Promoting Academic Socialization Through Service Learning Experiences

Linda S. Behar-Horenstein,
University of Florida

Nadine Isaac
GCSCORED Caribbean

Charisse N. Southwell
Broward County Public Schools

Michael E. Hudson-Vassell
Broward College

Lian Niu
University of Florida

Melissa Pratto
Alachua County Public Schools

Kellie W. Roberts
University of Florida

Robert J. Wingfield
Boys Town Washington DC

Jeff D. Wolfgang
Xavier University of Louisiana

Mueen A. Zafar
Capital University of Science and Technology

This study explores the narratives of eight students who served as journal reviewers on a non-course-related service activity. The aim of this study was to develop an understanding of their experiences. The review board was multi-disciplinary in composition; the majority of its student and faculty members were from communities historically excluded from, and marginalized within, structures of U.S. higher education. Student engagement in learning how to manage an online journal fostered academic socialization through collaboration and collective learning. Students' perceptions of the benefits of working on the journal were categorized across five themes: Academic Career Enhancement, Practicing Faculty Work, Illuminating Faculty Roles, Demystifying Writing for Publication, and Grappling with Prioritization. The benefits and challenges of promoting academic socialization through service learning and mentorship, as well as showing how service engagement can be integrated in academic and personal identities, are discussed.

Tierney and Bensimon (1996) describe academic socialization as consisting of an Anticipatory and Organizational Stage. Anticipatory socialization occurs during graduate school as students participate, observe, and interact with faculty members (Rosser, 2004). Organizational socialization occurs prior to entering the academy and continues as individuals develop their roles as a faculty. Weidman, Twale, and Stein (2001) suggest that, in addition to the Anticipatory Stage, there are the Formal, Informal, and Personal Stages. They extend the definition of the Anticipatory Stage by suggesting that during graduate school students become aware of the behavioral, attitudinal, and cognitive expectations of prospective faculty. Observing the roles of new and older students, as well as learning the department norms and regulations and how they are carried out, are tasks in the Formal Stage. The Informal Stage is guided by interactions with older students and faculty as graduate students learn to observe and act in ways that are normative to the profession. During the Personal Stage (akin to the Organizational Stage) students internalize the social roles and structures characteristic of the profession, accept a value orientation, and relinquish former ways as they develop their own professional identity. Although socialization may vary widely by institution and discipline (Gardner, 2008), the literature implies that an understanding of faculty work begins in graduate school (Austin, 2002).

Graduate education offers students opportunities to experience the skills and expectations characteristic of faculty work (Austin, 2002). They undergo several socialization processes simultaneously related to the role of the graduate student, academic life, the profession, and a specific discipline or field (Golde, 1998; Staton, & Darling, 1989). Students facing socialization tasks ask the following questions: 1. Can I do this? 2. Do I want to be a graduate student? 3. Do I want to do this work? 4. Do I belong here? (Golde,1998).

Service learning is integral to training and preparing students for future roles as practitioners or professors (Felten, & Clayton, 2011). Unlike the lecture or other teacher-centered instruction, it helps students recognize the benefits of working with others and offers authentic opportunities to integrate the linkage between theorizing, learning information, and applying it in practice. Service learning is a required component of study in such disciplines as counselor education, (Arnold & McMurtery, 2011), medical education, teacher education (Ethridge, 2006), gerontology, computer graphics (Hutzel, 2007), and social work education (Maccio, 2011). Typically, service-learning experiences—also referred to as practicums, internships, or field-based placements—require tuition be paid. In the academy, service learning is described as committee work; faculty senate work; service within the department, college, or institution; or external service at the local, state, national, or international level (Rosser, 2004). In the latter context, faculty lend their expertise and time; it is not required and rarely remunerated. It is this type of service that is the focus of this research inquiry.

Documenting students' experiences during service activities and discussing them simultaneously can facilitate the students' capacity to bridge classroom learning with actual practices. As a pedagogy that depends on reflection to facilitate learning (Jacoby, 2003), the definition of service learning has broadened. Felten and Clayton (2011) summarize the potential benefits of service learning as the following:

- Advancing learning goals (academic and civic) and community purposes
- Fostering reciprocal collaboration among students, faculty/staff, community members, community organizations, and educational institutions to fulfill shared objectives and build capacity among all partners
- Stimulating critical reflection and assessment processes designed to facilitate and document meaningful learning and service outcomes (p. 76).

