R. (2014). Toward inclusive excellence in graduate education: Constructing merit and diversity in PhD admissions. *American Journal of Education, 120*(4),481–514.

Posselt, J. R. (2016). *Inside graduate admissions: Merit, diversity, and faculty gatekeeping*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Posselt, J. R. (2018). Rigor and support in racialized learning environments: The case of graduate education. *New Directions for Higher Education, 181*, 59–70.

Rankin, S. R., & Reason, R. D. (2005). Differing perceptions: How students of color and white students perceive campus climate for underrepresented groups. *Journal of College Student Development, 46(1)*, 43–61.

Rogers, M. R., & Molina, L. E. (2006). Exemplary efforts in psychology to recruit and retain graduate students of color. *American Psychologist, 61*(2), 143–156.

Rosenbaum, J. E., Becker, K. I., Cepa, K. A., & Zapata-Gietl, C. E. (2016). Turning the question around: Do colleges fail to meet students' expectations? *Research in Higher Education, 57*(5), 519–543.

Slay, K. E. (2017). Choosing colleges in a post-affirmative action era: Black students' perceptions of institutional diversity and campus climate. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI.

Smith, D. G. (2015). *Diversity's promise for higher education: Making it work* (2ⁿᵈ ed.). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Solem, M., Lee, J., & Schlemper, B. (2009). Departmental climate and student experiences in graduate geography programs. *Research in Higher Education, 50*(3), 268–292.

Solórzano, D. G. (1998). Critical race theory, racial and gender microaggressions, and the experiences of Chicana and Chicano scholars. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 11*(1), 121–136.

Sowell, R., Allum, J., & Okahana, H. (2015). *Doctoral initiative on minority attrition and completion.* Washington, DC: Council of Graduate Schools. Retrieved from http://www.cgsnet.org/ckfinder/userfiles/files/Doctoral_Initiative_on_Minority_Attrition_and_Completion_2015.pdf

Strayhorn, T. L. (2013). Measuring race and gender differences in undergraduate students' perceptions of campus climate and intentions to leave college: An analysis in Black and White. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice, 50*(2), 115–132.

Thomas, K. M., Willis, L. A., & Davis, J. (2007). Mentoring minority graduate students: issues and strategies for institutions, faculty, and students. *Equal Opportunities International, 26*(3), 178–192.

Tienda, M. (2013). Diversity ≠ inclusion: Promoting integration in higher education. *Educational Researcher, 42*(9), 467–475.

Tierney, W. G., & Bensimon, E.M. (1996). *Promotion and tenure: Community and socialization in academe.* Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Truong, K. A., & Museus, S. D. (2012). Responding to racism and racial trauma in doctoral study: An inventory for coping and mediating relationships. *Harvard Educational Review, 82*(2), 226–254.

Truong, K. A., Museus, S. D. & McGuire, K. M. (2016). Vicarious racism: A qualitative analysis of experiences with secondhand racism in graduate education. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 29*(2), 224–247.

Waddell-Terry, T. (2014). *The impact of multiple mentoring relationships on attrition in the Ed. D. program.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Drexel University, Philadelphia, PA.

Ward, K.M. & Zarate, M.E. (2015). The influence of campus racial climate on graduate student attitudes about the benefits of diversity. *Review of Higher Education, 38*(4), 589–617.

Weick, K. E. (2016). Constrained comprehending: The experience of organizational inquiry. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 61*(3), 333–346. doi:10.1177/0001839216633453

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

Weiss, R.S. (1995). Learning from strangers: The art and method of qualitative interview studies. New York, NY: Free Press.

Yin, R. (2014). *Case study research: Design and methods* (5ᵗʰ ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.