THE CULTURE OF THE COLLEGE ACCESS PROFESSION

by

Nancy Ann Singer

_____

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF HIGHER EDUCATION

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
For the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

In the Graduate College

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

2009

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
GRADUATE COLLEGE

As members of the Dissertation Committee, we certify that we have read the dissertation prepared by Nancy Ann Singer entitled The Culture of the College Access Profession and recommend that it be accepted as fulfilling the dissertation requirement for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

_____ Date: 5/14/09
John Cheslock

_____ Date: 5/14/09
Jenny Lee

_____ Date: 5/14/09
Gary Rhoades

Final approval and acceptance of this dissertation is contingent upon the candidate's submission of the final copies of the dissertation to the Graduate College. I hereby certify that I have read this dissertation prepared under my direction and recommend that is be accepted as fulfilling the dissertation requirement.

_____ Date: 5/14/09
Dissertation Director: John Cheslock

STATEMENT BY AUTHOR

This dissertation has been submitted in partial fulfillment of requirements for an advanced degree at the University of Arizona and is deposited in the University Library to be made available to borrowers under rules of the Library.

Brief quotations from this dissertation are allowable without special permission, provided that accurate acknowledgment of source is made. Requests for permission for extended quotation from or reproduction of this manuscript in whole or in part may be granted by the head of the major department or the Dean of the Graduate College when in his or her judgment the proposed use of the material is in the interests of scholarship. In all other instances, however, permission must be obtained from the author.

SIGNED: Nancy Singer

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS - *Continued*

TABLE OF CONTENTS – *continued*

LIST OF TABLES

ABSTRACT

The overall goal of the research was to deepen our understanding of the culture of college access work through the views of practitioners who design and staff college access programs. This study sought to explore the values, standards, philosophical foundations, career patterns, and networks that influence and guide the work of college access professionals. The study was based primarily upon interviews with twenty college and university professionals who work in the state of Arizona and an analysis of the professional associations in which they participate. The study was modeled after Becher's analysis of the culture of academic disciplines and interview questions fell in the following categories: 1) characteristics of the field, 2) epistemological issues, 3) career patterns, 4) reputations and rewards, 5) professional activity, and 6) value systems. Results indicate that college access professionals tend to describe their work in terms of programs and services to students, family engagement, and developing capacity in the schools. The use of research varies amongst practitioners. The change in the scope of college access work and the growth in the field have also led to the creation of new professional associations. Implications of the study include the need for practioners and professional associations to collaborate, and the need for practitioners to build their knowledge base of the research supporting their work.

INTRODUCTION

This dissertation is the result of a qualitative research study focusing on college and university professionals in the state of Arizona that work in K-12 college access programs. The goal of these college access programs is to increase the number of underrepresented students enrolled on college and university campuses. The study was based primarily upon interviews with those that work in the profession and an analysis of the professional associations in which they participate. This introductory chapter outlines the statement of the problem, the organizational framework and research questions, the theoretical framework of the study, and a brief overview of the research design.

Statement of the Problem

Despite striking increases in postsecondary enrollment at American colleges and universities over the past thirty years, gaps still exist in who enrolls in college. African American, Hispanic, and low-income populations continue to be underrepresented at institutions of higher education as compared to their representation within the general population (Swail & Perna, 2002). In 1997, an analysis of the Integrated Post-Secondary Education Data System showed that African Americans made up 11.2 percent of the undergraduate population and earned 7.8 percent of the bachelor's degrees despite the fact that they made up 14.3 percent of the traditional college-age population. Hispanics faired even worse. Hispanics made up 14.4 percent of the traditional college-age population, but made up only 10.1 percent of the undergraduate population and 6.3 percent of its graduates (Gandara, 2002; Perna, 2000).

The quality of one's education varies considerably based on social class and race (Tierney, Colyar & Corwin, 2003). Although almost all students expect to go to college, not all do. Ninety-five percent of 8th graders from low socioeconomic status backgrounds or with parents who did not attend college expect to go to college, but only 65% of them actually do (Swail, 2000). In contrast, almost all affluent students or students with college graduates for parents go on to college (Swail, 2000). In their study on the impact of students' socioeconomic status (SES) on college choice, Cabrera and La Nasa (2000) found that 71 percent of the lowest-SES high school students did not obtain the academic qualifications necessary to enroll in college. In contrast, only 30.3 percent of the highest-SES students did not complete the required college preparation coursework in high school. Enrollment in a rigorous academic curriculum speaks to the overall success of students earning a bachelor's degree as well. Seventy-one percent of students who enroll in a rigorous academic curriculum in high school successfully complete a bachelor's degree (Tierney, Colyar & Corwin, 2003).

The state a person lives in matters as well. The *Quality Counts 2007: From Cradle to Career* report published by Editorial Projects in Education (EPE) examined state educational policymaking in the area of standards, assessments, and accountability systems and tracked state efforts to create a more seamless education system by looking at performance across the various educational sectors. The EPE Research Center staff created a Chance-for-Success index based on 13 indicators that highlight whether young children get off to a good start, succeed in elementary and secondary school, and hit crucial educational and economic benchmarks as adults. The 13 indicators grouped by

stage of life were: 1) family income, 2) parent education, 3) parental employment, 4) linguistic integration, 5) preschool enrollment, 6) kindergarten enrollment, 7) elementary reading, 8) middle school mathematics, 9) high school graduation, 10) postsecondary participation, 11) adult educational attainment, 12) annual income, and 13) steady employment. States gained up to two points or lost up to two points on each indicator based on how they performed compared with the national average. Results showed that a child born in Virginia, the top ranked state with a 22 Chance-for-Success score, has a better-than-average chance for success, while a child from New Mexico, the bottom ranked state with a -23 Chance-for-Success score, is likely to face a series of hurdles throughout life. Other states and the District of Columbia fall between these two extremes (EPE, 2007).

Continuing with their state by state comparison, EPE researchers also developed an Achievement Index that focused solely on performance during the K-12 years. It was based on a combination of current performance outcomes and gains states have made over time. The 15 indicators are: the percent of students scoring at the "proficient" level or higher on National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) reading and math tests in grades four and eight; the average change in NAEP scores in both grades and subjects from 2003 to 2005; the gap in NAEP math performance between 8th graders who are and are not eligible for subsidized school meals, and the change in that gap between 2003 and 2005; the high school graduation rate and the change in that rate between 2000 and 2003; the number of Advanced Placement scores of three or higher (out of a possible five) for every 100 public high school students, and the change in that figure from 2000

to 2005; and the percent of 8th graders scoring at the "advanced" level on the NAEP math exam in 2005. Once again, states gained up to two points or lost up to two points on each indicator based on how they performed compared with the national average. State K-12 achievement scores varied significantly, from a high of 20 points for Massachusetts to a low of -14 points for Mississippi (EPE, 2007).

To address these disparities policymakers, K-12 educators, college and university administrators, and educational researchers have developed a number of college access programs. Early intervention programs are designed to supplement school-based learning and to improve the academic preparation and college readiness of underrepresented groups of students. Federal and state governments, educational foundations, and community organizations have been sponsoring these types of programs since the War on Poverty began in the mid-1960s (Swail & Perna, 2002). Most widely known are Federal TRIO programs that include Upward Bound and Talent Search. In 1998 with the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, the federal government established Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs (GEAR UP) expanding the federal government's role in early intervention. Other well known outreach initiatives include Math, Engineering, Science Achievement (MESA), Advancement via Individual Determination (AVID), and "I Have a Dream".

Whether government funded or privately funded, the general purpose of college access programs are to increase the number of youth from underrepresented backgrounds who complete high school and are prepared to enroll in and succeed in college by addressing educational obstacles such as low expectations, inadequate academic

preparation, and a lack of information about postsecondary options and opportunities. Program activities generally focus around academic support services for students; increasing parent engagement in preparing students for college; and ongoing staff training and professional development opportunities to help teachers raise their expectations and to ensure that all students have access to rigorous academic courses that prepare them for college.

In 1999, the College Board, in association with The Education Resources Institute (TERI) and the Council for Opportunity in Education (COE) designed and administered the National Survey of Outreach Programs. The survey was designed to provide detailed information about all types of college access programs and was expected to help practitioners, researchers, policy makers, and philanthropic organizations to better understand the programs that are currently serving students around the country and to help build a network that could be used to develop and strengthen partnerships between programs (Swail and Perna, 2002). The survey resulted in 1,110 program responses and included the following categories of questions: 1) financial support, 2) program placement, 3) program goals and services, 4) parental involvement, 5) program operation, 6) targeted student populations, 7) incentives for participation, 8) program evaluation, and 9) program staffing and training (College Board, 2000).

Program staff and training results from the survey indicated that 87% of the responding programs had at least one paid staff member with 79% employing full-time staff and 67% employing part-time staff. An average of 17 hours of pre-service training was required of staff members (College Board, 2000). The College Board survey did not

include questions regarding professional preparation, the theory or value systems that guide staff members' work, professional associations or networks, or career patterns.

The National Survey of Outreach Programs study also included focus groups of program directors from across the country. Several themes consistently came up when talking about essential elements of successful outreach initiatives: 1) the need for clear and focused mission and vision, 2) start early, 3) motivate students, 4) involve parents, 5) collaboration, 6) sustainability, 7) use proven practices, 8) rely on standardized processes, 9) incorporate technology, and 10) practice professionalism and personal development (College Board, 2000).

Program directors that participated in the focus groups indicated that program staffing is critical to successful practice. Programs need to have effectual hiring strategies to sustain the mission and goals of the organization. Programs must also provide ongoing professional development to build and retain staff, and many directors indicated they experienced high turnover rates, due in part to inadequate salaries and limited opportunities for professional advancement (College Board, 2000). Swail and Perna (2002) called for future research on testing these perceptions.

Tierney, Corwin and Colyar (2005) recently published *Preparing for College: Nine Elements of Effective Outreach* in which higher education scholars analyzed and defined the parameters of effective college preparation programs. Rather than looking at college outreach as a whole, the authors specifically looked at various components of outreach programs. This work went beyond simply describing college preparation program elements, but examined how various components operate within the context of

preparation programs and analyzed how each component contributed or had not contributed to program success. Program elements that were studied included: culture, families, peer groups, counseling, mentoring, rigorous academic preparation, cocurricular activities, timing, and cost effectiveness.

Not included in the study were staffing patterns of college access programs and information about the professionals who staff these programs. Despite the focus and resources dedicated to college access initiatives by the public and private sectors, limited information is available about the professionals who design, develop, staff, and evaluate these programs. Attempts to increase the numbers of underrepresented students eligible to enter and succeed in college are limited by this lack of knowledge.

Understanding who these college access professionals are and what guides and motivates their work is important, because it impacts program effectiveness. Because so many college preparation programs are under funded and understaffed (Tierney, 2002), college access professionals can not afford to spin their wheels designing and developing programs that are well-intentioned but ineffective. A sound theoretical framework, an understanding of the constituents being served and what constitutes success, should inform practice.

Purpose of the Study

This study was designed to contribute to our understanding of college preparation programs, contribute to the literature on the growing number of managerial professionals on college and university campuses, and address the deficiencies in available research on college access professionals. The overall goal of my research was to deepen our

understanding of the culture of college access work through the views of practitioners who design and staff college access programs. The study sought to explore the values, standards, philosophical foundations, career patterns, and networks that influence and guide the work of college access professionals, and should be of interest to policy makers, educational administrators, and outreach personnel themselves.

Framework and Research Questions

This study focused on deepening our understanding of the construct of the college access profession through the views of individuals who work in college preparation programs and through the examination of networks and associations in which they participate. The overall questions that guided the research were as follows:

1. How do individuals who work in college preparation programs define their work?

2. How does academic research and theory influence the work of college access professionals?

3. What are the career patterns that college access professionals follow?

4. What are the criteria for professional recognition?

5. How do professional networks, associations, and programmatic alignments influence the work of college access professionals?

6. What value systems guide the work of college access professionals?

This study was modeled after Becher's (1989) analysis of the culture of academic disciplines. Being a member of a disciplinary community or professional field involves a sense of identity and personal commitment. Becher understood that a young professional

entering a new field with the ambition of becoming a respected, competent member of that profession has to learn to comply with its fundamental cultural rules. Hence, he designed his study of academic disciplines with the following categories of questions:

1. Characteristics of the discipline

2. Epistemological issues

3. Career patterns

4. Reputations and rewards

5. Professional activity

6. Value systems (Becher, 1989).

In analyzing characteristics of a discipline, Becher (1989) considered the following: a) the structure of the subject, b) its internal and external boundaries, c) the degree of unity across specializations, and d) its nearest intellectual neighbors. Tightly knit disciplines, in terms of fundamental ideologies and shared judgments of quality, tend not to be open to the infiltration of new practices. On the other hand, loosely knit disciplines tend not to hold so firmly to intellectual boundaries. My first research question sought to identify the overall nature of the college access profession, its boundaries and professional neighbors.

For epistemological issues, Becher (1989) studied the role of theory, the scope of ideology, the nature of evidence and disciplinary forms of controversy. Similarly, my second research question asked how theory and academic research influence the work of college access professionals.

My third research question looked at career patterns of college access professionals. Becher's (1989) analysis of this area included the recruitment and induction of new members within the discipline, how specialties were chosen, mobility between specialties, and mid-career crises. My interview outline followed a similar pattern including questions about hiring of new staff; personal, educational and professional experiences; career preparation; and career goals.

In the context of reputations and rewards, my fourth research question asked what are the criteria for professional recognition. To assess criteria for professional recognition, my interviews included questions regarding professional standards, the recognition of good work of others, and identification of leaders in the field.

In analyzing the professional activities of faculty, Becher (1989) studied communication and publishing patterns, professional associations, availability of grant funds, characteristics of competition, and whether scholarly teamwork was valued. To address my research question regarding how professional networks, associations, and programmatic alignments influenced the work of college access professionals, my interview questions covered topics of communication patterns, professional development activities, involvement with professional associations, and the publications produced by professional associations.

My final research question addressed value systems as did Becher's (1989) study of university faculty. My study asked questions about the rewards and frustrations of college access work; involvement in one's work; one's interests outside of work and their

involvement in the community; along with the value systems that guide professional associations.

Theoretical Framework

Although I used Becher's (1989) study of faculty disciplines as the organizational model for my study, the theoretical lens through which this study was conducted was Schein's (1992) work on organizational culture and Rhoades' writings on managerial professionals (1995, 1998, and 2006).

The concept of culture is most useful because it helps explain some of the more seemingly inexplicable and illogical aspects of group behavior and organization (Schein, 1992). At the core of organizational culture are basic assumptions that guide member behavior. Basic assumptions are so taken for granted by group members that behavior based on any other premise is inconceivable. The basic assumptions of a culture tell members what to pay attention to, what things mean, how to react emotionally to what is going on, and what actions to take in various kinds of situations. One of the most central elements of any culture will be the assumptions the members share about their identity and mission or function (Schein, 1992).

Rhoades (1995) wrote about the increased professionalization of college and university administration, and aligned the growth of the profession with the growth in university bureaucracies. This growth has lead to a decrease in faculty positions and the growth of managerial professionals on college and university campuses (Rhoades, 2006). Managerial professionals are defined as professional support personnel with advanced degrees who are neither faculty nor senior administrators. These professionals subscribe

to a body of technical knowledge and belong to professional associations that produce journals and publications (Rhoades, 2006). Managerial professionals generate outputs and create value, and as the number of managerial positions grow on campuses, it is important to examine how effective and efficient they are in these roles (Rhoades, 1998). Little is written about non-faculty professionals on campus. This study speaks to the lack of scholarship on managerial professionals, specifically those professionals working in outreach and college preparation programs.

Research Design

I approached this project from a social constructivism perspective and hence relied as much as possible on the participants' views of their profession (Creswell, 2003). Multiple stages of data collection were used including campus visits, interviews with college access professionals and website analysis. I used a guided interview approach so that participants could express themselves fully. Twenty-five interviews were recorded and transcribed.

Data analysis consisted of three concurrent courses of activity: data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing/verification (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Data reduction occurred continuously throughout the project and involved the process of selecting, focusing, simplifying, abstracting, and transforming the data from interview transcriptions and field notes. Data reduction techniques were used including writing summaries of field experiences, coding, identifying themes, and memo writing. Data display allowed for conclusion drawing by organizing and assembling the information gathered in matrices, graphs and/or charts.

For the final data analysis, I put into categories all the material from my interviews that spoke to one theme. I compared materials within the categories to look for variations and nuances in meanings. I compared across the categories to discover connections between themes, with the goal of integrating the concepts into a theory that offered an accurate and detailed interpretation of the college outreach profession; whether there were common elements of organizational culture across institutions that could be defined as an occupational culture; and whether the theoretical framework of managerial professionals applied to the world of college preparation programs (Rubin & Rubin, 1995).

Organization of the Dissertation

This dissertation is organized into five chapters. This first chapter has introduced the general problem of the lack of writings and research about professionals staffing college preparation programs, the organizational and theoretical framework from which the study was conducted, and briefly described the research design. Chapter 2 reviews the available literature on college access programs, organizational culture, the process of professionalization, and the theoretical lens from which the study was conducted. The methodology of the study is presented in Chapter 3 and includes sample selection, data collection methods, and data analysis procedures. Chapter 4 presents the results of my efforts. And the final chapter is a discussion of the study including implications of this research and suggestions for further study.

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter presents a review of the research and literature and is organized into three main sections. The chapter begins by examining the theoretical perspective from which this study is conducted with an overview of the literature that is written about organizational culture and professionalization theories. Midway through the chapter, I provide an overview of previous studies on professional cultures within higher education with a particular focus on disciplinary cultures. Finally, to ensure that the reader understands the context in which college access professionals' work, I close with relevant research on college access programs and practices.

Theoretical Literature

Schein's (1992) work on organizational culture, professionalization theories, and Rhoades' writings on managerial professionals (1995, 1998, and 2006) provide the theoretical lens that guides this study and provides the framework for why this study is important.

Organizational culture. The concept of culture is most useful because it helps explain some of the more seemingly inexplicable and illogical aspects of group behavior and organization (Schein, 1992). Culture can be a stabilizing force, providing a sense of continuity and a reliable framework within which behavior can be understood. In the case of higher education, traditions, expectations and routine practices are used to orient new students, faculty, and staff into the norms and values of a particular college or university (Kuh & Whitt, 1988).