Challenging students to become producers of knowledge, service learning encourages transformative change. Thus, engagement in service learning can help students surpass their traditional classroom identities as consumers of unalterable knowledge (Felton & Clayton, 2011). Researchers suggest that service learning has a positive impact (Maccio, 2011) and emphasize developing skills that help students respond to community needs in accordance with their disciplines (Arnold & McMurtery, 2011; Baker & Murray, 2011; Leung, Liu, Wang, & Chen, 2006; Maccio, 2011). Continued research into service-learning experiences can improve practice and contribute to the knowledge base of educational practices. Nevertheless, there is a dearth in the studies that identify the contributions of service learning beyond the non-profit sector (Carpenter, 2011). Research about student experiences in service might augment educators' and professors' knowledge about the type of preparation, foundational knowledge, and skill-based learning that students need to maximize the benefits of field-based practice.

The purpose of this study was to explore the experiences of eight graduate student participants who acted as journal reviewers on a service-learning project while assisting with the management and production of an online educational journal. The researchers' aim was to develop an understanding of how students benefited from working under faculty supervision outside of the classroom. Three research questions guided this inquiry: 1. What themes emerge from students' experiences with service learning while working on an online journal? 2. How are students' academic socialization experiences highlighted by the themes of their narratives? 3. Based upon student experiences, what is the potential for this type of service learning to be implemented and for its capacity to build bridges between the classroom and knowledge-creation?

Theoretical Framework

In this study, the faculty student relationship within service learning experiences is organized around the framework of mentorship, often a central activity in the Anticipatory Stage of academic socialization. The aim of this study is to explore mentoring through the student-advisor relationship and the interactions that characterize it. In the academy, mentoring is a personal relationship with more experienced faculty who provide knowledge, advice, challenge, counsel, and support. Mentoring is significant to the development of students' scholarly potential and to promulgating the traditions of intellectual inquiry (Rosser, 2004).

Betts and Pepe (2005) showed that success, awareness, and advancement are among the positive benefits of mentoring. Facing the arduous process of publishing, faculty mentors play a pivotal role when they show graduate students how to turn their ideas into publishable papers. Mentoring and service learning experience in the academy provide opportunities for graduate students to identify career trajectories, and to be exposed to experiences that are akin to actual job placements while still having access to the mentor's expertise, knowledge, and experiences. A growing body of literature suggests that the role of the graduate mentor is neither as central nor as extensive in socializing students into the academy as traditionally assumed (Bieber & Worley, 2006) due to an overreliance on inactive means for transmitting knowledge and building student capacity. In the advisor-advisee mentoring relationship, knowledge is often transmitted passively. As applied in this study, service learning as an occasion for mentorship will extend the concept of mentorship for developing student capacity through progressive engagement.

Methods

Participants

Eight graduate students who served on the editorial board of the online journal were invited to participate in this study. As part of the board, they assisted in managing the online journal and reviewing manuscripts for potential publication. The board met monthly to discuss the reviewers' comments on manuscript submissions and to determine whether or not to publish a manuscript in its current form, request a revision, or reject the submission. The aim of the journal was to build a body of educational leadership studies that accomplished the following: 1) fostered an appreciation for faculty and staff diversity; 2) promoted culturally

and linguistically responsive teaching; and 3) explored how those practices affect student achievement, school climate, and instruction. Each year, one doctoral student was appointed to serve as an assistant editor who was responsible for assigning manuscripts to reviewers, ensuring that prospective publications were sent to another student—also appointed—who maintained the journal's tracking system, and sending completed reviews to the Editor-in-Chief for final dispositions. All of the participants were doctoral students seeking degrees in educational leadership, higher education, counselor education, and school psychology. Four females and four males participated in the study including one student from China and one from Pakistan, three African American students, and three White students.

Data Collection and Analysis

Two doctoral graduate students, who had served on the journal's board for less than one year, interviewed the remaining eight graduate students (participants) who had more than two years of experience on the board. Students conducted the interview to minimize bias from the editors who served as the mentors and, also, because they had some familiarity with the roles of journal's board members. Participants were interviewed about their experiences while serving on the editorial board, their perceptions of service learning, lessons they learned about getting published and doing the work of a reviewer, and insights they gained from observing interactions between the journal's Editor-In-Chief and Associate Editor.

Participants were asked to respond to the questions in Table 1. Interviews were scheduled at mutually agreed upon times and locations and ranged from 30 to 90 minutes. After receiving signed consent forms, the participants' responses were audiotaped and transcribed verbatim by the interviewers. One of the interviewers and a professor with expertise in qualitative research open coded the data independently. After recording the open codes of the eight interview transcripts, the first and second authors met to compare their analyses. Using NVivo 10, they reached consensus on the themes and related conceptual definitions. Qualitative methods were used because they permitted a greater depth of insight and emergent understanding than a quantitative approach. The names used for participants and professors are pseudonyms.

An analysis of the interview transcripts revealed five emergent themes including the following: Academic Career Enhancement, Practicing Faculty Work, Illuminating Faculty Roles, Demystifying Writing for Publication, and Grappling with Prioritization. Conceptual definitions of the themes are shown in Table 2.

Results

The five themes that emerged are presented in rank order from highest to lowest frequency along with exemplars of each theme.

Academic career enhancement. Stan described the importance of working together, sharing that he "liked being a part of creating a group of diverse publications that tied into each other." He particularly liked working with others on the board: "It is like being in this process as a student without having those shackles of produce, produce, produce." Hamid enjoyed the lack of bureaucratic structures that typify most organizations: "I found that there was no hierarchy, that you could approach anyone and communicate your own thoughts." Similarly, Chan commented about the social aspects of working on the board, "It is really helpful for me to feel comfortable working together with other board members and communicating with the others."

Participants explained what they learned by observing interactions and listening to others. Working in teams to complete reviews of each manuscript was essential to ensuring fairness. They proffered that having only a single person conduct a review might lead to questions about the veracity or validity of the reviewer's comments. Soliciting colleagues across the nation to participate in the review process, they believed, helped build a network for both the journal and themselves. Aside from the process of reviewing, participants reported that the editors had a great working relationship and were supportive of the students. Participants felt that they were committed to developing partnerships and strong networks and that they were supportive of prospective authors.

When asked to describe how serving in the role of reviewer enhanced her academic career, Antonia reported that she "learned tons, [including the] day-to-day, the nuts and bolts [of] getting a paper through the entire review process." She described how the journal helped her sustain her course of study: "It kept me here, it kept me grounded, gave me hope, I guess, [because] it gets very lonely in this college." The journey towards earning a doctoral degree is often a single and solitary focus. Unless a doctoral student is going to school with friends who share similar interests, curiosity, or skills, often there are few people outside the academy with whom they can describe their work, share conversations, or explain the activities that occupy their daily lives. Stan reported that he had "gained a new respect for what's going on and then understanding the process of what it takes, [sometimes] the three or four reviews of an article." Having served on the board, he believed, was "really going to allow me, when I become a professional academic, to really participate in being an editor." Moreover, he felt that

Table 1
Service Learning Experiences Questionnaire for the Graduate Student Participants

1.	Describe your experiences as a board member.
2.	What have you learned?
3.	What have you liked/disliked in your role as an editorial board member?
4.	What have you learned from being a reviewer?
5.	What have you learned from watching professors interact during board meetings?
6.	What have you learned about the flowchart of procedures pertaining to conducting reviews?
7.	What have you learned about the process of online publication/publication?
8.	How have you balanced the responsibilities of editorial board service and graduate studies?
9.	What have you learned about "quality" research from your editorial board service?
10.	What have you learned about the role of service in academia?

Table 2
Themes and Conceptual Definitions

Themes	Conceptual Definitions of Themes
Academic Career Enhancement	Mentoring through journal work; describing how serving as a reviewer enhanced academic career opportunities.
Practicing Faculty Work	Applying journal review protocol; identifying characteristics of good research.
Illuminating Faculty Roles	Expressing beliefs about the meaning of service.
Demystifying Writing for Publication	Acquiring insight into writing for publication.
Grappling with Prioritization	Completing reviews in a timely manner.

reading "other people's research and seeing it, helped me to be a better researcher." Candy emphasized the transportability of her work, exclaiming that she would "be able to use [this experience in her] own writing and [while] working with someone else." She reported having become more professional, especially when having to e-mail colleagues and indicate that their papers were not accepted. For all of the members, this was their first time serving on a review board; it provided a unique opportunity unlike those they had in their courses. Describing the relationship among board members and the editors, participants observed the interpersonal communication and spoke about maintaining a professional stance. Molly found that disagreeing with others did not have to result in disagreeableness: "Even if you disagree, it is not really personal as long as everyone has the philosophical underpinnings of [the] journal. Then the disagreements can be solved in a reasonable fashion." She appreciated the dynamics cultivated by the editors that led to a group norm such that "opinions were respected" and that board members received the same credibility as the professors. Hamid explained that the service learning experiences enhanced his academic career "immensely [pointing out that he] now [had] five publications in the year [following his graduation]." He explained the differences between his Far Asian university culture with the university

where he completed his doctoral work, and noted the following:

> Many of the PhD's in my university [rarely] start with publications in the first two years because they feel overwhelmed. But because [getting published] was ingrained in me early [in my studies], I think that gave me a lot of impetus.