Schein (1992) described three levels of culture with the most basic level, artifacts, at the surface and quite apparent to the casual observer. The next level of analysis is espoused values of the group. Organizational values serve as a guide and as a way of dealing with uncertainty or difficult times. In analyzing values, one must distinguish carefully between those that are compatible with underlying assumptions and those that are rationalizations or hopes for the future. Espoused values will predict what organizational members will say in a variety of situations, but there may be inconsistencies in what they say and actually do. At the core of organizational culture are basic assumptions that guide member behavior. Basic assumptions are so taken for granted by group members that behavior based on any other premise is inconceivable. The basic assumptions of a culture tell members what to pay attention to, what things mean, how to react emotionally to what is going on, and what actions to take in various kinds of situations.

One of the most central elements of any culture will be the assumptions the members share about their identity and mission or function (Schein, 1992). What is the organization's function in the larger scheme of things such as a profession?

Professionalization theories. Larson (1977) and Collins (1979) defined professionalization as the shared effort of members of an occupation to define the circumstances and manner of their work, to control entry into the field, and to establish a knowledge base and authority for their occupational autonomy. Professions are subject to the same isomorphic pressures as are organizations. Two aspects of professionalization are important sources of isomorphism. One is formal education and the knowledge base

produced by university specialists, and the second is the expansion of professional networks that span institutions and across which new models disseminate quickly (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983).

Isomorphism. Once different organizations in the same line of work are structured into an actual field, influential forces surface that lead them to become more similar to one another. The concept that best captures this notion of homogenization is isomorphism. It is a useful tool for understanding the politics and ceremony that permeate organizational life. DiMaggio and Powell (1983) identified three types of isomorphism: coercive, mimetic, and normative. Coercive isomorphism stems from political influence and the need for legitimacy. Mimetic isomorphism results from typical responses to uncertainty, and normative isomorphism is associated with professionalization.

Coercive isomorphism results from formal and informal pressure exerted on organizations by other organizations upon which they are dependent and by cultural expectations of the society within which the organizations function. Organizations are increasingly organized around rituals of conformity, and in some cases, organizational change is a direct response to government mandates (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983).

When goals are vague or when the environment creates uncertainty, organizations may model themselves on other organizations that they perceive to be more legitimate or successful. Mimetic isomorphism, or modeling, may be spread unintentionally through employee transfer or turnover, or openly by organizations such as consulting firms or professional associations. Organizations tend to model themselves after aspirational peers (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983).

Normative isomorphism applies most directly to this study, because it stems primarily from professionalization. Universities and professional associations are important centers for the development of organizational norms and rules about professional behavior. Individuals in an organizational field undergo socialization to common expectations about their personal behavior, appropriate style of dress, vocabulary, and standard methods of speaking or addressing others. To the extent that key personnel are drawn from the same universities and through membership in professional associations, they will tend to view problems in a similar fashion; see the same policies, procedures and structures as normatively sanctioned and legitimated; and approach their work in much the same way (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983).

Managerial professionals. Rhoades (1995) wrote about the increased professionalization of college and university administration, and aligned the growth of the profession with the growth in university bureaucracies. This growth has lead to a decrease in faculty positions and the growth of managerial professionals on college and university campuses (Rhoades, 2006). Between 1975 and 1985 administrative, managerial, and executive positions grew by 18 percent. Managerial professional positions grew by 61 percent during that same period (Rhoades, 1998). Li (2006) recently reported similar statistics. From 1993 to 2003 professional support/service positions (in other words managerial professions) on college and university campuses grew by 45 percent compared to a 26 percent growth rate for faculty.

Managerial professionals are defined as professional support personnel with advanced degrees who are neither faculty nor senior administrators. These professionals

subscribe to a body of technical knowledge and belong to professional associations that produce journals and publications. Unlike the faculty, managerial professionals lack academic freedom and have no rights to the intellectual property they create (Rhoades, 2006).

Managerial professionals are increasingly involved in activities that are central to the mission of the university that is in producing students and research (Rhoades, 1998). Their roles include assessing quality, ensuring accountability, financial sustainability, facilitating the production of instruction and research, managing the use of technology, providing student support services, and student outreach and recruitment services (Rhoades, 2006).

Managerial professionals generate outputs and create value, and as the number of managerial positions grow on campuses, it is important to examine how effective and efficient they are in these roles (Rhoades, 1998). Little is written about non-faculty professionals on campus. This study speaks to the lack of scholarship on managerial professionals, specifically those professionals working in outreach and college preparation programs.

Cosmopolitans and locals. An individual's professional orientation will influence their behavior within the institution, will impact their interest in developing professional networks, and will influence their professional identity. In his study of internal politics of organizations, Alvin Gouldner (1957) defined a social role as a set of shared expectations oriented toward people who are assigned a particular social identity, and he made a distinction between manifest and latent social roles. Gouldner's study focused on two

latent social roles, "cosmopolitan" and "local", and analyzed three variables: loyalty to the organization; commitment to professional skills and values; and reference group orientation.

Gouldner (1957) describes a cosmopolitan as a professional with a national or external focus whose career and reward system is linked to professional associations and career advancement, as opposed to the employing organization. Creativity, autonomy and mobility are valued by cosmopolitans. On the other hand, locals are recognized for their care of and loyalty to the employing organization, their rule orientation, and their ability to navigate community and political networks.

The concepts of cosmopolitan and local are relevant to this study, because they might explain an outreach professional's orientation towards literature and research, professional associations, and the use of community networks to support their work, as well as their commitment to the local community and their career patterns.

Professional Cultures within Higher Education

Cultural studies of higher education have fallen into three main categories: 1) institutional based studies, 2) portrayals of faculty and students, and their roles within the institution, and 3) studies of intellectual disciplines (Becher, 1984).

Institutional based studies. Kuh and Whitt (1988) provide a framework for institutional based studies. They outlined four layers of analysis: 1) the external environment that surrounds an institution of higher education, 2) the institution itself, 3) subcultures within the institution, and 4) the roles of individuals within the institution.

Colleges and universities are continually evolving and are shaped by regional, economic, social, and/or occupational conditions in the external environment. When colleges and universities change, it is usually in response to outside influences such as the availability of resources and political agendas. The traditions of the host community or region influence the attitudes of students who attend the college, and hence influence the institutional culture as well (Kuh & Whitt, 1988).

An institution's culture develops over time fashioned by institutional memory, academic programs, and organizational characteristics. Institutional memory serves as the fabric weaving the past and present and influencing how future events will be interpreted. An institution's identity, academic traditions, and heroes are influential cultural determinants. How faculty and students spend their time, with whom they socialize, what people recognize the culture to be, and the way in which the norms and values of the institution influence behavior seem to be the main characteristics of institutional culture (Kuh & Whitt, 1988).

Bergquist (1992) identified four different types of institutional cultures and hypothesized that different change strategies would be needed within the four different institutional cultures. The institutional cultures were collegial, managerial, developmental and negotiating. The collegial culture evolves for the most part from the disciplines of the faculty and values scholarship, shared governance, and rationality. On the opposite end of the spectrum, managerial culture focuses on the goals and purposes of the institution and values efficiency, effective supervisory skills, and financial responsibility. Those within a developmental culture value personal and professional growth of all

members of the college community, and the negotiating culture values the establishment of equitable and democratic policies and procedures, valuing confrontation, mediation, power, and special interest subcultures.

The meanings people make of events and actions within an institution of higher education are fragmented by a number of factors including roles, disciplines, and focus of interests. Subcultures develop within an institution when a group of people have shared a significant number of important experiences in responding to problems imposed by the external environment or by internal conflicts. These experiences encourage the group to develop a similar view of the institution and their place in it. A shared value system provides for further bonding. Within an institution of higher education, numerous subcultures may operate, such as senior administrators, managerial professionals, classified staff, college or discipline-based faculty groups, discipline-based student groups, and social organizations of students. The various groups have different paradigms or views of the world and differ in what they perceive to be the primary purpose of the institution (Kuh & Whitt, 1988).

All members of a college community participate in constructing a realistic picture of what is going on within the institution. The extent to which faculty and students identify with the institution and are culturally competent is fluid and always changing (Kuy & Whitt, 1988).

The roles of faculty and other professionals. Much of what is written in the literature about higher education focuses on the teachers and their students. The fact that every college and university has a significant share of non-teaching researchers, a

sizeable cadre of administrators, and a substantial payroll of ancillary, secretarial and technical staff is not commonly acknowledged in any cultural analysis of the inhabitants of higher education institutions.

In an effort to address this deficiency in the literature, Kuh and Whitt (1988) identified several administrative functions that were common across all institutional types. The functions included educational leadership, articulating institutional priorities and values to both internal and external audiences, acquiring and distribution of resources, managing fiscal issues and budgets, managing student services, and maintaining communication between students, faculty and all levels of administration. Except in the case of department chairs, academic deans, and provosts, campus administrators tend not to come from the faculty. They have training for their jobs that is very different from that of the faculty, and their interests and duties are different from faculty members as well.

Kuh and Whitt (1988) hesitated to identify higher education administrators as a subculture within colleges and universities, because of the diverse nature of their work. They viewed task related administrators, such as student affairs professionals, financial managers and physical plant managers, as cultures of their own. These professionals associate with other professionals through regional and national organizations that encourage the development of their own professional identity and areas of expertise. These professional associations provide a powerful sense of identity by reinforcing networks of collegial support and disciplinary values.

Kuh and Whitt (1988) studied the academic profession and identified three basic values that all faculties, across disciplines and institutional type, share: 1) production and transmission of knowledge is the purpose of higher education; 2) autonomy in the conduct of academic work and the support of structures that reinforce autonomy such as academic freedom, peer review, and tenure; and 3) collegial governance. On the other hand, they found difference between disciplines in relation to performance standards, patterns of publication, professional interaction, the socialization process of graduate students, and social and political status.

Intellectual disciplines. The role of academics – their responsibilities, attitudes and activities, their sense of professionalism, and sense of being part of a larger academic community – are functions of the institutions and disciplines to which they are connected (Ruscio, 1987). A number of studies have been written on faculty culture and many delineate between disciplines.

A recent quantitative study by Lee (2004) examined how the relationships between the institutional culture and the culture of the academic department varied by disciplinary field. The five disciplines she chose to study were biology, English, political science, business, and education. She chose thirteen dimensions of faculty culture for analysis: collegiality, commitment to diversity, commitment to scholarship and scholarly recognition, commitment to students' affective development, commitment to teaching, dissatisfaction with collegiate culture, governance stress, instrumental orientation, job satisfaction, multicultural orientation, prestige orientation, student centeredness, and valuing professional autonomy.

The results of Lee's (2004) analysis indicate that the relationships between the departmental culture and institutional culture varied for the five fields she studied. Results indicate that four dimensions of faculty culture; instrumental orientation, effective/multicultural orientation, interpersonal orientation, and reputation orientation; differentiate between the five fields studied and no two fields shared the same pattern of cultural orientations. Through her findings, Lee concluded that academic departments vary by values, beliefs, and priorities are relatively independent and distinct from their institutional cultures.

Using three dimensions of Gouldner's (1957) concepts of locals and cosmopolitans, Becher (1987) developed a typology of disciplinary cultures. The dimensions considered were one's orientation to the institution or to the discipline; pure applied knowledge and the use of knowledge; and the humanistic personal interpretation of knowledge. By examining the interactions of the above dimensions, Becher identified four groups of faculty members: teacher, scholar/researcher, demonstrator, and consultant. Characteristics aligned with teachers included a strong identification with the institution and a strong commitment to pure study. Where as scholar/researchers' loyalties aligned with their discipline, but too had a high commitment to pure study. Demonstrators took a more humanistic approach to knowledge and identified strongly with their college or university. Consultants too took a humanistic approach to knowledge, but identified more with their discipline as opposed to their institution.

Building on Becher's notion that disciplines differ from each other both cognitively and socially, Ylijoki (2000) examined disciplinary cultures with a focus on

teaching and how students from different fields were socialized during their university experience. Four fields of study were considered: sociology and social psychology, computer science, public administration, and library and information science.

Ylijoki (2000) found the discipline of sociology and social psychology to stress the importance of theoretical work, critical thinking, and intellectual growth, with an emphasis on learning for the sake of learning, as opposed to preparation for a career. The disciplinary culture emphasized the value of intellectual independence and academic freedom, and stressed the virtue of improving the world by aligning with marginalized and underprivileged people.

In contrast, the relationship between the discipline and the labor market was more tightly coupled for the public administration discipline. Practical knowledge was appreciated and the disciplinary culture stressed the virtue of advocating for reforms and development. Faculties were degree-oriented and considered it absolutely crucial to market the discipline to employers (Ylijoki, 2000).

The disciplinary culture of computer science also had its roots in professional orientation with high paying jobs for those who work hard. Expertise and work-related qualifications were more important than accumulating academic credit or possibly even earning a degree. There was little distinction between the academic world and the business world (Ylijoki, 2000).

Ylijoki (2000) found the education of library and information science students to be geared to the requirements of working life. However at the time of her study, a conflict was brewing between library and information science as to which occupation should be

the reference point of the field. Those supporting the library as the reference point for career development were devoted to tradition and serving the needs of others through careful listening. Others felt the information science arena offered students better paying jobs as information officers.

Ylijoki (2000) concluded that the development of teaching and learning and quality assessment should assume different modes in different fields. The assessment and the improvement of teaching have to originate from each department's own cultural basis.

In 2003, Ylijoki once again studied disciplinary culture, this time by examining research agendas. Ylijoki studied whether departmental characteristics and disciplinary culture of three academic programs impacted the type of research faculty members were conducting at research universities in Finland. The three departments studied were a history department, the Laboratories of Surface Science and Semiconductor Technology (part of the physics department) and a multidisciplinary Work Research Centre. In analyzing the research agendas conducted by faculty members in the three programs, Ylijoki compared the following characteristics: the funding source of the research; who set the research agenda; how the research was organized; values and ideals guiding the department; and sources of tension.

Ylijoki (2003) found that the source of funding and agenda setting for research varied between disciplines with research funds for the history department coming from academic sources; public sector funds supporting the research of the Work Research Centre; and private sector funding supporting the research of the Lab of Surface Science

and Semi Conductor Technology. Ylijoki found that the humanities are most dependent on public sources of funds for research, but enjoyed autonomy in establishing the research agenda, whereas those departments with strong links to private enterprise experienced tension between pure and applied science.

College Access Profession and Practices

A number of studies have been done over the years in an attempt to understand the variety and effectiveness of outreach and college preparation programs around the country (Swail, 2000; Tierney et al., 2005; U.S. Dept. of Education, 2001). The U.S. Department of Education's study *Paving the Way to Postsecondary Education: K-12 Intervention Programs for Underrepresented Youth* (2001) had three goals: 1) to chart the field and record the range of program types that exist and describe program features; 2) to identify programs with evaluation data that would allow an evaluation of the effectiveness of distinct models and program features; and 3) to assess the extent to which existing programs address needs and issues identified in research literature. Programs were organized by their source of funding or support and were divided into five major categories: private nonprofit, university-based, government-sponsored, community-based, and K-12. Within each of the five program types there were multiple program components. The authors found the most widespread program components to be counseling, academic enrichment, parental involvement, personal enrichment and social integration, mentoring, and scholarships. I used the above organizational structure as an outline for this review of effective outreach practices.

Private nonprofit programs originate from agencies, corporations or foundations with a specific mission of better preparing students for college. The impetus for these types of programs revolves around that idea that people outside the public schools can have an impact on students inside the schools. An excellent example of this type of program is "I Have a Dream" which started in New York City in a single classroom with a promise of guaranteed scholarships. The program has grown to over 100 sites throughout the United States and now includes a menu of supplemental services for students (U.S. Dept. of Education, 2001).

About one-third of all colleges and universities offer at least one program designed to increase access for educationally and/or economically disadvantaged students (U.S. Dept. of Education, 2001). Results from the National Survey of Outreach Programs indicated that 57% of college preparation programs were based at a college or university (College Board, 2000). Programs focus on partnerships between colleges and school districts in an effort to share resources, strengthen the schools, and establish connections between the various educational communities. The University of Arizona's College Academy for Parents (CAP) sponsored by Early Academic Outreach and the Sunnyside Unified School District is such a program. CAP provides elementary school students and their parents with the college knowledge that students need to successfully navigate through middle school and high school, and to transition to a four-year college or university.

The federal government and individual states are two major sources of college preparation programs. Federal initiatives stem from an evolving attitude about the role of

the federal government in education. The federal government's responsibility has increasingly become that of equalizing opportunity across the states by providing information to students, assistance to schools, and financial support for low-income students to attend college. Examples of federal programs include Talent Search, Upward Bound and GEAR UP which provide comprehensive services from middle school to college to increase the number of low-income and underrepresented students who gain access to postsecondary opportunities. California, Florida, Indiana, and Oklahoma are examples of states that have developed statewide initiatives to stimulate college-going (U.S. Dept. of Education, 2001). California alone spends about $40,000,000 a year on middle school and high school outreach initiatives. (Swail, 2000).

Thirteen percent of the respondents to the National Survey of Outreach Programs were community based outreach initiatives (College Board, 2000). Community-based programs originate from members of a community who see a need among their own children and design a program to help students prepare for life beyond high school. Local church groups, business groups and/or civic organizations often focus on supporting students outside of the school environment and often include mentors and cultural experiences that help students develop healthy self-concepts (Swail, 2000). Examples of community-based programs include Kids to College, The Posse Program and Puente (U.S. Dept. of Education, 2001).

K-12 public schools have been under pressure from the government and the public to improve high school graduation rates and produce more students who are prepared to succeed in postsecondary education. One way school districts have responded

to this pressure is by developing college preparation intervention programs, especially for low-income and ethnically diverse children. Sixteen percent of outreach programs surveyed for The National Survey of Outreach Programs were school based (College Board, 2000). Early and constant attention to academic achievement is imperative to achieving any significant increase in the educational attainment levels of students. One such program is Advancement via Individual Determination (AVID) that began in San Diego, CA. The focus of the program is to "untrack" average students by placing them into college preparation courses and then providing them with the academic support and encouragement to be successful and go on to college (U.S. Dept. of Education, 2001).

Moving beyond the question of funding, the literature also addresses the question, "What do these programs do?" The College Board (2000) found the most common goals of outreach programs to be: 1) college attendance and awareness, 2) building student self esteem, 3) providing role models, 4) increasing college graduation rates, 5) reducing high school dropout rates, 6) improving academic skills, and 7) increasing parental involvement. Outreach programs strive to meet their goals by offering a variety of services to students. The College Board (2000) found that many of the services focused around college and career awareness, social development, and academic support. College awareness activities included campus visits, meeting with faculty and students, college fairs, and SAT and ACT test preparation. Common types of social development activities included cultural activities, leadership development, and personal counseling. Academic support services included instruction in critical areas such as math, science,

reading and writing; study skills workshops; academic advising; and grade and attendance monitoring (Swail, 2000).

In 2005, Tierney, Corwin and Colyar published *Preparing for College: Nine Elements of Effective Outreach* in which a number of higher education scholars analyzed and defined the parameters of effective college outreach programs. Their work examined how particular components contributed or did not contribute to program success. Program elements that were included in the study were: culture, families, peer groups, counseling, mentoring, rigorous academic preparation, and timing.

Villalpando and Solorzano (2005) focused on the role of students' culture in college preparation programs. The guiding question of their literature review and study was, to what extent is it essential for college preparation programs to emphasize the culture of the student in order to enable her or him to get into a college or university? (p. 15) They found that the literature linked the concept of cultural capital to a cultural integrity framework. Cultural integrity emphasizes the importance of affirming students' cultural identities, while cultural capital is often used to reinforce the power and influence of culture in society. Although some programs were more deliberate and intentional than others, the authors found that most programs strove to improve student's chances for enrolling in college by emphasizing some dimension of students' culture. The most common way that college preparation programs incorporated culture into their programs was by involving students' families. Other means of cultural integration included peers, mentors and cultural instruction.

Despite the fact that there is not much empirical research published on the role of culture in college preparation programs, Villapando and Solorzano (2005) drew the following conclusions from their study. College preparation programs framed by a focus on cultural wealth and academic skills development can have a substantial impact on college enrollment rates of underrepresented students. Programs must be tailored to meet students' needs, and programs that provide a diverse array of components are most effective.

Tierney and Auerbach (2005) reviewed the literature on family engagement in K-12 education and college preparation programs. They defined family engagement broadly to suggest a wide range of formal and informal activities at home and at school that family members undertake to support their children's academic success. Their research focused on how critical family engagement is to college preparation for underrepresented students, and specifically what types of family knowledge, beliefs, and practices are most effective in promoting college eligibility and access.

Tierney and Auerbach (2005) found that families can be of significant help in enabling children to graduate from high school and to attend college. They recommend that college preparation programs plan at least a minimal family component beginning no later than middle school. The following types of support activities were found to be helpful to families: 1) information focusing on the pathway to college and how parents can help; 2) expansion of family social networks related to college options to include more educators, college students, and college alumni; 3) reinforcement of parents' sense of self-efficacy, including workshops on adolescent development or advocacy training;

and 4) gathering with other families for support and fellowship about college preparation, such as high school class selection, meeting with college representatives, college visits, and the financial aid application process.

The topic of peer groups is essential for college preparation programs because nearly all programs focus on cohorts or discrete groups of students (Tierney & Colyar, 2005). College preparation programs, by definition, are communal endeavors. The programs are not self paced, instead college preparation programs occur in groups. The central question to Tierney and Colyar's study (2005) was considering outreach programs have limited resources and time, how much effort should be put toward enhancing peer relationships?

Tierney and Colyar's (2005) review of the literature found that the research on the influence of peer groups does not provide a definitive answer about their impact on the college-going plans of low-income minority youth. However, with the realization that peer groups exist, and that students are part of peer groups in and outside of college preparation programs, Tierney and Colyar offered the following suggestions. First, consider the type of peer groups produced by college preparation programs. Attention needs to be paid to the characteristics of these groups and how their interaction might be made more effective in influencing students' educational aspirations or self-confidence. Think of peer groups as a resource to be developed. Develop a sense of teamwork within the peer group. Students can learn from one another (Tierney & Colyar, 2005).

Because a significant portion of a high school counselor's day is spent on competing responsibilities and because counselor/student ratios are much larger than is

considered advisable, college counseling is an essential component of college preparation programs (McDonough, 2005). In middle school, counselors can have positive impacts in three ways: 1) structure activities that foster and support college aspirations and understandings of the importance of college; 2) assist parents in understanding their role in nurturing and supporting college aspirations, setting college expectations, and motivating students; and 3) ensuring that students are on track for college prep classes. In high school, college access counselors need to be consistently available to students for guidance and to provide basic college knowledge and financial aid information. All students need the services of counselors, but for those students who come from families and communities where college knowledge is not available, then the need for trained, available, trustworthy counselors becomes paramount. Counselors need to be well trained for the college advising task and be able to build trusting relationships with poor and underrepresented minority students and their families.

Although mentoring has become more and more popular as a tactic for improving social, behavioral, and academic outcomes for at-risk youth, Gandara and Mejorado (2005) did not find a lot of research documenting strong effects for the role of mentors in college preparation programs, nor did they find the theoretical mechanisms for understanding how mentors might facilitate college access. Most of the research on mentoring programs that showed significant positive outcomes had been based on studies of one-to-one mentoring programs in which a student was paired with an individual mentor and the relationship was sustained over a period of at least one year. Because of the significant time commitment and the skills necessary for the job, it is often

challenging to recruit adequate numbers of mentors to meet program needs. For this reason, some programs turn to group or peer mentoring. While mentoring programs are often naively seen as low cost, win-win arrangements in which students benefit from the attention of a caring adult, the reality is quite different. Mentoring programs that serve youth are labor intensive. To be successful, they require extensive recruiting, processing, matching, training, and supervision.

Gandara and Mejorado (2005) concluded that good mentoring programs may have positive impact on behavioral outcomes for at risk adolescents under particular conditions, but could not establish a link to academic outcomes and college going behavior.

The key to college access is rigorous academic preparation (Perna, 2005). Research shows that taking at least one advanced mathematics course is linked with a higher probability of enrolling in a four-year college or university among students who are at risk of dropping out of high school and first-generation college students. Altonji (1992) found that the number of years of postsecondary education completed increased with each additional year of high school science, math, and foreign language that was completed even after controlling for high school tracking, aptitude test results, and family background. Because low-income and other disadvantaged groups are less likely to be academically prepared; are more likely to attend schools with less rigorous courses; and are less likely to be placed in rigorous courses; it is critical that college preparation programs focus on rigorous academic preparation (Perna, 2005). To achieve this goal, college preparation programs must 1) begin efforts to improve academic preparation

before students enter high school; 2) deliver academic preparation activities in culturally sensitive ways; and 3) coordinate with K-12 teachers and college faculty.

Bonous-Hammarth and Allen (2005) examined the timing of college preparation within the context of students' college choice processes and specifically with reference to the structure of college outreach programs. The precise series of activities and behaviors that students engage in to prepare for college becomes more and more significant because critical tasks such as completing algebra or actually filing a college application must occur within prearranged deadlines set by colleges, high schools, and other agencies. Students have four years during high school to concentrate attentively on college preparation, and the earlier they begin this process, the more knowledge they have to complete the maximum activities possible to remain competitive among other college applicants.

The college choice process includes three stages: 1) the predisposition stage when the student actually decides to attend college, 2) the search stage when the student gathers information about prospective colleges, and 3) the selection stage when the student actually applies and matriculates to a specific college (Hossler, Braxton & Coppersmith, 1989). For college preparation programs to be effective, they must influence the students' predisposition to college before entering high school in order for the student to enroll in the prerequisite college preparation courses.

Summary

Having provided the theoretical lens that guides this study, having defined culture and reviewed the literature on disciplinary cultures, and having provided the context in

which college access professionals work, I now move on to explain the methodology of

my study.

METHODOLOGY

This chapter explains the methods used in carrying out this study. The chapter

begins by discussing qualitative research strategies and the justification of the use of

these strategies for this particular study. The research context, the research participants

and the role of the researcher set the stage for the description of the data collection

procedures. Special emphasis is given to the analysis of the data including coding, and

the chapter closes with a brief discussion of the limitations of the study.

Qualitative Research Strategy

Qualitative researchers search for answers to questions by exploring various

social settings and the individuals who occupy these settings. Qualitative researchers are

most interested in how humans arrange themselves and their settings and how individuals

within these settings make sense of their surrounding through symbols, rituals, social

structures, social roles, and so forth. Qualitative methods allow researchers to share in

the understandings and perceptions of others and to explore how people organize and

give meaning to their every day lives. By using qualitative techniques researchers study

how people learn about and make sense of themselves and others (Berg, 2004).

Descriptive research. Many qualitative studies are descriptive and exploratory.

They encourage rich descriptions of multifaceted circumstances that have not previously

been explored in the literature (Marshall & Rossman, 1999). Descriptive research is used

to document and describe the characteristics of a group of people by studying samples of

that population and is usually undertaken in the early stages of a particular occurrence or

trend. It can easily serve as the source for insights and hypothesis development that may be pursued in future studies. (Berg, 2004; Creswell, 2003).

A descriptive research methodology was used for this study. The goal was to understand what it is like to work in a college preparation program and whether there are common elements of organizational culture across institutions that could be defined as an occupational culture.

Social constructivism. Social constructivism is based on three assumptions: 1) that individuals seek to understand the world in which they live and work; 2) humans engage with their world and make sense of it based on their historical and social perspective; and 3) the basic generation of meaning is always social, arising in and out of interaction with a human community (Creswell, 2003).

I approached this project with the above perspective and hence relied as much as possible on the participants' views of their profession and used open-ended questions so that participants could express themselves fully. I sought to understand the setting and context in which college access personnel work by visiting their campuses and offices and by gathering information personally.

The Research Context

The study was conducted during the 2008 – 09 academic year and was restricted to college and university professionals who work in the state of Arizona in K-12 college access programs and to leaders of professional networks and associations. The study was based primarily upon interviews with those that work in the profession and an analysis of the professional associations in which they participate. Leaders with the following

professional associations were included in the study: Council for Opportunity in

Education, National College Access Network, National Council for Community and

Education Partnerships, Pathways to College Network, and Western Association of

Educational Opportunity Personnel.

The Research Participants

Qualitative researchers usually work with small samples of people, situated in

their context and scrutinized in depth. Qualitative samples tend to be purposive, rather

than random, and are not always prespecified, but can evolve once fieldwork begins

(Miles & Huberman, 1994).

A criterion sampling methodology was used for this study. I began my search for

potential participants by visiting community college, university, and professional

association websites. College and university websites included information about their

outreach and college access programs and contact information was included. Similarly,

staff, board, and commission members were listed on professional association websites.

Once potential participants were identified through the websites, I called and/or

emailed individuals, explained my study, and invited them to participate. As my

fieldwork progressed, I also took advantage of new leads and added interviewees to my

sample based on recommendations from people who knew others that they thought would

be rich with information for my study.

Outreach professionals selected for initial interviews met the following criteria: 1)

full-time employee; 2) a minimum of one year of experience working in a college

preparation program; 3) a representative sample of interviewees from each of the three

universities and community college campuses; 4) balanced numbers of interviewees with various years of experience, i.e. those with seven years of experience or more, and those with less than five years experience; and 5) interviewees from both grant and state funded programs.

Of the twenty practitioners that I interviewed, six worked at community colleges and 14 worked at state universities. Fifteen of the practitioners had been first-generation college students themselves; eleven of them were working at the institution where they earned their degree; and the majority of them had earned a master's degree. Of the seven practitioners with a bachelor's degree, four were either working on or close to finishing a master's degree. As shown in the table below, the field is dominated by women. Even the five professional association executives and board members that I interviewed were women.

Table 3.1 Study Participants: Practitioners

		AU1	AU2	AU3	CC1	CC2	Total
Number of Interviews		4	4	6	4	2	20
First Generation		3	4	3	3	2	15
Education	Bachelor's	2	1	2	1	1	7
	Master's	1	3	4	3	1	12
	EDD/PhD	1					1
Gender	Female	4	3	3	2	2	14
	Male		1	3	2		6
Ethnicity	Asian			1			1
	Caucasian	2	2	1	1		6
	Hispanic	2		3	2	2	9
	Native American		2	1	1		4
Funding	State	2		3	1	1	7
	Federal	1	2		3		6
	Combo/Soft Funds	1	2	3		1	7
Years of Experience	Less than 5 Years	3	1	3	3	1	11
	More than 7 Years	1	3	3	1	1	9

Five representatives of professional associations were also included in the study. Four of the associations were national organizations with the fifth association being a regional association serving a number of the practitioners in the study. Professional associations were identified by the practitioners. During interviews practitioners were asked questions about professional development opportunities and affiliations with professional associations. The following organizations were repeatedly referenced and included in this study: Council for Opportunity in Education, National College Access

Network, National Council for Community and Education Partnerships, Pathways to College Network, and Western Association of Educational Opportunity Personnel.

Table 3.2 Study Participants: Association Executives and Leaders

Number of Interviews		5
Practitioner	Yes	5
	No	
First Generation	Yes	3
	No	2
Education	Bachelor's	
	Master's	3
	PhD/Law	2
Gender	Female	5
	Male	
Ethnicity	Asian	
	Caucasian	3
	Hispanic	2
	Native American	

All five of the association leaders that I interviewed had worked in the field before moving to their respective associations. Four of them had worked in TRIO programs. Three had also been first generation college students.

Role of the Researcher

In qualitative research, the researcher's role is to acquire a holistic overview of the context under study. The researcher collects data on the perceptions of the participants from an insider's perspective through a process of profound attention, of

empathetic understanding, and of deferring preconceptions about the topics under

discussion (Miles & Huberman, 1994).

Kahn and Cannell (1957, p.62) suggest, "The role of the interviewer is determined

in part by the expectations of others." This idea was especially applicable to this study,

because I had extensive experience working in college access at both the community

college and university level. I have written TRIO grants and served as director of a

GEAR UP program for nearly three years. As a former outreach professional and

"insider", I brought insight, experience and cultural understanding to the table (Rubin &

Rubin, 1995). My work experience and my relationships with many outreach personnel

allowed me quick access to study participants and allowed me to establish rapport,

credibility, and common ground easily with the interviewees.

Glesne and Peshkin's (1992) term "backyard" research applied to my study as

well, because I had worked at AU3 and interviewed former colleagues. Although I tried

not to bias my study, my professional experience at AU3 provided me with insights and a

critical eye toward the data that was much richer than surface responses to interview

questions.

Data Collection Procedures

"Qualitative interviewing requires intense listening, a respect for and curiosity

about what people say, and a systematic effort to really hear and understand what people

tell you" (Rubin & Rubin, 1995, p.17). Qualitative interviewing includes a variety of

ways of questioning, and interviews differ in the degree of emphasis on culture, in the

parameters of the study, and in the specific information that is wanted. In other words, how we interview depends, in part, on what we are trying to hear (Rubin & Rubin, 1995).

In this particular study, I "tried to hear" or learn about the culture of the outreach profession. Rubin and Rubin (1995) define culture as how people interpret the world around them by developing shared understandings. People learn together how to figure out what is important and unimportant and how to conduct themselves in certain situations. Culture provides people with guidelines about how to function in the world in which they live and work.

Interviews. I collected data for this study through qualitative interviews. Rubin and Rubin (1995) describe two categories of interviews, cultural interviews and topical interviews. Cultural interviews focus on the standards, values, understandings, and taken-for-granted rules of behavior of a group or society. Topical interviews are more narrowly focused on a specific event or action, and are concerned with what happened, when and why.

Although some of my interview questions were topical, focusing on the history, environmental trends and events that impacted the direction of the college preparation program; the majority of my interview questions were culturally focused. Cultural interviews search for the special and shared meanings that group members develop, the kinds of activities that they normally do, and the reasons why they do them (Rubin & Rubin, 1995). It is possible to acquire some useful insights into cultural activities as well as cultural values by attending to what people say and noting what words they use in describing good and bad practice (Becher, 1984). Looking at outreach professionals as a

group, both within their departments and institutions and as a whole within a profession, I

strove to understand how they perceived themselves as a professional and where they fit

into the broader mission of the university.

I conducted twenty face-to-face interviews and five phone interviews. Face–to-

face interviews were conducted with college access professionals residing and working in

Arizona community colleges and universities. Logistics prohibited me from conducting

face-to-face interviews with the leaders of the professionals associations and networks,

since most of them live and work near Washington, DC. I conducted phone interviews

with the professional association leaders.

A guided interview approach was used, and three different sets of interview

questions were used. Leaders of a professional association or network were asked one set

of questions, and two different sets of questions were used for college access practitioners

depending on their years of experience in the field. The interview guides are included in

Appendix A. Because this study was modeled after Becher's (1989) analysis of the

culture of academic disciplines, my interview questions fell into the following categories:

1) characteristics of the discipline, 2) epistemological issues, 3) career patterns, 4)

reputations and rewards, 5) professional activity, and 6) value systems.

Questions are coded back to these six main categories.

In analyzing characteristics of a discipline, Becher (1989) considered the

following: a) the structure of the subject, b) its internal and external boundaries, c) the

degree of unity across specializations, and d) its nearest intellectual neighbors. Tightly

knit disciplines, in terms of fundamental ideologies and shared judgments of quality, tend

not to be open to the infiltration of new practices. On the other hand, loosely knit

disciplines tend not to hold so firmly to intellectual boundaries. Unlike Becher's study,

my study sought to examine a non-academic unit, so his characteristics of a discipline did

not apply to my study and needed to be modified. I used the following parameters to

define the characteristics of the college access profession: the history of the program,

services and activities provided, trends or events that influenced the direction of the

program, targeted populations, and campus and community partnerships.

 For epistemological issues, Becher (1989) studied the role of theory, the scope of

ideology, the nature of evidence and disciplinary forms of controversy. Similarly, my

interview questions related to epistemological issues asked about the publications and

academic research influencing the work of college access professionals; the critical issues

facing the profession; trends that may influence the future direction of the field; contested

ideologies within the profession; and professional development opportunities.

 My third category of questions looked at career patterns of college access

professionals. Becher's (1989) analysis of this area included the recruitment and

induction of new members within the discipline, how specialties were chosen, mobility

between specialties, and mid-career crises. My interview outline followed a similar

pattern including questions about hiring of new staff; personal, educational, and

professional experiences; career preparation; and career goals.

 In the context of reputations and rewards, my fourth category of interview

questions asked about the criteria for professional recognition. To assess criteria for

professional recognition, my interviews included questions regarding professional

standards, the recognition of good work of others, and the identification of and recognition of leaders in the field.

In analyzing the professional activities of faculty, Becher (1989) studied communication and publishing patterns, professional associations, availability of grant funds, characteristics of competition, and whether scholarly teamwork was valued. To address my research question regarding how professional networks, associations, and programmatic alignments influence the work of college access professionals, my interview questions covered topics of communication patterns, professional development activities, involvement with professional associations, and the publications produced by professional associations.

My final category of interview questions addressed value systems as did Becher's (1989) study of university faculty. My study asked questions about the rewards and frustrations of college access work; involvement in one's work; one's interests outside of work and their involvement in the community; along with the value systems that guide professional associations.