Nate was reassured as he acquired "more insight or confidence [indicative that he] was doing things the right way." He learned that he only needed an invitation from scholars and professors, that he had just needed someone who would share "the secret [because I had] never learned about publication." After being invited to write for the journal and recognizing the gift of fostering others' growth, he discovered the importance of "being as giving as possible to people who are new." For several students, the journal offered their first venue for getting published. Feeling a sense of accomplishment and joy in getting their research published fueled some board members to seek other venues for their work, but with a discernible sense of purpose and confidence.

The editors tried to impart to students the necessary knowledge about how to conduct reviews effectively, solicit other professors to review, and develop an online journal publication. Students described how the editors'

interactions influenced their own growth as prospective academic professionals. Overwhelmingly, students felt that the professors' interactions were exemplars. Chan stated, "I think it is a very good example of how collegiality works in college, because faculty members can work together to expand their own specialty, and put together all their good ideas and get something done." Stan described the balance between the Editor-in-Chief and Associate Editor and how he liked that "one's expertise would support one area of the publication process and then the other's expertise in another area." He also appreciated that "the Editor-in-Chief and the [Associate] Editor were really all about diversity [and] about work that benefitted participants." Nate stated the following:

> I love watching Dr. Harper and Dr. Walker interact; it was almost fun. They kind of have fun with hard work. They joked and were very personable in their style. They are extremely organized [and] incredible writers [who] are able to create agendas and time lines very efficiently. They kept teamwork as their main theme but always showed appreciation. No matter how much you put in, or how little, you got a lot of love, and that was consistent. They made me feel important.

Candy expressed her indebtedness to Dr. Harper who provided her with unique opportunities: "[In] my other graduate degree [program] I didn't have these experiences." She explained, "She pushed me to do [what] has been so beneficial and so educational." Molly appreciated the collegiality provided by the editors and the students, grateful that everybody worked together "in a positive fashion." Antonia summarized the group's sentiments, pointing out that she learned a lot about "what mentoring could look like." Participants also expressed their appreciation for the opportunity to serve in this role. Candy stated, "We didn't walk in there knowing this. Instead she guided us and we learned by doing and learned by watching her do. And I think that's the only way to learn something like this is to get your hands wet, and we did." Also, because the review process often took them out of their comfort zone, they were grateful that the professors valued their opinion.

Students felt empowered and respected. Receiving praise for work completed and a certificate acknowledging their service at the end of the year affirmed their contribution. They acknowledged the professors' openness to their various contributions. Because she worked full time, Molly could rarely attend monthly meetings. Yet, she provided input because she knew that her perspectives were welcomed. Max concurred, stating that having mentors who understood that students were grappling with many responsibilities was helpful.

Commenting about the characteristics of quality research, Candy "learned what kinds of studies were appropriate [or] were really considered scholarly when they arrived." At times she was flabbergasted "with the level [of work] that people would send" to the journal when they did not quite finish the manuscript or the topic did not fit the journal's aim. Stan remarked that he "really learned the importance of beginning clear" in writing. He opined that quality research was conditional as well as dependent on the journal's focus, "so I'm looking for research that is going to give us new information, not a complete repetition of what is already out there." Molly reported, "There is also a lot of variation in the quality of research. Some of it was really low-level, not really well thought out; others were." Overall, students discerned the differences in the characteristics that distinguished quality and non-quality studies. Weaknesses of some studies, they discovered, oftentimes occurred due to unacceptable style format. The lack of clarity actually influenced their opinion of the manuscript's quality. Nate surmised that quality research is an author's ability to "explicate the theory, content or the idea of the hypotheses into a digestible format." Participants reported that quality research articles must be clear and supported by substantial evidence, by numerical findings in quantitative studies, or by rich thick descriptions for qualitative studies.

Practicing faculty work. Describing those experiences she had while analyzing manuscripts using the journal's American Psychological Association (APA) reference system, Chan reported "learn[ing] a lot about [the] detailed format style." After observing the tedious nature of reviewing manuscripts for their correctness of style, Max stated, "APA is extremely intricate." He noted that at times there are "subtleties that you would not normally pick up on unless you've seen a lot of articles." Prospective authors may not realize how using the proper citation affects an individual's ability to provide a substantive review. However, as one participant noted, reviewers may be so distracted by APA errors that they end up focusing more on style than the content of a manuscript. This can hinder a critical analysis or supportive critique.

Antonia and others described the benefits and disadvantages of being a reviewer, as well as their perceptions of the procedural guidelines that governed the review process: "A lot of work was completed independently and there were holes in decisions that needed to be attended to." She observed that when the board was together there were at least about six eyes on any one thing. Candy concurred, stating, "A lot of sets of eyes is helpful and so clarifying." Chan noted the following:

[I] liked [the] opportunities to learn how to run a journal, from the very beginning [including] how to identify reviewers, how to communicate with authors, how to design a call for manuscripts, [as well as how] to target some certain researchers and let them know that there is such a journal.