Interviews were recorded and an interview protocol for recording information during the interview was also used. The following components were captured on the protocol: probes to follow-up questions, interviewer's comments, and reflective notes (Creswell, 2003). The interviews were transcribed by the researcher using a computer.

Professional association web page content analysis. To understand more thoroughly how professional associations define and impact the culture of the college access profession, I conducted a content analysis of the websites of the five professional

associations previously mentioned: Council for Opportunity in Education (COE),

National College Access Network (NCAN), National Council for Community and

Education Partnerships (NCCEP), Pathways to College Network, and Western

Association of Educational Opportunity Personnel (WESTOP). Four of the associations

are national organizations, while the Western Association of Educational Opportunity

Personnel (WESTOP) is a regional association serving TRIO professionals in the western

United States including Arizona.

The website analysis covered four of Becher's six categories used throughout this

study: 1) characteristics of the discipline, 2) epistemological issues, 3) reputations and

rewards, and 4) value systems. In analyzing characteristics of a discipline, Becher (1989)

considered the following: a) the structure of the subject, b) its internal and external

boundaries, c) the degree of unity across specializations, and d) its nearest intellectual

neighbors. My analysis included mission statements, membership criteria, partnerships,

affiliations, and funding sources. For epistemological issues, Becher (1989) studied the

role of theory, the scope of ideology, the nature of evidence and disciplinary forms of

controversy. Similarly, my website analysis relating to epistemological issues sought

information about the publications and academic research that was produced by or

sponsored by the association; research links or resources that were posted on the website

available to members, and professional development opportunities. In the context of

reputations and rewards, my third category of analysis dealt with the establishment of

professional standards of practice, criteria for professional recognition and the

recognition of leaders in the field. My final category of web analysis addressed the value systems that guide professional associations.

Data Analysis Procedures

Miles and Huberman (1994) described three approaches to data analysis: 1) interpretivism, 2) social anthropology, and 3) collaborative social research. Using an interpretive approach, human activity is seen as text, an assortment of symbols conveying layers of meaning. Interpretation comes by way of insight into group actions and interactions. Using a social anthropological approach to data analysis requires extended contact with subjects and a thick descriptive analysis of everyday situations such as language use, rituals, artifacts, and relationships. Collaborative social research is an action research approach where the aim is to transform the social environment through a process of critical inquiry.

I used an interpretive approach to my data analysis. As is the case with this study, interpretive researchers are not detached from their objects of study. Researchers have their own understandings, convictions and conceptual orientation, in other words, researchers are members of the culture. Using this approach, interviews tend to be collaborative, not a one sided gathering of information by the researcher.

Qualitative data analysis consisted of three concurrent courses of activity: data reduction, data display and conclusion drawing/verification (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Data reduction occurred continuously throughout the project and involved the process of selecting, focusing, simplifying, abstracting and transforming the data from interview transcriptions and website analysis notes. Data reduction techniques that were used

include writing summaries of field experiences, coding, identifying themes and memo writing. Data display allowed for conclusion drawing by organizing and assembling the information gathered in matrices, graphs and charts.

Data analysis included coding. Codes are labels for assigning units of meaning to the descriptive information collected during the study. Codes are attached to words, phrases, or sentences that speak to a particular theme or concept (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Codes pull together a lot of material and can be at different levels of analysis ranging from descriptive to interpretive to the generation of patterns. Bogdan and Biklen (1992) recommended a coding scheme that divides codes in the following way:

1. Setting/Context: general information on the environment that allows you to put the study in a larger context

2. Definition of the situation: how people understand, define, or perceive the setting or the topics of the study

3. Perspectives: ways of thinking about their setting shared by interviewees

4. Ways of thinking about people and objects: understandings of each other, of outsiders, of objects in their world

5. Process: sequence of events, trends, transitions, and turning points, changes over time

6. Activities: regularly occurring kinds of behavior

7. Events: specific activities, especially ones occurring infrequently

8.   Strategies: ways of accomplishing things; people's tactics, methods, techniques for meeting their goals

9.   Relationships and social structure: unofficially defined patterns such as partnerships, coalitions, friendships, enemies

10.   Methods: problems, joys, dilemmas of the research process – often in relation to comments by observers.

For this study, I modified Bogdan and Biklen's (1992) coding scheme to align with Becher's (1989) six categories of academic disciplines. Rather than having 10 main coding categories, I used six. The coding categories included:

1.   Characteristics of the Field: general information on programs and services, targeted populations, and partnerships; and historical trends that influenced the direction of the profession.

2.   Epistemological Issues: the influence of theory and academic research on the work of college access professionals; the critical issues and trends that may influence the future direction of the field; contested ideologies, and professional development opportunities.

3.   Career Patterns: personal, educational, and professional experiences; career preparation; career goals; and hiring practices.

4.   Reputations and Rewards: criteria for professional recognition including professional standards, the recognition of good work, and the identification of leaders in the field.

5.   Professional Activity: how professional networks, associations, and programmatic alignments influence the work of college access professionals.

6.   Value Systems: the rewards and frustrations of college access work; one's community involvement and interests outside of work; along with the value systems that guide professional associations.

See Appendix B for my list of codes that stems from the conceptual framework of the study and my list of research questions.

For the final data analysis, I put into categories all the material from my interviews that spoke to one theme or concept. I compared materials within the categories to look for variations and nuances in meanings. I compared across the categories to discover connections between themes, with the goal of integrating the themes and concepts into a theory that offers an accurate and detailed interpretation of the college access profession (Rubin & Rubin, 1995).

Limitations

As with other studies of college preparation programs, this study has its limitations. Most notably the scope of the study was narrowed to include only practitioners at colleges and universities in Arizona. This purposive sampling procedure decreased the generalizability of the findings to other state systems or the profession as a whole (Creswell, 2003). A population of 20 practitioners and five association leaders might yield a somewhat limited and ambiguous interpretation of the culture of the college access profession. Ideally, findings would need to be cross-checked against those derived

from further setsof respondents, preferably from additional colleges and universities outside the state of Arizona.

In addition, as with Becher's (1989) study the value of the basic data is limited by the method used in the inquiry. Relying almost entirely on spoken testimony, rather than on the full-fledged anthropological technique of participant and non participant observation, limits its validity to the opinions of those interviewed as opposed to the practices of those within the profession.

Summary

This chapter has explained the methods used in this qualitative analysis of the culture of the college access profession. The next chapter presents the results obtained with the above methods.

THE DATA AND RESULTS

The study reported here focused on deepening our understanding of the construct of the college access profession through the views of individuals who work in college preparation programs and through the examination of networks and associations in which they participate. By exploring the values, standards, philosophies, climate, and networks within the college access profession, I sought to learn more about the culture of professionals who design and staff college access programs. The chapter is organized around the concepts that emerged as themes during the interviews and in terms of the six research questions posed in Chapter 1.

In regards to the first research question, results indicate that the boundaries of college access work are changing and that college access professionals define their work in terms of relationship building with a variety of constituents. The next section examines research question two on how research and theory influence the work of these professionals including discussion on when they use research and what is the source of the research. Research questions three and four examine the career patterns that college access professionals follow as well as an examination of the leaders in the field. The results of the fifth research question provide an overview of the professional networks and associations that influence the work of those working in college access. The chapter closes with a discussion of research question six regarding the value systems that guide the work of college access professionals.

Define their Work

In talking with college access professionals, it became clear that their work varies from recruiting and selecting students and families for their programs, to developing curriculum for academic enrichment programs, to planning field trips and college visits, to developing series of family college knowledge workshops and campus visits, to offering professional development opportunities for teachers, counselors, and school administrators with the goal of developing a college going culture in the schools. One practitioner defined the role of her department in this way, "we provide services to students, secondly services to parents, and lastly services that try to build capacity in the schools."

Her description is useful because it captures the essence of the majority of my interviews, and I will use it as a framework for this discussion as to how college access professionals define their work including the boundaries of the work and professional neighbors. The boundaries of college access work, or in other words the scope of work, varied from professional to professional and from campus to campus. Using the above categories services to students, services to parents and building capacity in the schools, the chart below provides the reader an overview of the scope of work for the practitioners in my study.

Table 4.1 Practitioners' Primary Scope of Work

	AU1	AU2	AU3	CC1	CC2	Total
Number of Practitioners	4	4	6	4	2	20
Programs & Services to Students	1	3	3	4	2	13
Programs & Services to Families	1		1			2
Building Capacity in the Schools	2					2
Combination of the Above		1	2			3

Of the twenty practitioners that I interviewed, 13 focused their efforts primarily

on programs and services to students. Programs and services to students include such

things as Saturday academies, after-school academic enrichment programs, tutoring,

summer programs, classroom presentations, field trips and college visits, and dual

enrollment courses. These programs also tend to include occasional family celebrations

or workshops, but do not include extensive long term relationship building with families.

Programs included under services to families are more deliberate than the occasional

family celebrations or workshops offered to participating students' families under

programs and services to students. Parent programs included in this category specifically

recruit parents to participate in ongoing college knowledge activities and campus visits,

and include long-term relationship building with families. Programs that build capacity in

the schools include activities such as professional development for counselors, teachers,

and school administrators; connecting schools with college and university resources; and

supporting the implementation of programs such as Advanced Placement, International

Baccalaureate, and AVID in the high schools. As shown in the chart above, three practitioners in my study served in managerial roles and focused their efforts on all three categories of programs.

Whether working with students, families, or school personnel a reoccurring theme that arose from my interviews with practitioners and professional association representatives was the importance of relationship and partnership building. One practitioner with over 20 years of experience summed up the importance of school, university, and community partnerships to reach students and families in this way:

We work with many individuals and university departments on campus, and I would say that almost every academic college we have some sort of partnership….We actually really depend on our partnerships to implement many of our programs....... Sometimes we're approached to reach out to parents and students, but we also depend upon them [faculty] a lot, not only to make presentations…. We go to them for advice or to run ideas by them.…. I learned from my predecessors that it's really important to work with the community or be visible within community organizations because you know they are a resource to reach out to families and students to get the word out.

The practitioner's comments highlighted the ever expanding scope of college access work to also include building partnerships with campus departments and community allies. College access work is about building relationships with schools, students, their families, and campus and community partners, and it is through these relationships that practitioners are able to practice their trade and implement their

programs. The following subsections outline how practitioners define their work in relation to their associations with schools, students, their families, and campus and community partners. I will also outline the results of this study that speak to the need for better relations with fellow practitioners.

Schools. Except for one program at AU1, outreach practitioners are deliberate about the school districts they choose to develop partnerships with. They target school districts that "do not have the same resources or advantages that other groups may have", identifying districts with high percentages of students on free and reduced lunch programs, low high school graduation rates, high percentages of first-generation college bound students, and high percentages of underrepresented minorities.

Without trusted relationships within the schools, college access practitioners do not have access to the students they serve, nor would they have access to data about these students that they very much need for accountability and evaluation purposes of their programs. When asked about partnerships, one AU3 practitioner spoke about the importance of relationships in the schools:

> A lot of people within the school districts – teachers, counselors, principals, school district administrators - for them to allow us access to their students and understanding that these are their schools and that they have responsibilities for these students and their parents and understanding that we do in a sense have to ask for permission.

Access to students is not the only reason practitioners develop relationships with schools. Constructive relationships between practitioners and schools are necessary in order to shape students' academic preparation.

We know through research that the college preparation programs should focus on academic preparation not only because a high level of academic preparation is required to enroll in college but also because the groups of students who continue to be underrepresented in higher education are also the groups that are least likely to be academically prepared (Perna, 2005). And yet when talking with practitioners, less than half referred to their work as involving teachers, counselors, and administrators with professional development opportunities to increase the capacities in the school. Practitioners at AU3, a practitioner who coordinates a statewide program through AU2, and a practitioner at AU1 who leads a program with a mission to train teachers to be Advance Placement instructors are an exception to that statement. But seemingly TRIO practitioners, community college practitioners, and others do not see their relationships with schools beyond access to the students they serve. In fact, one Upward Bound professional commented during her interview that "we need to do a better job communicating with our high school districts beyond the recruitment time."

Practitioners at AU3 clearly articulate trying to build capacity in the schools as a component of their mission. They are building capacity by providing funding for professional development activities for teachers, by training counselors how to create a college going culture in their schools, and through a new initiative college knowledge for school teams. One AU3 practitioner spoke of rewriting the curriculum for her program to

align with Arizona state math, science and structured English immersion standards. AU1 has chosen to build capacity in the schools by "helping school districts develop Advanced Placement programs…by serving as the liaison with the College Board and ACT bringing the resources to schools" and by organizing a summer professional development conference for teachers.

Pathways to College Network's *A Shared Agenda* established six general principles to guide educators and stakeholders in efforts to improve college access and success. The fourth principle is to involve leaders at all levels in establishing policies, programs, and practices that facilitate student transitions toward postsecondary attainment. GEAR UP practitioners spoke of the importance of partnerships with school districts and the importance of P-16 alignment and the role of college access programs in systemic change in schools in this way:

> It's the efforts that are happening nationwide and at a statewide level to try to make K-16 and P-20 seamless…There is just lots more communication naturally now between universities and colleges and K-12. It takes so long, when I think they don't even know how to talk to one another or there are so many silos at so many levels and so much to be done to have a system be seamless to make sense from a student's perspective.

Students. Helping students make sense of the college preparation process is what college access professionals do on a daily basis. How they do that may vary, but the constituents they serve are consistent across the Arizona programs included in this study. College access practitioners build relationships and provide services to low income,

underrepresented minority, and first-generation college bound students. Some may start earlier with students working with them while in elementary or middle school, while others may work only with high school students. Some programs target their populations more narrowly to also include students with disabilities, students from single parent households, foster children, teen parents, teens working more than 15 hours per week, and students with a desire to improve their academic performance and go on to postsecondary education.

No matter whom the students are, the college access practitioners included in this study all spoke of the rewarding nature of the work and that "working with the individual students and helping them through the process, and being that connection to the university" was the best part of the job. Another spoke of her commitment to her students in this way "once I recruit a student to this program, I'm making the commitment to help the student get to the other end of the journey." And yet another practitioner summed up her thoughts on relationships with students as such:

> The beauty of access programs is that it's so much more than a classroom relationship with the student. In access programs that I'm familiar with, you develop such a personal relationship with the student that transcends teacher/student. It's mentor/mentee; it's a guide. It's so much more of an intrinsic relationship. I don't know of any other field that would allow me that kind of relationship with people.

For this particular practitioner, relationships develop easily with students because her program is designed to work with students through all four years of high school and includes a weekly Saturday academy and a summer residential program.

Saturday academies and summer programs were common elements of college access programs. In addition, the college access programs included in this study provided some sort of academic enrichment component, trying to address the issue of academic preparedness of the students. It varied in the ways that it presented itself from program to program to also include tutoring, dual enrollment courses at community colleges, study skills workshops, and test preparation sessions. Other common programmatic elements include: college visits and tours; career exploration activities in the community and on college campuses; hands on math, science and engineering activities; and college knowledge and financial aid workshops for students and their families.

Families. Despite all the research that states the importance of family enagement in the college preparation process, it is surprising how few practitioners spoke of the prominence of family activities as part of their program. And yet it is these same practitioners when talking about their own experience preparing for college and/or deciding on what college to attend, spoke of how their parents were supportive, but could not help them because they had no college knowledge themselves. This was especially evident amongst TRIO, community college and AU2 practitioners.

One community college practitioner, whether intentional or not, viewed parental engagement through a deficit model lens.

Because of the socio-economic background of most of the parents, they are out there working and hustling jobs. They are not as much in the lives of their children as one would like to. But the circumstances are beyond their control. To make ends meet they have to work day and night, so the children don't get that much supervision.

With this particular outreach program, parents were asked to sign a contract making a commitment on behalf of their children, however the program did not provide for family college knowledge or financial aid workshops or visits to college campuses.

In the case of the Upward Bound program at AU1, we were into our interview for well over an hour before the topic of family engagement came up. Over the years they have struggled with family support. For the upcoming year, they are modifying their program's student selection process to include a parent interview where parental expectations will be explained to parents. Students, whose parents can not commit to the program, will not be selected for participation. The program manager is realistic about the realities of incorporating family engagement activities into their program.

It's hard to involve families….We know the session should be short and that they should be at night. It would be great if we could afford to provide child care. They might have to be bilingual. There should be food and again when we can accommodate those areas we will do it but it's not always possible.

On the opposite end of the spectrum the two major research universities in the state have developed and sponsor family programs intended to increase parents' social and cultural capital - the resources that parents need to have in order to help their children

navigate the pathway to higher education. With a 25 year history, AU1's mother daughter

program annually selects 150 teams of mothers and daughters whom they work with for

nine years, from 8th grade through university graduation. The program practitioners

believe that "by educating the mother, we are also educating the entire family." When

asked about critical issues facing college access programs, the program manager talked

about the importance of involving families.

> I think that's one of the reasons why our program is so successful because we are
>
> involving the parent in the program. And they know exactly what their daughters
>
> are doing. They are actually doing everything alongside their daughter... Many of
>
> our parents say that I only speak Spanish. I don't speak English so it's really
>
> helpful for me to know how I can help my daughter…With this program I can be
>
> involved and ask questions. So many other programs don't involve that parent
>
> piece.

AU3's approach to family engagement is similar. Their focus on family

engagement started about ten years ago.

> We realized that parents were a key component of a student's decision as to
>
> whether they are going to enroll in higher education. Our parents' college
>
> knowledge program started at about that time. We were working with parents in
>
> the transition from middle school to high school to provide them information that
>
> they needed to be best prepared for higher education. Later we developed the
>
> college knowledge academy which works with parents of elementary students,

providing those messages at the earliest stage of the educational pipeline, as possible.

Using a funds of knowledge approach to his work, the practitioner coordinating the college academy for parents incorporates what families know about student success and college preparation into his 12 weekly sessions.

I'm not looking for people to listen to me for an hour or two hours. It's lets hear what you guys know for right now. What do we think about each of these subject areas? … Or how can we break some of the myths that may be out there? That's the framework I take with it. Rather than the other way – where I could just lecture for two hours…. It gets the information across, but it comes off very cold and it doesn't relate to the culture. And it doesn't respect the fact that they have knowledge that they can use.

Campus and community partners. The program above, college knowledge academy, would not be possible without faculty support. Practitioners at all the sites talked about the support they received from campus departments, but clearly AU3's programs receive far more faculty support than other campus programs in my study. One practitioner spoke of the loose coupling between the college access program and campus faculty that allows for effortless participation on behalf of the faculty.

It allows faculty members to come and do their presentation and to come out.…They don't have the time to set something up in a local school where they can go out and talk with parents. For us to do that, to have a relationship already set up…so they can come in and come out and yet invite them back to our closing

ceremony, I think that that allows them to feel like they are part of the program

and hopefully that leaves them with…a willingness to give back.

At AU3 there is strong support from science faculty, that one practitioner

explained in this way:

Most of the time they are very grateful to have somebody who can do this piece,

because their grant has a requirement to reach students and they don't know how

or have the staff to do that, to actually get students to come…[These grant

requirements], particularly in math and science, [got started] due to the lack of

possible future employees….Student aren't majoring in those fields…work force

development.

Besides engaging science and math faculty members in their programs, college access

practioners at AU3 engage faculty members from the social sciences as well. They have

also had success with engaging bilingual faculty members to make presentations to

monolingual Spanish speaking parents.

Although not all college outreach programs receive the kind of faculty support

that AU3 receives, most college practitioners spoke of the support their programs receive

from student affairs departments such as multicultural student centers, multicultural

student affairs, tutoring and learning services, testing, academic advising, career services,

residence life, and financial aid; and yet some feel no allegiance to being part of the

student affairs division or even the campus community. One practitioner put it this way:

I definitely don't identify with student affairs in the job that I do….I can't find the

relationship with that larger unit as to what we do.…We are outcasts from the rest

of the unit that we are in.

In a similar vein, a practitioner from AU2 said "I often feel like I'm not part of anything, not even the university."

Although practitioners may not feel part of their campus division, most practitioners spoke positively of the support their program received from their institutional admissions office. Admissions staff generally provided campus tours, made presentations, provided marketing materials, and waived application fees for program participants. Although campus admissions offices value early outreach programs, because they assist campuses in reaching their long term diversity enrollment goals, there appears to be a division between practitioners as to whether they recruit for the college or not. Those working in federally funded grant programs were outspoken about the fact that they do not recruit for the institution that they work for. And yet even programs that claim they don't recruit for their institution, offer opportunities for participants to earn college credit from the institution.

Of the 20 practitioners that I interviewed, five of them coordinate or manage programs with an expectation that participating students will be recruited to their institution and eventually convert to matriculating students. Similarly six practitioners coordinate programs in which participating students are enrolled in credit bearing classes at their institution. CC2's program is an excellent example of this. They have built their entire college access program around the opportunity for high school juniors and seniors to earn up to 24 units of college credit in a two year period from the summer before their junior year in high school through high school graduation.

This notion of whether college access practitioners recruit for their institutions, speaks directly to the boundaries of their work and their professional neighbors. At AU1, outreach initiatives are coordinated by an assistant dean in undergraduate admissions with the primary focus on two goals "leveraging [institutional] resources for schools and increasing enrollment to the university from those schools." Similarly, the community colleges outreach efforts use "a 2+2+2 program model…[designed to provide] two years college experience during high school during the junior and senior year. Hopefully two years at the community college, and the last two years at the university as a transfer student." That approach to outreach is built upon a different philosophical foundation from AU3's approach, which is best described by a practitioner's comments.

> "Our job is not to help recruit for [AU3] at all. We can talk about any university in Arizona or not. We can talk about how to get there, what those requirements are. We are completely open to doing that as long as they are going to college. That's the main goal.

Partnerships with college access programs spread beyond the walls of academia to relationships with community organizations and businesses as well. Depending on the size and scope of the college access program, the external partnerships can range from a career exploration field trip to a local newspaper to million dollar foundation agreements. A practitioner speaks with pride about her work in building a partnership with a school district, the university, and Advanced Placement.

> [A local school district] is an example of total partnership and collaboration. When I was given [the district] assignment, I went to New York and met with the

president of Advanced Placement. I asked him for assistance, and he said that for

every teacher that I sent to a summer institute, he would pay the price for another

one. So for three years in a row large numbers of teachers got to attend. By

the time their AP program began; they had a well educated prepared staff and

that made a big difference.

The above example exemplifies what college access professionals know about building

capacity in the schools.

Relationships between practitioners. "Schools can't do it alone. It really takes

partnering and collaborating with a lot of other organizations and folks." Despite the

emphasis on relationship building with schools, students, families, and campus and

community partnerships, very little effort is made to develop relationships with one

another. As opposed to a sense of professional comradery, practitioners' loyalty to their

institutions tends to breed organizational competitiveness between programs. As an

example, a young practitioner at AU3 commented that "not anywhere else in Arizona are

they doing college access work", and later in the interview when talking about his

professional future, he commented that "AU1 doesn't have a developed outreach

program, and because it's AU1, I can't ever see myself going there."

That same organizational pride came across in other interviews as well. AU3

practitioners see themselves as leaders in Arizona. When asked about leaders in the field,

the program manager of AU3's outreach program commented.

I think [AU3] in our own state because we are a unique office…considering what

a small little office we have, we've accomplished a lot. And we are pretty

innovative too.

It is that same practitioner when talking about her decision on what college to attend talked about "the prestige factor in choosing AU3 over AU1…that I was going to the best college in Arizona." This prideful attitude maybe fueling the myth that no one else is doing this type of work in our state and keeps practitioners from crossing institutional lines to collaborate on behalf of Arizona students.

If practitioners worked collaboratively, they might be able to pool their resources to build capacity in the schools or coordinate their efforts with students and families. A common theme I heard throughout my interviews was the challenge of maintaining the integrity of programs despite years of level funding from the federal government, or the need to make tough choices to eliminate services because of budget cuts. One program coordinator suggested that "by pooling resources you could do a lot more for the students. If one group focused on campus visits, and another focused on speakers, money would go farther, and we wouldn't always have to be worried about our tight budget."

Another practitioner spoke with frustration about the duplication and redundancy of services to students and the changing relationships with schools:

> When I first took over the grant, the schools seemed to provide us more access to students. Now the schools are very sensitive to the number of times we are taking students out of classrooms and off the school grounds…. with the Upward Bound program with the same requirement to get the kids out there….We just can't be pressing all the same people…..JTED, Ignite, AVID, there are so many programs out there now, which is also impacting how we conduct operations at the

schools….Teachers are getting a little frustrated with constantly pulling kids

out....It's an issue.

The comments above not only highlight the duplication of services in schools, but

also exemplify the above practitioners lack of understanding that the scope of college

access work is expanding. Ignite and AVID are programs initiated in the schools by

GEAR UP that speak directly to building capacity in the schools and are sustainable even

without GEAR UP funding. JTED (Joint Technical Education District), although not a

college access program, builds on this notion of sustainable school reform with a goal to

engage students in their education and prepare them for postsecondary career and

technical education.

To summarize, college access professionals define their work in terms of

programs and services to students, family engagement and building capacity in schools.

Beyond relationships with students, families, and school personnel, outreach staff depend

on relationships with campus and community partners to effectively implement their

programs and services. Beyond these relationships, college access work should also be

defined by research emphasizing the critical elements for college readiness. This leads us

to the next section of this chapter that will outline practitioners' use of research and

theory in designing and implementing their college access programs.

Research and Theory

The use of theory and research by college access professionals varied widely and

at times seemed to split along institutional stratification lines or along TRIO and GEAR

UP practitioner lines. And amongst those that valued research and theory, there was little

continuity amongst practitioners as to the theories or the authors that grounded their work.

Not surprisingly, practitioners from the two state Research I institutions often used the term research based practices during our conversations and referred to the work of William Tierney including *Preparing for College: Nine Elements of Effective Outreach.* Tierney's work was popular amongst these practitioners because he has "developed some research that is really geared toward practitioners". These same practitioners also referred to theoretical concepts of funds of knowledge, and social and cultural capital as a lens through which they approach their work. Where as, community college practitioners and those at AU2 valued hands on experience and took more of a trial and error approach to their work.

> I'm not against reading or research….but I'm more a balance of 50/50
>
> that experience is just as important….We have someone who's been
>
> here for 18 years doing this with kids. I'm not going to tell him how
>
> to do his job because I've read a book about it.

A TRIO professional expressed a similar attitude about the use of theory in the design of her work: "I'm a hands-on kind of person. I've never enjoyed the theory of something. Just tell me what you want me to do and I will do it."

In contrast the foundation of GEAR UP and the National Council for Community and Education Partnerships (NCCEP) is research based. NCCEP's mission statement refers to their work in developing new research-based college access programs and supporting the implementation of proven educational strategies. An association leader

spoke eloquently about the research that was done during the design phase of the GEAR

UP model on the federal level.

> I give credit to the Clinton administration that had the foresight and the committee
>
> that helped develop GEAR UP… all the research they put into this makes it easier
>
> for us to argue that we know what works. It has to have a family engagement
>
> component. You are not going to be successful if this is a missing part.…We
>
> know that students need to have the academic rigor. It must be a priority.

Articulating that same philosophy, a GEAR UP practitioner referred to research that

influenced using a cohort model, beginning work with students no later than the seventh

grade, setting high expectations for students, accountability, and using a partnership

model.

Just as research was used in the design of the federal GEAR UP model,

practitioners also used research when designing their local programs and practices.

Tierney, Corwin and Colyar's (2005) *Preparing for College: Nine Elements of Effective*

Outreach was used while writing a GEAR UP grant, and all staff members working in

outreach at AU1 read the book as they were expanding their outreach efforts. Similarly,

when talking about how she designed her award winning outreach program at CC2, the

program director spoke of a two year planning grant she received from a foundation and

the research that went into the development of the program. "We took a little bit of

Upward Bound, what JTPA (Job Training Partnership Act) had at that time, the mother

daughter program at AU1. We took a little bit of everything and formed our own

program."

Research had been done during the planning process for AU3's college knowledge academy program. The journal articles that had been collected during that time have been saved and passed on over the years to new coordinators of the program. The current coordinator shared his frustrations with me about the readings that that he was given.

> "I don't know that there is a lot of literature that goes into it. A lot of the focus becomes more on the administration of it and just getting the planning and everything together. And not so much that theory that goes into it. Which I always feel is a down side to it, and I wish there was more focus on that. I think that's something I've found widely within our work. It doesn't always have this really good base in any kind of theory."

In contrast to the above practitioner's frustration with the lack of theory supporting his parent program, colleagues working in programs with services to students more often than not sited student development theory, retention theory, and John Gardner's work, *The First Year Experience* as the foundation for their work with students. One practitioner summed it up this way, "I'm living the theory. I feel that I'm living the theory as weird as that may sound; it does make sense…So I use student development theory….I use it daily."

Three of the five professional association leaders spoke to the idea that college access was not enough; college access needs to result in college success with students earning a bachelor's degree. If indeed this notion of college success permeates down to practitioners, then using retention theory as a foundation for practice, whether they do it

consciously or not, makes sense. And for those professionals working within student affairs and student services, embracing these theories may help them feel "at home" in their placement within the institution.

In relation to research and publications, so many practitioners said "I don't read enough". Or another admitted "that's one of my weakest areas. I've not really looked at a lot of research." Another practitioner explained why she doesn't stay current on her reading. "We get caught up in what we do so much that what anyone else does takes up my time that I could be spending with students."

The lack of interest in research and theory by the above practitioners may be explained by their "local" orientation to their work. Both practitioners went to college at the institutions in which they currently are employed, and as college students worked as student employees in the same college access program in which they currently work. Both have strong loyalty to their institutions and have never worked professionally anywhere else. Gouldner (1957) found that along with high organizational loyalty, locals generally exhibited a low commitment to specialized skills, as manifested in this study, by practitioners prioritizing students' needs over academic reading.

Understanding that practitioners feel they don't have time to read, NCAN developed a daily email listserv for members. The service is described as "wildly popular" and as "a clipping service". Whenever there is policy development, new research, or an article in the *Chronicle* that relates to college access, they put it out on the listserv. Building on the popularity of the listserv, NCAN also developed a series of monthly conference calls with guest speakers who talk for a half hour on a particular

topic and then take questions and answers. Sometimes the calls focus around different reports that have been published and other times they may focus on resources that are available to practitioners to assist them in their work. Either way, the services that NCAN provides to their members speaks to their critical role in the research to practice connection.

Pathways to College Network (Pathways) is also focused on using research to inform policy and practice. Pathways sees themselves as "the middle organization that brings together and links researchers, policy makers, and practioners", and their work focuses on creating "resources that are easy to use for practioners and to promote with practitioners the value of using data and research to inform their decision-making, assess the effectiveness of what they're doing, and maintenance needed to improve the outcomes for their students."

Pathways produced *A Shared Agenda,* a report that included research and exemplary practices that practitioners and leaders in government and education could use to guide their work in creating equal educational opportunity for students. Although NCCEP works collaboratively with Pathways, and uses *A Shared Agenda* as the foundation and tool for the professional development they offer for college access practitioners, the *Agenda* and its messages do not appear to be permeating the work of practitioners. Of the twenty practitioners that I interviewed only three mentioned the Pathways to College Network or *A Shared Agenda.*

Career Patterns

One explanation for why practitioners don't subscribe to a particular theoretical frame of reference could be because their educational backgrounds and their career patterns leading them to outreach work vary greatly. However, three traits many practitioners do have in common are that they themselves were first generation college students; that many worked while in college in similar, if not the exact program, they are currently working in today; and that many continue to work at the institution from which they earned their bachelor's degree.

The degrees practitioners chose to pursue as undergraduates varied across the board from secondary education, to criminal justice, to family studies, to business, and graphic design. Of the twenty practitioners included in the study, thirteen currently hold advanced degrees. Their paths to an advanced degree were far more similar to one another than their undergraduate programs. Twelve of the 13 practitioners have advanced degrees from colleges of education with some variation between degree programs. Ten of the practitioners with advanced degrees earned them in Arizona. Five earned their degrees in educational leadership through a distance education program designed for working professionals, while the other five earned their degrees as full-time students at a residentially based doctoral/research extensive university, which may explain practitioners' use of research and publications in their work.

Much has been written about faculty disciplinary culture and its impact on their professional lives, the variation in priorities, and their social and epistemological orientations (Becher, 1987; Clark, 1980). Applying Clark's (1980) conclusion that disciplinary culture prevails throughout one's career regardless of where one is

employed, could explain why those trained at the doctoral/research extensive university were more likely to refer to research based practices, data driven decision making, and the sociological theories of funds of knowledge, and social and cultural capital as a foundation for their work.

Although the practitioners that I interviewed pursued various undergraduate majors, one characteristic they had in common were that they themselves were first generation college students. Fifteen of the twenty practitioners and three of the five association leaders were first generation college students. Many talked of their own personal struggle with navigating the waters from high school to college, their frustrations with not understanding the system while in college, and often spoke of a mentor or someone who took time with them to unmuddy the waters and point them in the right direction. A motivating force behind their work is the desire to be that "someone" who calms the waters and help students and their families navigate the college preparation and application process. One practitioner shared his experience.

> My dad has a high school degree, and my mother doesn't even have that. They
> didn't know anything about college….They didn't know anything about FAFSA.
> They didn't know anything about scholarships. I showed up on campus with what
> my father could pull together. I didn't know that I could apply for financial
> assistance. I didn't know any of that stuff. So when I got this job, I saw the
> opportunity maybe to fix that. I made it my mission.

Many other practioners echoed similar thoughts and feelings about their work, especially those that were first generation themselves.

I was surprised to find that twelve of the twenty practitioners included in my study had worked as a college student in a program similar to, if not the exact program; they are currently working in today. The professional staff that supervised and mentored them as student employees tended to have a great impact on the direction of their educational and professional career path. As an example, one UA3 practitioner shared:

> I worked for a transitional summer program and a program that was similar to a TRIO program and because of my work there, I started to find that I really loved to do this, to help students that were in a similar situation become acquainted with the university and find success here. And as I was getting ready to graduate, five years later, I had to figure out what was the next step. I was fortunate to have a graduate student within our office at that time that was studying within higher education, and she said that you need to look into the program. I picked up a brochure and it was what I wanted to do, so I enrolled.

Similarly, the person above, as a professional staff person, mentored the next generation of student employees into the field.

For some practitioners, like the example above, their student experiences lead to a conscious decision to pursue a career in higher education, but for others it was more of a natural progression from student employee to a professional staff position. "I was looking for a job. It was a department I was familiar with, and I enjoyed the work. I figured it's something until I figure out what I want to do." Eleven years later this practitioner is still working in the field.

Other than direct work experience as a student employee, practitioners entered the outreach field by a variety of avenues. Those practitioners that focus their efforts on building capacity in the schools and increasing academic rigor for students tend to have had K-12 teaching experience which has allowed them to easily establish credibility with teachers and school administrators. Those that provide direct services to students had previous experience with tutoring students or working with youth groups. One practitioner who came to college access work by way of the Arizona Attorney General's Office and the Arizona Bar Foundation described her professional journey to college access work in this way:

> Everyone of the experiences that I have had, have been comparable in caring about the underdog or people that are disadvantaged….So my identity, even though it was a different arena, the common element or theme has been the disadvantaged population….It wasn't like I said to myself, I want to go find a college access program to be the director of….the passion, it really triggered my passion for the work.

Because college access practitioners come to this work with such varied experiences, when hiring new staff, program managers tend to look for particular personal qualities more so than specific types of work experiences. First and foremost is a belief in educational equity. One program manager put it this way, "They must believe that education can change lives. And they believe that it changed theirs, and they are passionate about the work." That sentiment was repeated in all of my interviews. And frankly that passion is necessary because as so many practitioners pointed out the work is

hard; there is a lot of work to be done; the hours are long; and there is little financial reward.

For many in the field, that passion may have been sparked as a student employee in a similar program, and may explain why so many university practitioners included in this study are working at the institutions from which they earned their bachelor's degree. This is true of all the practitioners at AU1, three of the four at AU2, and four of the six at AU3. As I reflected on this trend, I was reminded of Gouldner's (1957) work on "cosmopolitans" and "locals". An individual's professional orientation will influence their behavior with the institution, will impact their interest in developing professional networks and will influence their professional identity.

Gouldner (1957) described a cosmopolitan as a professional with a national or external focus whose career and reward system is linked to professional associations and career advancement, as opposed to the employing organization. On the other hand, locals are recognized for their care of and loyalty to the employing organization and their ability to navigate community and political networks.

To consider the application of this concept further, I looked at practitioners' professional goals and where they saw themselves in the future. For four of the twenty practitioners I interviewed, their professional careers in college access were nearing an end. Retirement and caring for aging parents is the next stage in their lives. For the 16 remaining practitioners in my study, their career goals and future plans varied, although one can see how they split down this cosmopolitan and local divide, with the majority leaning toward the local side.