Max appreciated the opportunity to work with an international author, later adding, "When I first got into the journal I was a little surprised [about the intensity of what] I was encountering as far as the process of review." However, because the quantity of articles he had to review was limited, he focused more intensely on the process rather than *"just doing for the sake of doing it."*

Students were grateful that their introduction to becoming a reviewer was eased by sitting down together reviewing and the journal's mission and objectives. This discussion gave everyone an idea about the journal's purpose and the kind of articles that were being sought. During the Editor's second year, the review process was standardized with use of a flowchart that included stages and related procedures, as well as the type of decision letters that would be sent to the prospective authors. Prior to that, the review process was at times exasperating, muddied by the lack of a clear procedure that guided the process.

Illuminating faculty roles. Students described their beliefs about doing service and the benefits. Antonia explained, "People who don't get this experience don't think that that is their responsibility to the society or to their community." Chan described the way that service is typically perceived: "Before this experience I always thought that service was just something required by a university." From serving on the board, she surmised that "actually doing service is an integrated part of your own academic work." Prior to serving on the editorial board, Max believed that service was a personal decision and that publication and teaching were the most important university activities, "but since watching these two professors work, I'm becoming more opposed to that notion." He found that "engaging in service on the journal helped me understand [and] to engage in reflective practice as a rule." Molly criticized the lack of service outreach provided by higher education faculty and pointed out that they did not "do as good of a job as K-12" in providing service-learning opportunities.

Participants enjoyed learning outside the classroom and acknowledged like Chan that being a reviewer "helps your research [and] teaching because it gives you opportunity to see academic work from other perspectives." Students also agreed that editorial board work was clearly different from community outreach or undertaking administrative responsibilities. Others

cautioned not becoming mired in excessive service commitments, pointing out that the dominant, hegemonic university culture would not be supportive.

Demystifying writing for publication. When asked to explain her understanding of how to develop and submit journal manuscripts, Antonia remarked that, before she was on the board, she was aware that "oftentimes what is published is controlled so it does not really represent the extent of knowledge available instead it represents the knowledge that certain people deem knowledge-worthy." Nate shared that "writing and publishing a manuscript was [a] mystery." He described that getting published was "a secret nobody was willing to invite me to learn about." Candy believed that reviewing others' manuscripts "improved her writing." Most of the participants stressed that carrying out the research design carefully and reporting sufficient information was indispensable. They emphasized the importance of becoming familiar with the journal's main purpose and aligning research with the journal's focus. Echoing this point, Stan described writing a manuscript as "an iterative process and conversation, so even if you submit and you get rejected, you know to go back and restructure and find another journal that would fit." He also surmised that writing a manuscript was really a "true dialogue between a group of professionals [and] reviewers [who] are experts [who] hopefully can provide dialogue."

Grappling with prioritization. Antonia had "nightmares about things not being finished." Nate shared how difficult it became to prepare timely reviews when he "was overwhelmed" with practicum and course work. However, he found that having another board member to turn to during this time "was really beneficial." Through this experience, Max found that being organized is essential to being successful in the academy. He observed, "Academic life is hard, and it is a lot of work in massive quantities." Along with developing organizational skills, students learned the importance of allocating time and pre-planning in order to complete reviews and other journal tasks.

Discussion

Five themes emerged from this study of eight graduate students' experiences while serving as editorial board members of an online journal. These themes, described in order of frequency, included the following: Academic Career Enhancement, Practicing Faculty Work, Illuminating Faculty Roles, Demystifying Writing for Publication, and Grappling with Prioritization The themes aligned with components of Betts and Pepe's (2005) five factor theory, including the identification of success (Academic career enhancement and Demystifying writing for publication), awareness (Practicing faculty work,

Illuminating faculty roles, and Grappling with prioritization) and advancement (Academic career enhancement).

The board experience improved students' capacity to see themselves as future academicians. Participants found that opportunities to learn outside the classroom broadened the depth of their research scholarship and teaching (Felten & Clayton, 2011). They expressed healthy academic socialization in comparison to some of their peers. Doctoral students, who report feeling stuck, usually feel a lack of belonging or connectedness to a learning community. Left without a compass, often they are compelled to wander and figure things out on their own. However, for these participants, who represented less than 1% of the college's total number of graduate students, their academic journey was enriched. Moreover, as this study showed, the participants were keen observers and listeners. They attended to the professors' remarks and interactions (Austin, 2002). Unlike Bieber and Worley's (2006) findings, the journal editors actively socialized and mentored students into the academy. The participants spoke at length about those experiences they had and the skills they developed, emphasizing their value and application to future work as members of an academic institution. They expressed gratitude for being mentored in their research and publications. Others described how the collaboration inside and outside of meetings was helpful to easing the requirements of board service and balancing it with their doctoral studies, as well as providing a comfortable social setting.