The cosmopolitans were connected to professional associations, kept current with publications from these associations, and were interested in earning a Ph.D. Some only toyed with the idea, but others were very clear as to what they wanted to study and how they hoped their research would impact their communities and contribute to the field.

> I would really like to do some work with Native Americans in higher education. …much of the literature shows that Native Americans tend to be statistically insignificant. And I think will remain significantly insignificant if there's no research done. I would like to contribute to that body of knowledge….I would like to find that model or formula or that piece of the puzzle that can help these students succeed.

A colleague agreed, wanting to make a contribution on a national level. "I want to develop or look at Native American leadership or the power of mentorship….incorporate some of the Native American culture teachings into leadership"

Although these cosmopolitans saw themselves continuing their education, a common theme amongst them was that their work would continue to impact youth, but on a much broader scale than their current position.

On the other hand, more than half of the practitioners in my study could not see themselves leaving the communities in which they work. One practitioner spoke of the importance of staying in his community in this way:

> I definitely see myself here working in [this community]….To me that is important staying here in the community and utilizing the benefits of all these relationships that I've been able to build and to continue to hopefully help myself

and whatever program I'm working with.

How one views oneself professionally, whether through a community lens or a national or external focus, could provide insight as to who they consider leaders in the field and as to the influence professional associations and networks have on their work.

Professional Recognition

To assess criteria for professional recognition I explored professional standards of practice, and the identification of and recognition of leaders in the field. However these efforts were to little avail. Although, the Council for the Advancement of Standards (2002) has adapted standards and guidelines for TRIO and other educational opportunity programs, not one practitioner and only one professional association leader mentioned them when asked about professional standards. The Council for Opportunity in Education (COE) representing TRIO professionals was aware of the standards, but ironically the association leader from the Western Association of Educational Opportunity Personnel (WESTOP), a regional member association of COE and a TRIO practitioner herself, was not aware of the standards.

Council for the Advancement of Standards (CAS) Standards and Guidelines (2006) consist of 13 parts including: 1) mission, 2) student learning and development outcomes, 3) leadership, 4) organization and management, 5) human resources, 6) financial resources, 7) facilities, technology and equipment, 8) legal responsibilities, 9) equity and access, 10) campus and external relations, 11) diversity, 12) ethics, and 13) assessment and evaluation.

The Pathways to College Network took a different approach to establishing professional standards of practice. Through a synthesis of research evidence from hundreds of studies, they established six principles to guide the actions of educational and community leaders in establishing college access programs. Those six principles are:

1. Expect that all underserved students are capable of being prepared to enroll and succeed in college.

2. Provide a range of high-quality college preparatory tools for underserved students and their families.

3. Embrace social, cultural, and learning-style differences in developing learning environments and activities for underserved students.

4. Involve leaders at all levels in establishing policies, programs, and practices that facilitate student transitions toward postsecondary attainment from: elementary to middle school; middle school to high school; high school to college; and college to work and further education.

5. Maintain sufficient financial and human resources to enable underserved students to prepare for, enroll, and succeed in college.

6. Assess policy, program, practice, and institutional effectiveness regularly.

These principles speak to and reflect the changing scope of college access work. Principles two and three embrace social and cultural differences and incorporate family into the college preparation process. Principle one, expecting that all underserved

students are capable of being prepared for college, speaks to changing school culture and building capacity in the schools; as well as principle four by including leaders at all educational levels.

Once again, when asked about professional standards of practice, practitioners did not specifically referred to the above principles; however their responses generally espoused similar values and certain themes rose to the surface. The most prevalent themes are summed up by two practitioners' responses. "I try to be the best that I can be in service of the people that I serve." And "I try to remember where I come from. I think that's most important for a student who is underrepresented. I try to come from that humble background. I know exactly where I came from and I hold myself to that."

Just as the responses to professional standards varied, so were practitioners' responses when asked about leaders in the field. A practitioner from UA1 jokingly summed it up this way, "I don't know. It depends on what website you're looking at, doesn't it?"

One young professional suggested that the leaders in the field were researchers not practitioners, citing the work being done at University of California Los Angeles and University of Southern California. His view was corroborated by those that referenced the College Board's and the Pathways to College Network's commitment to research through their publications and policy agenda.

On the practitioner side, several folks mentioned The University of California system with their infrastructure. The outreach directors convene regularly to share best

practices. Practitioners sighted their strong collaboration between the community colleges and the state universities to reach and serve more students.

The lack of universally recognized professional standards and leaders in the profession is indicative of the profession being a "nascent profession" as one practitioner described it.

Professional Networks and Associations

The variety and number of professional associations serving college access practitioners seems to further the division within the field. The Council for Opportunity in Education (COE) serves professionals working in TRIO programs. The National Council for Community and Education Partnerships (NCCEP) serves GEAR UP professionals, while the National College Access Network (NCAN) serves those practitioners working in community based college access programs. And the Pathways to College Network is an alliance of 38 national organizations and foundations of which COE, NCAN and NCCEP are all members.

DiMaggio and Powell (1983) and Rhoades (1998) speak to the importance of professional networks and associations in the establishment of an occupation as a profession. And in the case of those that work in college access, the National Council for Community and Education Partnerships (NCCEP) takes credit for coining the phrase "college access professional" as a way for all the players in college access to see themselves as part of a larger community. Whether practitioners actually see themselves as part of a profession is yet to be seen.

As one might expect, practitioners tend to split down the TRIO/GEAR UP party lines when participating in professional development activities; with TRIO professionals attending Western Association of Educational Opportunity Personnel (WESTOP) and Council for Opportunity in Education (COE) conferences, and those affiliated with GEAR UP programs attending NCCEP conferences. What I had not expected, was that College Board sponsored professional development activities would be as popular as they were amongst practitioners and that their activities seem to transcend the boundaries between TRIO and GEAR UP professionals. College Board offers a number of professional development opportunities, but those that college access practitioners have taken advantage of include: The National Advanced Placement Equity Colloquium, Preparate: Educating Latinos for the Future of America, Native American Student Advocacy Institute, and A Dream Deferred: The Future of African American Education. A practitioner from AU1 attended the College Board conference to make a presentation about her institution's access initiative, but found the benefit to attending to be, "feeling a connection to other people and what they were doing as far as college access."

The young practitioner who struggled with his department's placement within the division of student affairs agreed. "Having had the opportunity to present at a couple of conferences has helped to engender that a little bit. Because you connect with other people that are interested in your program who also do college access programs in other parts of the country. So you are able to see there are other people like us."

In describing managerial professionals Rhodes (2006) spoke to professionals subscribing to a body of technical knowledge and to the role of professional associations

in producing journals and publications. Larson (1977) and Collins (1979) also spoke to the idea of individual professions having a certain knowledge base on which one bases one's work. The work of COE, NCCEP, NCAN and Pathways support those theories. COE, through its Pell Institute conducts and disseminates research and policy analysis to encourage policy makers, educators, and the public to improve educational opportunities and outcomes for low-income, first-generation, and disabled college students. They have just begun to publish *Opportunity Matters,* a journal of research informing educational opportunity practice and programs.

In their mission and vision statement NCCEP refers to supporting proven programs and using research findings to create successful frameworks for action and as such, provides professional development for GEAR UP communities. Although NCCEP does not produce its own research; they use others' research to develop curriculum for practitioners to use with students and families.

In describing NCAN's role in research, an association leader described it this way, "It's less about us conducting the research and more about us taking this role in the research to practice connection. How do we help our practitioners translate all of this research that comes out? What are useful nuggets for them?" NCAN has an online tool kit, *Building Blocks for College Access,* and they produce an advisor training module.

Pathways to College Network emphasizes connecting policy makers, education leaders and practitioners, and community leaders with research on effective strategies for improving college preparation, enrollment and degree completion. Pathways developed

and published *A Shared Agenda* as a guide for educators and other stakeholders in efforts to improve college access and success.

The professional associations and networks included in my study all fundamentally agree that the purpose of the work is to make sure that traditionally underrepresented students are prepared for, have access to, and are ready to succeed in postsecondary education. Whom the associations serve and their approaches to their work are what separates them from one another and keeps them from collaborating on a broader scale.

It is easy to differentiate between the associations as to who they serve. COE and WESTOP serve professionals working in TRIO programs which include Talent Search, Upward Bound, Upward Bound Math/Science, Veteran's Upward Bound, Student Support Services, Educational Opportunity Centers, and Robert E. McNair Post-Baccalaureate Achievement Program. NCCEP serves GEAR UP professionals and those that work with ENLACE (Engaging Latino Communities for Education) programs. NCAN serves college access professionals that work in privately funded community based programs as opposed to college based programs. And the Pathways to College Network is an alliance of 38 national organizations and foundations committed to advancing college access and success for underserved students. COE, NCAN and NCCEP are all part of the Pathways to College Network.

One ideological difference between associations is the role of the federal government verse the private sector in providing funding for college access initiatives. A COE leader explained it this way:

Our organization strongly believes that opportunity is a federal responsibility.

And like financial aid, there is a place for state and private funding, but that

on balance you are not going to get opportunity except through federal

investment. I think there are some organizations that are more, as an example

NCAN, they have a stronger belief in the role of the private sector in

college access….I think probably they also differ on the level of

continuity that should be offered through these programs. The Council's

strong belief is that these programs are programs that individuals

ought to be able to rely on. Low income people ought to be able

to rely on and for that reason there should be continuity in the programs.

Continuity in programs is not something that is part of the GEAR UP and NCCEP

philosophy. An NCCEP leader explained the funding philosophy this way:

With the philosophy of GEAR UP, you've got to remain competitive.

You need to deserve the funding and need the funding. There is a different

mindset when you are a GEAR UP practitioner because….the idea here is

that you are in this for sustained reform efforts…You need to prove that you

have the data, that you can tell this story and that you are benefiting the

students and families involved. So there is this competitive edge that we

see in relation to a GEAR UP practitioner because of the nature of funding.

If you cannot come back and prove that you are making a difference, you

are not going to get funding. And that is a real point of contention.

When discussing critical issues facing college access programs, an experienced professional talked about the "critical issues around duplication and redundancy, and lack of coordination….it's still hugely political. In the early days of GEAR UP, COE and NCCEP they would fight unbelievable….In terms of what are the issues, because it is confusing from where I sit….The Metropolitan Education Commission is a huge fan of NCAN. I see that because they helped her at a time when she was reaching out and looking for help and that is where she connected…..and to what extent are we all contributing or not to furthering a common agenda or are we all just talking to hear ourselves talk?"

This lack of collaboration and redundancy is a reoccurring theme, not only between professional associations, but as discussed earlier in this chapter between practitioners in the field as well. One practitioner blames the lack of collaboration on money. "And there are so many programs out there that do similar things. You mentioned GEAR UP, WIA for Youth. But instead of everybody working together, we fight because we're fighting over the same money."

Value Systems

Despite the differences between professionals and professional associations, one association leader summed it up this way, "It is very clear to everyone that this is about serving low income students. And our priority is making sure that they are prepared for and have access to postsecondary education. So that is the common value system that is driving us." Another association leader referred to college access professionals "as a community of true believers", and indeed they are. Most practitioners work long hours.

They work Saturdays and evenings, and during summer residential camp programs put in 12 to 15 hour days for very little pay. Federal TRIO programs have been level funded for years; there are no salary increases and staff turnover is high. And yet people are drawn to the profession because of the rewarding nature of the work.

About her work in establishing an AP program, a practitioner said, "I take great pride in University High. It's been doing really well….knowing that I had an impact on something like that is important to me, in a district that a lot of people wrote off for a long time." Another practitioner echoed her sentiment about the difference her program is making in the schools. "What I find most rewarding is the success that we've experienced in effectively working with schools to accomplish our objectives." By improving schools, college access professionals are making "a difference in communities".

One practitioner spoke about how her experience as an Upward Bound student in high school and in college, and how she formed an appreciation for and an interest in politics and public policy.

> Because you become so involved with a small group of students, they become almost like family to you, and you care about their well being….you leave caring about more than yourself…you now just have to make sure that everyone else around you is going to be all right. So ever since I left Upward Bound in college, I didn't used to like politics all that much, but now I love politics. I don't want to be a politician or anything, but I understand the place for politics in our society. I understand the role that it plays specifically in Upward Bound, but I also think in access programs in general.

She is not alone in her interest in politics. One practitioner serves as a precinct committee member in his community, and another referred to herself as "political junkie". A practitioner's comments may explain the interest in politics, "Social issues are tied to politics. Immigration is really important to me and border issues are important…they are all tied to my work."

Overall, it appears that the nature of college access work is political. Whether it be on the federal level with immigration and border issues; on the state level in relation to school reform and educational funding; or on a local level with community members embracing the mission of college access programs; it seems that college access professionals need to be politically savvy.

An association leader in Washington DC described the political nature of the work and "the intricacies of the Beltway" in this way.

> There is a mixture of things that are aligning themselves to force a change…I see that the foundations that are supporting all of us in this field, whether it's Lumina or it's Ford or its Gates, everybody understands that the money is decreasing and that there isn't a need to have 20 of us doing the same thing. There is going to be a push for clarifying your niche and your identity as an organization about what you contribute. There's going to be some forced dialogs whether there is a way that we can see some mergers or greater collaboration…the shortage of funding at the federal level, and in the vision of a lot of the funders, will force people to collaborate and bring us back to the true meaning of partnerships.

For practitioners in Arizona, the passage of Proposition 300 in 2006 has had a great impact on their work, and an even greater impact on the undocumented students that they work with. One practitioner expressed her frustration this way.

We are raising a whole generation of kids that are as American as my children and your children. You have them work hard; they get good grades; and then they graduate from high school and you tell them they can't go to college or tell them you have to pay out-of-state tuition….Something horrible is going to happen if we don't solve this dilemma.

On a local level, practitioners talked cautiously about navigating the political waters and treading gently in working with school districts on student achievement issues and the politics of community organizations.

"I find it frustrating that there is a certain…tendency to not want to face the reality, the numbers, they don't want to share that information. They don't want the word to get out about how bad failure rates are in certain subjects....unless you have a sense of urgency about that problem…then I don't see how it's going to change in a significant way. I know what we do works for the people that we work with….but is it a large enough critical mass to make a difference? It's really frustrating to me to run into resistance about just talking openly about those facts and try to work together to find a solution. [They'd rather] just keep doing what we are doing because it looks good and it feels good.

A practitioner in the same community as the person above, shared additional insights into local community politics.

"The community members didn't understand why we are dedicating so many resources to [a south side school district]. There is going to be a push from the Hispanic community on how the university is serving [or not serving] second generation Hispanic students....when you have limited resources you need to serve the students who need the most help. At least that has been my philosophy here in the office.

The need to serve the students, who need the most help, seems to be at the core of college access professionals' being and is reflected also in their personal interests and activities. Practitioners spoke of their interests in border and immigration issues, civil rights, women's issues, mental health issues, and foster care; and their volunteer activities at battered women's' shelters, with church youth groups, and community foundations.

Summary

In summary, college access professionals "believe that education can change lives. And they believe that it changed theirs, and they are passionate about the work." The scope of work may vary from program to program or from campus to campus; their educational and career paths may vary; and they may be members of different associations and networks; but at the core they believe in the power of education. They are ardent supporters of educational equity and believe that this is more than a profession, "it is a new movement". In the next chapter I will discuss these finding in more detail, share my interpretations of the results, and their implications for practice in the field.

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

To assist the reader, the final chapter of the dissertation restates the research problem and the methodologies that were used to conduct the study and then summarizes the results. It then provides my interpretation of the findings, implications for practice, the relationship of this study to previous research, and suggestions for additional research.

Statement of the Problem

As stated in Chapter 1, the overall goal of my research was to deepen our understanding of the culture of college access work through the views of practitioners who design and staff college access programs. The study sought to explore the values, standards, philosophical foundations, career patterns, and networks that influence and guide the work of college access professionals.

Review of the Methodology

As explained in Chapter 3, I used a social constructivism perspective and based the study primarily upon interviews with twenty college and university professionals who work in the state of Arizona in K-12 college access programs and an analysis of the professional associations in which they participate. Leaders with the following professional associations were included in the study: Council for Opportunity in Education, National College Access Network, National Council for Community and Education Partnerships, Pathways to College Network, and Western Association of Educational Opportunity Personnel.

A guided interview approach was used, and three different sets of interview questions were used. Leaders of a professional association or network were asked one set of questions, and two different sets of questions were used for college access practitioners depending on their years of experience in the field. Because this study was modeled after Becher's (1989) analysis of the culture of academic disciplines, my interview questions fell into the following categories: 1) characteristics of the field, 2) epistemological issues, 3) career patterns, 4) reputations and rewards, 5) professional activity, and 6) value systems. Questions were coded back to these six main categories.

To understand more thoroughly how professional associations define and impact the culture of the college access profession, I also conducted a content analysis of the websites of the five professional associations previously mentioned. The website analysis covered four of Becher's six categories used throughout this study: 1) characteristics of the field, 2) epistemological issues, 3) reputations and rewards, and 4) value systems.

For the final data analysis, I put into categories all the material from my interviews and website analysis that spoke to one theme or concept. I compared materials within the categories to look for variations and nuances in meanings. I compared across the categories to discover connections between themes, with the goal of integrating the themes and concepts into a theory that offers an accurate and detailed interpretation of the college access profession.

Summary of the Results

College access professionals believe in the power of education to change lives, and key to their success is their ability to develop relationships with their constituents.

Who their constituents are differs amongst professionals and between programs, and may account for the differentiation of practice between practitioners and within the field. College access practitioners tend to describe their work in terms of programs and services to students, family engagement, and developing a college going culture within schools, with their constituents being students, families, or school personnel depending on the focus of their work. Research on college access and success has lead to the belief that college access programs need to do more than provide programs and services to students. They must also include a family engagement component and students must be enrolled in a rigorous college preparatory curriculum to ensure their best chance for college success (McDonough, 2005; Perna, 2005; Swail, 2000; Swail & Perna, 2002; Tierney & Auerbach, 2005; Tierney & Jun, 2001).

Unfortunately, the research has not permeated the field, and many programs, especially TRIO and community college programs, continue to focus on the student with few opportunities to engage families and no efforts toward creating a college going culture in schools. Practitioners who actively engage families and those that work with K-12 partners to reform schools know the importance of this work in relation to the sustainability of the effort and the impact on larger numbers of underrepresented students.

The change in the scope of college access work and the growth in the field, has also led to the creation of new professional associations and networks. Although the associations fundamentally agree that the purpose of the work is to make sure that traditionally underrepresented students are prepared for, have access to and are ready to

succeed in postsecondary education; whom they serve and their approaches to their work are what separates them from one another and keeps them from collaborating on a broader scale.

Besides the critical issue of duplication and redundancy, and lack of coordination amongst practitioners, other critical issues facing college access practitioners in Arizona are undocumented students and their ability to access higher education, and the alignment of high school graduation requirements with college entrance requirements.

Discussion of the Results

Interpretation of the findings. As noted throughout Chapter 4, there are significant ideological differences in how college access professionals approach their work, with the key difference being whether the extent of their work is to serve underrepresented students and their families to prepare students for postsecondary education, or if the scope of work should be broader to also include building capacity in the schools through systemic school reform. Through my research, I have come to believe that it is this ideological difference that keeps practitioners from working together more closely. It is that same ideological difference that also separates professional associations.

First, I will address the ideological difference between practitioners, and then I will follow up with the ideological differences between professional associations.

Table 4.1 provided an overview of the differences in the scope of practitioners' work from programs and services to students, to college knowledge for families, to building capacity in schools, and a combination of all three. Of the twenty practitioners in my study, 13 were focusing their efforts only on programs and services to students.

The programs that these practitioners are working in have long histories and were established on their campuses in the 1980's shortly after *A Nation at Risk* was released. At that time we did not know the importance of family knowledge and support in preparing students for college access, nor did we have the research showing the importance of a rigorous high school curriculum in relation to college access and success. But we do now, so why has the scope of their work and their program not grown beyond programs and services to students?

In the case of the universities, their college access programs have been expanding. Whether programs are centrally located in one department, or whether there is a loosely coupled network of programs on campus, other university college access colleagues are addressing family engagement and are contributing to P-20 curriculum alignment issues as they relate to building a rigorous college preparation curriculum. The results of this study seem to show that it is the community colleges, at least in relation to college access, that are not expanding the scope of their programs to actively and regularly engage parents and to build capacity in schools.

To more closely examine this dichotomy, I expand on the discussion in Chapter 4 as to whether college access professionals recruit for their institution and whether student participants in these college access programs enroll in college courses and earn credit as part of the program. In four of the six community college access programs included in this study; their participants earn college credit while in high school. At CC1, a major job responsibility for the outreach coordinator is to develop and implement dual enrollment courses at targeted high schools, and in the same community college district,

the students participating in a federal TRIO program earn college credit during summer programs. Similarly at CC2, their college access program allows participants to earn up to 24 units of college credit starting the summer before their junior year in high school through high school graduation.

Could it be that community college access professionals have not expanded the scope of their work to include capacity building in the schools because it could possibly impact enrollment at their colleges? If targeted schools' cultures changed, and more honors and AP courses were offered, there would be no need for dual enrollment courses at the high school. If high school cultures changed, and all students received a rigorous college preparatory curriculum and were ready for postsecondary success, potential students might bypass the community college system and enroll directly in four-year colleges and universities. In relation to enrollment numbers, it may be to the community college's advantage that students are not prepared to enroll and succeed in a four-year college or university.

This division in the profession as to what the scope of work should be is complicated too by the various federal college access programs and the professional associations that support them. As outlined in Chapter 4, the Council for Opportunity in Education (COE) serves professionals working in TRIO programs. The National Council for Community and Education Partnerships (NCCEP) serves GEAR UP professionals, while the National College Access Network (NCAN) serves those practitioners working in community based college access programs. For the purpose of this discussion, I am

only going to write about COE and NCCEP, since my study focused on college based access programs and not community based access programs.

The earliest TRIO programs were formed in the 1960's with the creation of Upward Bound with funding from the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 and the creation of Talent Search in 1965 with funding from the Higher Education Act. As described on the U.S. Department of Education website, Upward Bound provides instruction and enrichment activities throughout the calendar year with services to include study skill development; academic, financial, and personal counseling; tutoring; cultural and social activities; information about postsecondary education opportunities and college visits; assistance with college entrance and financial aid applications; and preparation for college entrance exams. Note there is no mention of families. Similarly Talent Search is described as serving sixth to twelfth grade students by providing academic, financial, career, and personal counseling; tutoring; information about post-secondary education and college visits; procedures for completing college admissions and financial aid applications; preparation for college entrance exams; mentoring; and middle school student and family involvement activities. In the case of family involvement, it is noted in relation to middle school students, but not high school students.

COE represents over 7,000 TRIO program staff with a mission "to advance the ideal of equal educational opportunity in postsecondary education. As such, the focus of the Council is assuring that the least advantaged segments of the population have a realistic chance to enter and graduate from a postsecondary institution." (COE, 2009)

Clearly, the focus of the mission statement is on the student, as were the foci of Upward

Bound and Talent Search when they were established in the 1960's.

On the other hand, GEAR UP was created in 1998 using a partnership approach to

provide services research indicates are critical for college readiness: 1) increase academic

preparation and achievement, 2) increase parental engagement in education, 3) increase

educational aspirations of student sand parents, 4) increase professional development for

teachers and school administrators, 5) increase awareness of college opportunities, 6)

increase financial aid awareness and application assistance, and 7) increase college

scholarships. (NCCEP, 2008).

NCCEP serves as the chief advocate in Washington, DC for GEAR UP and

provides professional development opportunities for GEAR UP staff and their partners.

The mission of NCCEP is "to expand access and opportunity in higher education for low-

income families and to ensure that anyone who wants to be the first in his or her family to

attend college can fulfill that dream. This is facilitated by developing and strengthening

partnerships throughout the education continuum from early childhood through

postsecondary education. To accomplish this goal, NCCEP brings together colleges and

universities with local K-12 schools, parent groups, government agencies, foundation,

corporations, and community-based organization in collaborative efforts to improve

education at all levels." (NCCEP, 2009)

It's clear in reading the mission statements, that the emphasis on research and the

scope of work for GEAR UP practitioners and their partners is much greater than for

TRIO professionals. I can appreciate that after reviewing the research on the impact of 30

years of college access programs, that researchers, educators, and policy makers saw the

need to broaden the efforts of federal college access initiatives. What I am not certain of

was the need for an entirely different federal program. Policy reform could have been

written into legislation expanding the scope of TRIO programs to include family

engagement and professional development for teachers and school administrators. Had

that occurred, the two programs wouldn't be competing with one another for federal

dollars; practitioners would not be competing with one another for access to students in

the same schools; and the politics of the Beltway (Washington, DC) would be simplified

without two associations lobbying policy makers and foundations on their constituent's

behalf.

In contrast to the division between COE and NCCEP, an organization that appears

to bridge the gap between TRIO and GEAR UP professionals and seems to be respected

by practitioners throughout my study is College Board. Whether practitioners worked

with students, parents, or teachers the College Board was mentioned as either a leader in

the field of college access, a source for research on college access issues, or as a source

for professional development. It was not just practitioners from the state universities that

spoke of College Board as a useful resource, but a community college practitioner

referred to them, and two professional association leaders also mentioned their affiliation

with College Board. College Board is a partner in the Pathways to College Network and

the National College Access Network (NCAN) is a member of College Board.

The Pathways to College Network leader spoke of College Board as an

"organization that works on college transition issues" and if the way practitioners are

using College Board resources is an indication, they agree with Pathways. Advanced

Placement course materials and trainings are being used to improve the rigor of high

school classrooms; PSAT and SAT prep materials are used in developing the curriculum

for test prep workshops; and College Keys is being used by university practitioners to

analyze institutional policies and practices to remove barriers to college access for low

income and first-generation college students. A number of the practitioners in my study

have attended College Board conferences with the most popular being their diversity

conferences: Preparate: Educating Latinos for the Future of America, Native American

Student Advocacy Institute (NASAI), and A Dream Deferred: The Future of African

American Education. Not only did practitioners attend these conferences, they often

presented workshops on their own programs, and two practitioners have actually served

on advisory boards to plan Preparate and NASAI.

Implications for practice. The results of my study speak clearly to the need for

collaboration between practitioners and across institutional lines. Despite practitioners'

emphasis on building relationships with schools, students, their families, and university

and community partnerships, little effort is made to build relationships with one another,

especially across institutional lines. So many practitioners spoke of their feelings of

isolation and vulnerability on their own campuses, in relation to the work. Others spoke

of feeling "a part of something" when they attend national conferences. So why is it that

they don't reach out within the state, and sometimes even across town, to one another?

An easy answer is funding, and certainly that is part of it. One practitioner described it this way "instead of everybody working together, we fight because we're fighting over the same money." However, I think it runs deeper than that.

Their professional behavior is influenced by organizational identity and organizational competition. Because the field in Arizona tends to be dominated by professionals with a "local" orientation as opposed to a "cosmopolitan" orientation, there is intense loyalty to their employing organization, which also happens to be their alma mater. And as locals, their reference group is largely within their organization and community, as opposed to professional networks. I believe it is this local orientation to their work that keeps practitioners from crossing institutional lines to collaborate on behalf of Arizona students.

Throughout my study I found numerous examples of how practitioners could work together to not only strengthen their programs, but to provide richer experiences for their students as well. Two of the three universities sponsor math and science achievement programs that include state competitions and a statewide advisory board of industry partners. The program is strong in southern Arizona, floundering in the Phoenix area and non existent in northern Arizona. And yet there is a multicultural engineering program at UA2 that sponsors summer camps for middle and high school students and struggles finding industry partners. Engaging AU2's multicultural engineering practitioner in the math and science achievement program, would connect her with industry advisory board members; might help to grow the program in the northern part of the state; and would provide participating students with a residential summer engineering

camp experience, that none of the other universities offer. A practitioner in southern Arizona has also spent time rewriting the math and science achievement program curriculum to align with state math and science standards. Once again, to support the growth of the program in other regions of that state, that curriculum should be shared.

UA2 offers an academy for Native American high school students that includes free of charge summer residential experiences and an academic year curriculum. The focus of the summer program is environmental sustainability and includes a cultural preservation class. The program was established in 1984, boasts a 70% student retention rate, and its graduates have earned Gates Millennium Scholarships. The program director's vision is to grow the program from a Four Corners regional program into a national program. By working with college access practitioners around the state, the program could grow from a regional program to a statewide program, a step closer to the national vision. It could be a powerful experience for Native GEAR UP and TRIO students from around the state. GEAR UP and TRIO funds could pay for transportation to camp, while the cost of the program, could be cost-share for the federal programs. A win-win for all programs, but most importantly the students.

For the past five years, AU1 has sponsored a summer professional development conference for teachers that has included a keynote speaker, Advanced Placement training, mentoring for teachers, and a resource fair to support schools. The conference is open to teachers statewide, and yet they mostly serve teachers in Maricopa County. In the meantime, college access programs in southern Arizona are tying to increase the college going culture in local high schools, and are spending thousands of dollars by

sending administrators and teachers to national Advanced Placement Institutes and AVID workshops. Additional teachers could be trained, at significantly less cost, if southern Arizona teachers were encouraged to participate in the AU1's conference.

To reciprocate Maricopa County middle school counselors could be invited to AU3's program for counselor development. Many of the school districts in Maricopa County are not unified school districts, and there is lack of college preparation knowledge amongst middle school counselors. Consequently, students are not being prepared to follow a rigorous college preparatory curriculum in high school.

Most disturbing is the lack of collaboration between community college access programs and university access programs. Although apparent throughout the state, the lack of collaboration in southern Arizona is exasperated because GEAR UP, MESA, Upward Bound, and Talent Search are all operating in the same schools. The professionals working in these programs all talked about the scarcity of resources and the need being great, and yet they don't pool their resources to offer training opportunities for teachers and counselors, or coordinate their efforts with students and families. One program coordinator suggested that "by pooling resources you could do a lot more for the students. If one group focused on campus visits, and another focused on speakers, money would go farther and we wouldn't always have to be worried about our tight budget." Talent Search, a community college based program, should be promoting the university's College Knowledge for Parents program to their eighth grade students and their families. GEAR UP and MESA students and families should understand all avenues to

postsecondary education including Advanced Placement courses, community college

dual enrollment, and community college transfer patterns.

It's ironic that so many of the practitioners spoke of California as being a model

of how college access programs should work and of their network of practitioners, and

yet so little effort is made to create that network in Arizona. A practitioner reinforced this

position.

> The TRIO programs in California are networked. If a student moves from one
>
> UC campus to another, they are networked. If there's not a Talent Search
>
> program, but there's an Upward Bound program, they'll switch him over. That
>
> would be a good example of what I'd like to see. I don't see that happening in the
>
> state of Arizona. [AU3] is just trying to get information from me about what I'm
>
> trying to do, and I couldn't get Upward Bound to make an appearance. And we
>
> are in the same school; we are broken. And I don't know that we want to get
>
> better.

The director of the state GEAR UP grant, who is housed in Phoenix, is the natural

person to provide the leadership for developing a statewide network of college access

practitioners. State GEAR UP grants are different from local partnership grants in that

they are required to ensure that their activities are coordinated with other potential GEAR

UP projects serving the same school district or state, as well as with other related federal

and non-federal programs (NCCEP, 2008). In addition the director of the state GEAR UP

grant has been named to the Commission for Post Secondary Education and served in an

advisory capacity to former Governor Janet Napolitano and her staff when they wrote

Arizona's College Access Challenge Grant. Part of that federal grant is going toward the development of a state network of college access programs.

Along with building a state network of college access programs, practitioners need to build their knowledge base of the research supporting their work and to use the curriculum and tools that are available to them through professional associations and foundations. As covered in detail in chapter four there is a void between the research that is being produced about college access programs and practitioners use of that research, even though many of the professional associations see their role as the "research to practice connection".

During many of my interviews, I couldn't help but feel that too many practitioners did not see the scope of their work beyond touching students' lives. Not to suggest that having an impact on students is not important, but *A Shared Agenda*, along with Tierney's research clearly outline the need for family engagement, a rigorous high school curriculum, P-16 curriculum alignment, financial aid, partnerships, and assessment to systemically increase access and success in higher education for underserved students.

If one is not going to use research to support one's work, why not at minimum use the curriculum and tools that have been developed by associations to make one's work easier? I think the answer to that question is twofold. First, there is a lack of awareness regarding what materials are available to college access practitioners, and secondly the awareness issue is complicated by the lack of affiliation with associations by professionals, and the lack of collaboration between associations. A prime example of tools that have been developed that are not being used by practitioners in my study are

NCAN's Advisor Manual, NCCEP's *Exito Escolar* and *16 Summers* curriculums, and the American Council on Education's college access marketing campaign, KnowHow2Go. NCCEP even sponsored two training sessions in Arizona last year to teach practitioners how to use the *Exito Escolar* films and supporting curriculum to reach out to Hispanic and first-generation families. Another tool that has been heavily promoted by NCCEP is KnowHow2Go, a multi year media effort developed by the Ad Council for the American Council on Education and the Lumina Foundation. The media campaign using print, radio, TV, and billboards is designed to encourage and prepare low-income 8th through 10th graders to actively pursuer higher education. Although well aware of the campaign, college access practitioners in Arizona have not taken the lead to get the campaign going in the state.

Relationship of the current study to previous research. Looking back to Chapter 2, the theoretical lens through which I conducted this study was Schein's work on organizational culture (1992), professionalization theories, and Rhoades' writings on managerial professionals (1995, 1998, and 2006). The following section of this chapter will discuss whether the findings of my study support these theories or present disconfirming evidence.

According to Schein (1992) one of the most central elements of any culture will be the assumptions members share about their identity and mission or function. While there is no doubt that college access professionals share a common mission; a common identity is not as clear. The mission for practitioners and professional associations alike is to increase access to and success in postsecondary education for underrepresented

students. And along with their mission, they share a common set of values, with educational equity being most prominent. However, this notion of a common identity is far less concrete. Practitioners seem to identify more with their programs than with a larger community of college access professionals. TRIO practitioners regularly referred to themselves and co-workers as TRIO professionals. And although NCCEP coined the phrase college access professional to encompass more than just GEAR UP professionals, during the NCCEP leader's interview she referred to "what distinguishes the GEAR UP professional from the TRIO professional." Less experienced practitioners too struggled with a professional sense of identity. When asked they more often than not referred to themselves as educators, not college access professionals.

Schein identified three sources from which culture develops: 1) the beliefs, values and assumptions of the founders or early leaders of an organization, 2) the learning experiences of group members as their organization evolves, and 3) the new beliefs, values and assumptions brought in by new members and leaders. The sources from which culture develops helps explain what is happening on a national level within the field of college access and here within the state of Arizona. On a national level for years, college access work was influenced by the beliefs, values, and assumptions of TRIO professionals through the leadership of the Council for Opportunity in Education. Then in more recent years, came NCAN, GEAR UP practitioners, and NCCEP bringing new beliefs, values and assumptions about college access practices, and it completely changed the playing field of college access work. One sees a similar pattern here in Arizona. The TRIO programs at UA1 and UA2 are some of the oldest continually operating TRIO

programs in the country, with funding since the late 1960's. Two other outreach

programs with a long history are UA3's outreach program focusing on math and science

achievement and CC2's college access program both operating since the mid 1980's. All

four of these programs primarily focus on programs and services to students. And then

along comes new research, and state and partnership GEAR UP grants that question

whether programs and services to students are enough to increase college access for

underserved populations of students. As practitioners struggle with these new values and

beliefs and the expansion of the scope of college access work, it makes it difficult for the

field to grow into a profession with a unified identity.

Larson (1977) and Collins (1979) define professionalization as the shared effort

of members of an occupation to define the circumstances and manner of their work, to

control entry into the field, and to establish a knowledge base and authority of their

occupational autonomy. Universities and professional associations are important centers

for the development of organizational norms and rules about professional behavior.

Individuals in an organizational field undergo socialization to common expectations

about their personal behavior, vocabulary, and the approach to their work (DiMaggio &

Powell, 1983).

Although one college access practitioner referred to the profession as a "nascent

profession", I'm not sure that TRIO practitioners working in the field since the 1960's,

would agree with her that the field has recently come into existence. I think what has

recently come into existence, is the expansion of the scope of college access work, which

TRIO practitioners have not embraced. Hence they continue to see themselves as "TRIO professionals" as opposed to being part of the growing college access profession.

NCAN was established in 1995 with seven charter members and has grown today to 260 members. With the establishment and funding of GEAR UP in 1999, the field instantaneously grew. That first year, 185 grants were awarded to the tune of $120 million serving 449,120 students. The program continued to grow with funding reaching its peak in 2005 at $306 million with 1,108,342 students being served (NCCEP, 2008). And in 2001 the Pathways to College Network was formed by a broad coalition of national organizations and funders to compile research and identify exemplary practices to assist practitioners in their work to increase access to and success in postsecondary education for underserved youth.