Convening meetings and conferencing with other students reduced participants' sense of isolation and helped them recognize that their experiences in classes, with professors and other students were not unique: instead, they were quite universal. Observation of the editors' interactions helped them learn the importance of being collegial. They discovered that in the academic world it is not about disagreeing or agreeing: it is about diplomacy and expressing intellectual viewpoints with civility and clarity (Rosser, 2004)

This particular service activity was not a requirement for degree seeking students. Given the students' commitment, attendance at monthly board meetings, constancy with completing reviews, communication with prospective authors, and maintenance of the journal's website tracking system, the process very nearly mirrored some of the service work that university faculty are often asked to do. The participants developed a deeper understanding of how to review manuscripts and acquired insight into publishing an online journal. In some respects, being a board member provided a microcosm of the arduous work that researchers must undertake in order to become published, as it mirrored the tasks that researchers face and the inherent challenges of expressing one's scholarly voice.

The findings suggest that these graduate students benefited from critiquing scholarship, reviewing manuscripts, and understanding the publication process in general. Some of the service experiences were liberating as students came to identify their own conceptions of scholarship. As they acquired a sense of themselves as scholars, they felt affirmed and empowered. Group interactions strengthened the conviction that putting forth their own scholarship was an important contribution to building knowledge in their disciplines.

Societal expectations of the academy have changed as community leaders ask how the university and faculty can contribute to the well-being of its citizens (Austin, 2002). Participants acquired clarity about what types of activities could be identified as service experiences and how they be could be translated into scholarship. The participants also expressed dismay that more of the professors in their discipline were not engaged in service. Initially, participants struggled as they tried to understand what service is, when to accept it, and what its personal value is. They also grappled with their service's value to the institution, as well as colleagues' assessment of their service engagement.

Participants reflected upon the qualitatively different experiences that the board offered in contrast to course work. For example, several participants found the academy unappealing because its political structure marginalized individuals, minority students in particular. Like those students who come to the academy because they believe that it offers a promise to change society, some participants discovered that the institutional structure does not favor the ends they hope for. Several of the participants had learning experiences that inculcated a sense of powerlessness rather than agency, thus highlighting the challenges associated with the four socialization tasks articulated by Golde (1989). Without the benefit of these mentoring relationships, they would not have had the opportunity to publish. In the institution, most students remain unexposed to the processes that show them how knowledge is codified, as well as which knowledge is considered worthy to the educational research community and, thus, disseminated. For some participants, serving on the board refueled an interest in the academy as a potential career. The editorial board experiences provided them with a glimpse of how to become published. In contrast, many of the participants were repelled when they realized that in fact it was often someone else, unknown to them, that assessed the value and credibility of research studies. These discoveries heightened their fear that their own work might be rejected and remain unknown by others. For students who have been historically marginalized, it seems that the board work offered a collegial setting by providing a sense of belongingness and hopefulness and that indeed their

scholarly contributions merited appreciation. Moreover, perhaps the authenticity of the interpersonal interactions and the persistent focus on the board's primary agenda also signaled that there are places in the academy where marginalization, micro-aggression, and disregard for individuals based on racial and ethnic background are not a constant in everyday work life.

Serving as editorial board members helped demystify the process of writing for publication and publishing in a journal. Interactions with the editors, in particular, and with other board members gave credence to students' research interests, affirmed their potential and ability to write, and increased their self-efficacy as scholars. This service learning provided opportunities for student reflection that could deepen the nexus between information processing, hypothesizing, and applying new skills, particularly as several students began to write for publication and experience success. The study findings mirror previous studies that have found service learning augments students' self-efficacy. In a study that explored the effects of service learning and community service on the cognitive and affective development of 22,236 college undergraduates' service, Astin, Vogelgesang, Ikeda, and Yee (2000) found that thirty percent of the undergraduates had participated in course-based community service (service learning) during college, and an additional 46 percent participated in another form of community service. Their findings showed that service participation had significant positive effects on all 11outcome measures of academic performance, including self-efficacy. In a meta-analytic review of the existing evidence on extent and types of change in participants in service-learning programs, Conway, Amel, and Gerwien (2009) found that self-efficacy increased as result of service (Billig, 2002; Eyler, 2002; Yates & Youniss, 1996).

Serving on the board, though unlike community outreach, was another avenue to fulfill service. The graduate student participants acknowledged that universities typically consider service important for faculty while pointing out that colleagues and mentors often caution newer faculty to guard their time and not to over-engage (Griffin, 2013). Their caution about not taking on too many service commitments showed that they were mindful of departmental philosophies and cultural norms (Austin, 2002).

Since the conclusion of this study, it is noteworthy that six of the board members who matriculated with their doctoral degrees have been hired into university settings, and two have attained candidacy.. We make no claim that there is a casual relationship between journal board service and academic placement.

The academic socialization evidenced in this study illustrates that the necessary knowledge, skills, and values that students need for successful entry into a professional career can be acquired via journal editorial

board service (Weidman et al., 2001). The findings point to the central role that mentoring and collaboration played in these young scholars' Anticipatory Stage of academic socialization. Although the long-term impact of service engagement on these participants is unknown, serving on the editorial board provided an opportunity for participants to consider how service engagement can be integrated in their academic and personal identities (Griffin, 2013).

This paper presents a case study of eight students who served on an editorial board for an online journal, highlighting what they saw as the benefits of their participation. In conclusion, the findings present an exploration of the way a particular kind of academic service learning is involved in the academic socialization of doctoral students.

References

Arnold, R., & McMurtery, R. F. (2011). Integrating service learning into counselor education: Applications and implications. *Researcher: An Interdisciplinary Journal, 24*(1), 59-74.

Astin, A. W., Vogelgesang, L. J., Ikeda, E. K., & Yee, J. A. (2000). *How service learning affects students*. Los Angeles, CA: Higher Education Research Institute, University of California.

Austin, A. E. (2002). Preparing the next generation of faculty: Graduate school as socialization to the academic career. *The Journal of Higher Education, 73*(1), 94-122.

Baker, P. H., & Murray, M. M. (2011). Building community partnerships: Learning to serve while learning to teach. *The School Community Journal, 21*(1), 113-127.

Betts, S. C., & Pepe, L. J. (2005). The value of mentoring: A five-factor framework. Proceedings from *Allied Academies International Conference. Academy of Organizational Culture, Communications and Conflict, 10*(1), 1-5.

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

Billig, S. H. (2002). Support for K–12 service learning practice: A brief review of the research. *Educational Horizons, 80,* 184–189.

Carpenter, H. (2011). How we could measure community impact of nonprofit graduate students' service-learning projects: Lessons from the literature. *Journal of Public Affairs Education, 17*(1), 115-131.

Conway, J. M., Amel, E. L., & Gerwien, D. P. (2009). Teaching and learning in the social context: a meta-analysis of service learning's effects on academic, personal, social, and citizenship. *Outcomes Teaching of Psychology, 36*, 233–245.

Ethridge, E. A. (2006). Teacher modeling of active citizenship via service-learning in teacher education. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning, 14*(1), 49-65.

Eyler, J. (2002). Reflection: Linking service and learning—Linking students and communities. *Journal of Social Issues, 58,* 517–534.

Felten, P., & Clayton, P. H. (2011). Service learning. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, Winter* (128), 75-84.

Gardner, S. K. (2008). Fitting the mold of graduate school: A qualitative study of socialization in doctoral education. *Innovation in Higher Education, 33*(2), 125-138.

Golde, C. M. (1998). Beginning graduate school: Explaining first year doctoral attrition. *New Directions for Higher Education*, *101*, 55-64.

Griffin, K. S. (2013). The calculus of yes and no: How one professor makes decisions about academic service. *Thought and Action, 29,* 35-43.

Hutzel, K. (2007). A service-learning approach to teaching computer graphics. *Art Education, 60*(1), 33-38.

Jacoby, B. (2003). *Building partnerships for service-learning*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Leung, K., Liu, W., Wang, W., & Chen, C. (2007). Factors affecting students' evaluation in a community service-learning program. *Advances in Health Sciences Education, 12*(4), 475-490. doi:10.1007/s10459-006-9019-1.

Maccio, E. M. (2011). Graduate social work students' attitudes toward service-learning. *Journal of Teaching in Social Work, 31*(2), 163-177. doi:10.1080/08841233.2011.560539.

Rosser, V. J. (2004). The socialization and mentoring of doctoral students: A faculty's imperative. *Educational Perspectives, 37*(2), 28-33.

Staton, A. Q., & Darling, A. L. (1989). Socialization of teaching assistants. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 39*, 15-22.

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

Weidman, J. C., Twale, D. J., & Stein, E. L. (2001). Socialization of graduate and professional students in higher education: A perilous passage? *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, 28*(3), 5-136.

Yates, M., & Youniss, J. (1996). A developmental perspective on community service in adolescence. *Social Development, 5,* 85–111.

DR. LINDA S. BEHAR-HORENSTEIN is Distinguished Teaching Scholar and Professor in the Colleges of Dentistry, Education, Veterinary Medicine, and Pharmacy, Director CTSI, Educational Development and Evaluation, and Co-Director at the University of Florida, College of Dentistry, HRSA Faculty Development Program. Her publications focus on faculty development, critical thinking in college students, cultural competency, and the assessment of behavioral, cognitive, and attitudinal change among faculty and students in professional schools.

DR. NADINE ISAAC holds a doctoral degree in Counselor Education from the University of Florida (UF). She is a national scholar of Trinidad and Tobago with a passion for working for children. She has served on the editorial board of the Florida Journal of Educational Administration and Policy (FJEAP) and as an editorial assistant for the Interamerican Journal of Psychology (IJP). Her research interests includes traumatic stress in children and social and emotional competence. She is currently a research and training consultant and professional counselor at GCSCORED Caribbean.

DR. MICHAEL E. HUDSON-VASSELL is a Senior Research Associate in Institutional Research at Broward College in Fort Lauderdale, Florida. Michael has served as a legislative policy analyst with the Florida Legislature and an instructor in research methods and design. His primary research interests include the study of teacher influence on the educational performance of Black children. His work has incorporated the use of quantitative methodology in critical and emancipatory education studies.

DR. CHARISSE N. SOUTHWELL is a Research Specialist for Title 1 Schools with Broward County Public Schools in Fort Lauderdale, Florida. Charisse has taught higher education courses on the socialization of race and culture in education and society. She has also taught courses on research design that feature emancipatory considerations for traditional approaches to inquiry. Her interests include interdisciplinary research methods for studying critical social justice in educator development and practice.

DR. LIAN NIU received Ph.D. in Higher Education Administration from the University of Florida. Her research interests include college teaching and learning, higher education equity and access, underrepresented students, and student learning outcomes assessment. Her previous publications focus on the effectiveness of teaching interventions of critical thinking skills in the college context.

DR. MELISSA PRATTO is a middle school assistant principal in Gainesville, Florida. Her research interests center around public practice, teacher development, culturally responsive approaches to behavior management, and their effects on student achievement in the middle school setting. She has been a past

member of the editorial board of the Florida Journal of Educational Administration and Policy. She has co-authored several publications, including a paper which was presented at the 2015 meeting of the American Educational Research Association.

DR. KELLIE W. ROBERTS is a faculty member at the University of Florida where she is Director of the Dial Center for Written and Oral Communication and Director of Forensics coaching the nationally competitive UF Speech and Debate Team. She has been named the Southeast Forensics Coach of the Year, Florida Communication Association Teacher of the Year, and is a recipient of the American Forensics Association's Distinguished Service Award and the Mort Wolfson Faculty Award for Outstanding Service to UF Students. Her research interests include communication in the disciplines, higher education curriculum, mentoring, and peer evaluation of college teaching.

DR. ROBERT J. WINGFIELD is Chief Psychologist of Boys Town Washington DC Behavioral Health Clinic, is a licensed psychologist specializing in individual, group, and family therapy within a behavioral pediatrics model of care. He earned a B.A. in Psychology from McDaniel College, followed by a M.A. in School Psychology from Towson University. He earned a Ph.D. in School Psychology from the University of Florida. He completed pre-doctoral training at Boys Town Center for Behavioral Health in Omaha, Nebraska. He completed specialized training in psychology as a postdoctoral fellow at Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine and Kennedy Krieger Institute in Baltimore, Maryland.

DR. JEFF D. WOLFGANG PhD graduated from the University of Florida. He is trained in marriage & family and clinical mental health counseling. He is currently working clinically in Jacksonville, FL and teaching as an adjunct professor at Argosy University, University of North Florida, and is an affiliate faculty of the Center for Traumatic Stress Research at Xavier University in Louisiana. Dr. Wolfgang has a strong research methodology background in both qualitative and quantitative methods. His work focuses on pediatric counseling issues, culture-centered counseling, and the relationship between traumatic stress and attachment for young children.

DR. MUEEN A. ZAFAR PhD was the Senior Vice President for HR & Training at the MCB Bank Ltd. Pakistan (2001-2006). In 2011 he completed his PhD in leadership and higher education administration from the University of Florida. He was the Department Chair in Business Administration for the International Islamic University, Islamabad, Pakistan (1997-2001), Assistant Dean in the School of Leadership at Riphah International University, Islamabad (2011-12), Dean (Administrative Sciences) at Air University, Islamabad (2012-16). Currently, Dr. Zafar is Professor and Dean (Quality Enhancement Cell), at the Capital University of Science and Technology, Islamabad teaches PhD, MS, MBA & BBA and supervises PhD/MS students.