Professional associations are contributing to the legitimization of the field by the establishment of research institutes, by including academic scholars on their boards and as keynote speakers at conferences, and by posting scholarly papers on their websites. COE has two research institutes as part of their organizational structure. The Pell Institute, whose senior scholars include Vincent Tinto and Tom Mortenson, and the Stokes Institute with an advisory board made up of university professors. NCCEP's board, although smaller than the Stokes Institute advisory board, is made up entirely of academics and researchers all with PhD's. Patrick Terenzini from the Center of the Study of Higher Education at Penn State has been a keynote speaker at NCCEP conferences and papers of his and his colleagues are posted on the NCCEP website. Pathways to College

Network's research committee reads like a who's who list of higher education researchers and includes representatives from the Pell and Stokes Institute as well.

The growing body of research and the professional associations supporting the work of college access practitioners are sources for the development of professional norms, behaviors, and practices. Research is influencing the expansion of college access programs beyond programs and services to students and is leading practitioners to increasingly develop programs designed to increase families' social and cultural capital in relation to college knowledge and to build capacity in schools. Practitioners across association lines need to come together and embrace the research in order to advance the field of college access work into a legitimate theoretically based profession.

Suggestions for additional research. Additional research seems needed in relation to the work of college access professionals. Since this study was focused exclusively on practitioners in Arizona, it seems a natural progression to look at practitioners in other states. Because participants in my study often spoke of California's network of college access professionals and as being a leader in college access initiatives; studying practitioners in that state might provide new insight into the culture and/or direction of the profession.

My study was also restricted to studying practitioners working on college and university campuses in K-12 outreach programs. Having gained a greater understanding through my research of the National College Access Network (NCAN) and their constituency, a study of professionals working in community based college access programs would be interesting. How they define their work, the partnerships and

networks they build, and the use of research and theory in their work might be very different than those who are affiliated with college and university campus. One might even find that community college based practitioners have more in common with community based practitioners than their colleagues affiliated with research based universities.

Through my study, I also came to understand that practitioners working in rural areas face different challenges than those working in urban areas. The travel costs, the lack of local businesses to partner with, and accessibility to campus facilities and staff, make the work of these professionals different than those who work in urban schools located near the college or university campus. Hence a more detailed analysis comparing the work of practitioners in rural and urban settings might be intriguing.

And most importantly, additional research and detailed analysis needs to be done on TRIO and GEAR UP programs. Both programs are funded through the U.S. Department of Education with the focus to prepare more underrepresented students for access and success in higher education, but the approach and scope of the programs are vastly different. At a time, when our nation's economy is the worst it has been since the Great Depression, and at a time when federal agencies are being asked to be more efficient, I can foresee a time when programs might be asked to consolidate, or when foundations no longer want to support the duplication of effort. So it would behoove use to have some understanding of cost effectiveness and what programs have the greatest impact on college access and success, as opposed to making critical decisions based on the politics of the Beltway.

APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW GUIDE

Interview Questions for Experienced College Access Professionals:

1.1 Tell me about the history of your college access program and what

activities/services are offered through your department?

Probe:

How do you determine which components to offer?

Who do these programs serve?

How have these programs and services changed over the years?

1.2 What were the key trends or events that influenced those changes and the

direction that the college preparation programs have taken?

Probe:

National trends, state trends, local trends, etc.

1.3 Tell me about the individuals, university departments and/or community

organizations that you regularly work with to implement your outreach

program(s).

Probe:

How did these partnerships develop?

2.1 Tell me about the publications and/or research that has influenced your work and

the direction of college access programs at this college or university?

2.2 What are the critical issues facing college access programs today?

2.3 When you think about the future of your college access program(s), what trends,

events, or circumstances might influence the direction of your program?

4.1 Who do you consider to be leaders in your field and why?

I'd like to shift gears now. As opposed to talking about your program, I'd like to focus on you.

3.1 Tell me about your experience deciding about going to college or what college to attend.

Probe:

Did you grow up in the community where you attended college?

What factors did you consider when you were selecting a college to attend?

Who influenced your decision to attend college?

3.2 Tell me about your previous educational and professional experiences.

3.3 How did those experiences prepare you and lead you to your current position?

Probe:

Was this a planned career move to this position?

What personal and professional matters were considered when you accepted this position?

3.4. What are your professional goals and what career path do you see yourself following?

Probe:

Have your goals changed since taking this job?

If you are working in a grant funded position, what will you do when the funding for the grant is over?

Would you consider moving to another location to work with this grant program?

Why or why not?

3.5 When hiring new staff, what qualities and experiences do you look for in new

employees?

4.2 What professional standards do you hold yourself to?

4.3 How do you recognize the good work of others?

5.1 What professional associations and professional development activities do you

participate in?

Probe:

To what extent are you involved in these associations?

5.2 Tell me about your communication patterns with others regarding college access

issues.

Probe:

Whom do you communicate regularly within the institution and how?

Outside the institution, whom do you communicate regularly with and how?

6.1 Tell me about the extent of involvement with your work.

Probe:

What kind of hours do you keep?

How many hours a week on average do you work?

6.2 What do you find most rewarding about your work?

6.3 What do you find least rewarding or frustrating about your work?

6.4 What are other contemporary social and environmental issues that are of concern

to you?

Probe:

To what degree are you concerned about these issues?

6.5 What other activities and organizations are you involved with outside of work and

your professional associations?

Interview Questions for those with Less Experience in the College Access

Profession:

1.1 Tell me about your job and the programs and services you are responsible for or

work with.

Probe:

Have those program and services changed while you have held this position?

If so, what circumstances lead to the changes?

1.2 Who are you targeting with your programs and services?

Probe:

How was it determined what population would be targeted?

1.2 What other university departments and community organizations do you work

most closely with and why do you work with them?

Probe:

How did these partnerships develop?

2.1 Tell me about the publications and/or research that have influenced your work?

2.2 What are the critical issues facing college access programs today?

4.1 Who do you consider to be leaders in your field and why?

I'd like to shift gears now. As opposed to talking about programs and services, I'd like to focus on you.

3.1 Tell me about your experience deciding about going to college or what college to attend.

Probe:

Did you grow up in the community where you attended college?

What factors did you consider when you were selecting a college to attend?

Who influenced your decision to attend college?

3.2 Tell me about your previous educational and professional experiences.

3.3 How did those experiences prepare you and lead you to your current position?

Probe:

Was this a planned career move to this position?

What personal and professional matters were considered when you accepted this position?

3.4 What are your professional goals and what career path do you see yourself following?

Probe:

Have your goals changed since taking this job?

If you are working in a grant funded position, what will you do when the funding for the grant is over?

Would you consider moving to another location to work with this grant program?

Why or why not?

4.2 How do you know when you are doing a good job?

4.3 Do you consider yourself to be part of a profession?

Probe:

If so, what profession is it?

4.4 What professional standards do you hold yourself to?

5.1 What professional associations and professional development activities do you

participate in?

Probe:

How you were first introduced to these associations and/or activities?

To what extent are you involved?

5.2 Tell me about your communication patterns with others regarding college access

issues.

Probe:

Whom do you communicate regularly within the institution and how?

Outside the institution, whom do you communicate regularly with and how?

6.1 Tell me about the extent of involvement with your work.

Probe:

What kind of hours do you keep?

How many hours a week on average do you work?

6.2 What do you find most rewarding about your work?

6.3 What do you find least rewarding or frustrating about your work?

6.4 What are other contemporary social and environmental issues that are of concern

to you?

Probe:

To what degree are you concerned about these issues?

6.5 What other activities and organizations are you involved with outside of work and

your professional associations?

Interview Questions for Professional Association Leaders:

5.1 Tell me about the events that lead to the formation of your association.

Probe:

Does your association serve the same purpose today?

6.1 Has your organization established any professional standards of practice for its

members?

Probe:

What values system guides your association and its members?

5.2 Tell me about the professionals who are members of your association.

Probe:

Has the membership changed over the years?

2.1 What type of professional development opportunities do you offer your members?

4.1 How does your organization recognize leaders in the field?

Probe:

What annual or national awards have been established by your organization?

How are members selected for leadership positions within your association?

5.3 What types of publications does your organization publish?

Probe:

2.2 Does your organization conduct any of its own research?

Does your organization offer financial support for research?

5.3 What other organizations/associations/networks does your association affiliate

with?

Probe:

How are your organizations similar?

What are your common goals?

6.2 What associations do you consider to be your competitors?

Probe:

How are these associations different from your professional association?

2.3 What are the contested ideologies within the profession or between professional

associations?

2.4 When you think about the future of college access programs on a national level

and the

future of this profession, what trends, events, or circumstances might influence

the direction of the profession?

APPENDIX B: LIST OF CODES

Descriptive Label	*Code*	*Related Interview Questions*
Characteristics of the Field		
CF: History	CF-H	EP 1.1
CF: Programs & Services	CF-PS	EP 1.1, LP 1.1
CF: Trends	CF-T	EP 1.2, LP1.1 Probe
CF: Campus Partners	CF-P	EP 1.3, LP 1.3
CF: Community Partners	CF-CP	EP 1.3, LP 1.3
CF: Population Served	CF-PS	EP 1.1, LP 1.2
Epistemological Issues		
EI: Publications	EI-P	EP 2.1, LP 2.1
EI: Research	EI-R	EP 2.1, LP 2.1, AL 2.2
EI: Critical Issues	EI-CI	EP 2.2, LP 2.2,
EI: Future Direction	EI-FD	EP 2.3, AL 2.4
EI: Professional Development	EI-PD	AL 2.1
EI: Contested Ideologies	EI-CTI	AL 2.3
Career Patterns		
CP: College	CP-C	EP 3.1, LP 3.1
CP: Influence	CP-I	EP 3.1, LP 3.1
CP: Major	CP-M	EP 3.1, LP 3.1
CP: Degree	CP-D	EP 3.1, LP 3.1
CP: First Generation	CP-FG	EP 3.1, LP 3.1
CP: Professional Experience	CP-PE	EP 3.2, 3.3, LP 3.2, 3.3
CP: Professional Goals	CP-PG	EP 3.4, LP 3.4
CP: Staff Qualities	CP-SQ	EP 3.5
CP: Staff Experience	CP-SE	EP 3.5
Reputations and Rewards		
RR: Leaders	RR-L	EP 4.1, LP 4.1, AL 4.1
RR: Professional Standards	RR-PS	EP 4.2, LP 4.4
RR: Profession	RR-P	LP 4.3
RR: Good Work	RR-GW	EP 4.3, LP 4.2,
Professional Activity		
PA: Professional Associations	PA-PA	EP 5.1, LP 5.1
PA: Professional Development	PA-PD	EP 5.1, LP 5.1
PA: Communication Patterns	PA-CP	EP 5.2, LP 5.2

PA: Publications	PA-P	AL 5.3
PA: Affiliations	PA-A	AL 5.4

Descriptive Label	*Code*	*Related Interview Questions*
Value Systems		
VS: Involvement in Work	VS-IW	EP 6.1, LP 6.1
VS: Rewards	VS-R	EP 6.2, LP 6.2
VS: Frustrations	VS-F	EP 6.3, LP 6.3
VS: Social Issues	VS-SI	EP 6.4, LP 6.4
VS: Environmental Issues	VS-EI	EP 6.4, LP 6.4
VS: Activities	VS-A	EP 6.5, LP 6.5
VS: Organizations	VS-O	EP 6.5, LP 6.5
VS: Competitors	VS-C	AL 6.2
VS: Affiliations	VS-A	AL 5.4

REFERENCES

Altonji, J.G. (1992). The effects of high school curriculum on education and labor market outcomes. *Journal of Human Resources, 30*(3), 409-438.

Becher, T. (1984). The cultural view. In B.R. Clark (Ed.), *Perspectives on higher education* (pp. 165-198). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Becher, T. (1987). The disciplinary shaping of the profession. In B.R. Clark (Ed.), *The academic* (pp. 271-299). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Becher, T. (1989). Academic tribes and territories. Bristol, PA: Open University Press.

Berg, B.L. (2004). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences* (5th ed.). Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.

Bergquist, W. (1992). *The four cultures of the academy.* San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Bogdan, R. & Biklen, S.K. (1992). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods* (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Bounous-Hammarth, M. & Allen, W.R. (2005). A dream deferred: The critical factor of Timing in college preparation and outreach. In W.G. Tierney, Z.B. Corwin, & J.E. Colyar (Eds.), *Preparing for college: Nine elements of effective outreach* (pp. 155-172). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Cabrera, A.F. & La Nasa, S.M. (2000). Three critical tasks America's disadvantaged face on their path to college. In *New Directions for Institutional Research* (No. 107, pp. 23-29). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Clark, B.R. (1980). *Academic culture.* Higher Education Research Group, Yale University

College Board, (2000). *National survey of outreach programs directory.* Washington, DC: Author.

Collins, R. (1979). *The credential society.* New York: Academic Press.

Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education. (2006). *CAS professional standards for higher education* (6th ed.). Washington DC: Author.

Council for Opportunities in Education Mission Statement. (n.d.) Retrieved May 3, 2009, from http://www.coenet.us/ecm/AM/Template.cfm?Section=Our_Organization& Template=CM/HTMLDisplay.cfm&ContentID=6614

Creswell, J.W. (2003). *Research design* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

DiMaggio, P.J. & Powell, W.W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review, 48*(2), 147-160.

Editorial Projects in Education (EPE) Resource Center. (2007, January). *Quality counts 2007: From cradle to career.* Bethesda, MD: Author.

Gandara, P. (2002). Meeting common goals. In W.G. Tierney & L.S. Hagedorn (Eds.), *Increasing access to college* (pp. 81-103). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Gandara, P. & Mejorado, M. (2005). Putting your money where your mouth is: Mentoring as a strategy to increase access to higher education. In W.G. Tierney, Z.B. Corwin, & J.E. Colyar (Eds.), *Preparing for college: Nine elements of effective outreach* (pp. 89-110). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Glesne, C. & Peshkin, A. (1992). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction.* White Plains, NY: Longman.

Gouldner, A.W. (1957). Cosmopolitans and locals: Toward an analysis of latent social roles. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 2*(3), 281-306.

Hossler, D., Braxton, J., & Coppersmith, G. (1989). Understanding student college choice. In J.C. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (Vol. 5, pp. 231-288). New York: Agathon Press.

Kahn, R.L., & Cannell, C.F. (1957). *The dynamics of interviewing.* New York: Wiley.

Kuh, G.D., & Whitt, E.J. (1988). *The invisible tapestry: Culture in American colleges and universities.* ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 1. Washington, D.C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education.

Larson, M.S. (1977). *The rise of professionalism: A sociological analysis.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Li, X. (2006). *Changes in staff distribution and salaries of full-time employees in postsecondary institutions: 1993-2003* (NCES 2006-152). U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.

Lee, J.L. (2004). Comparing institutional relationships with academic departments: A study of five academic fields. *Research in Higher Education, 45*(6), 603-624.

Marshall, C. & Rossman, G.B. (1999). *Designing qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

McDonough, P.M. (2005). Counseling matters: Knowledge, assistance, and organizational commitment in college preparation. In W.G. Tierney, Z.B. Corwin, & J.E. Colyar (Eds.), *Preparing for college: Nine elements of effective outreach* (pp. 69-87). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Miles, M.B. & Humberman, A.M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

National Council for Community and Education Partnerships. (2008, February). *Positioning GEAR UP partnerships for long-term sustainability.* Washington, DC: Authur.

National Council for Community and Education Partnerships Mission Statement. (n.d.) Retrieved May 3, 2009, from http://www.edpartnerships.org/Template.cfm?Section=About_NCCEP

Pathways to College Network. (n.d.). *A shared agenda.* Boston, MA: Author.

Pathways to College Network Mission Statement. (n.d.) Retrieved May 3, 2009, from http://www.pathwaystocollege.net/aboutus/index.html

Perna, L.W. (2000). Racial and ethnic group differences in college enrollment decisions. In *New Directions for Institutional Research* (No. 107, pp. 65-83). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Perna, L. W. (2005). The key to college access: Rigorous academic preparation In W.G. Tierney, Z.B. Corwin, & J.E. Colyar (Eds.), *Preparing for college: Nine elements of effective outreach* (pp. 113-134). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Rhoades, G. (1995). Rising stratified administrative costs: Student services' place. In *NewDirections for Student Services* (No. 70, pp. 25-37). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Rhoades, G. (1998). Reviewing and rethinking administrative costs. In J.C. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research: Vol. XIII.* (pp. 111-147). New York: Agathon Press.

Rhoades, G. (2006). The higher education we choose: A question of balance. *The Review of Higher Education, 29*(3), 381-404.

Rubin, H.J. & Rubin, I.S. (1995). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data.* Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Ruscio, K.P. (1987). Many sectors, many professions. In B. Clark (Ed.), *The academic* (pp. 331-365). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Schein, E.H. (1992). *Organizational culture and leadership* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Swail, W.S. (2000). Preparing America's disadvantaged for college: Programs that increase college opportunity. In *New Directions for Institutional Research* (No. 107, pp. 85-101). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Swail, W.S. & Perna, L.W. (2002). Pre-college outreach programs: A national perspective. In W.G. Tierney & L.S. Hagedorn (Eds.), *Increasing Access to college: Extending possibilities for all students* (pp. 15-34). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Tierney, W.G. (2002). Reflective evaluation: Improving practice in college preparation programs. In W.G. Tierney & L.S. Hagedorn (Eds.), *Increasing Access to College: Extending possibilities for all students* (pp. 217-230). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Tierney, W.G. & Auerbach, S. (2005). Toward developing an untapped resource: The role of families in college preparation. In W.G. Tierney, Z.B. Corwin, & J.E. Colyar (Eds.), *Preparing for college: Nine elements of effective outreach* (pp. 29-48). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Tierney, W.G. & Colyar, J.E. (2005). The role of peer groups in college preparation programs. In W.G. Tierney, Z.B. Corwin, & J.E. Colyar (Eds.), *Preparing for college: Nine elements of effective outreach* (pp. 49-68). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Tierney, W.G., Colyar, J.E. & Corwin, Z.B. (2003). *Preparing for college: Building expectations, changing realities.* Los Angeles, CA: University of Southern California, Center for Higher Education Policy Analysis.

Tierney, W.G., Corwin, Z.B. & Colyar, J.E. (Eds.). (2005). *Preparing for college: Nine elements of effective outreach.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

U.S. Department of Education. (2001). *Paving the way to postsecondary education: K-12 intervention programs for underrepresented youth* (NCES 2001-205). Washington, DC: Author.

Ylijoki, O.H. (2000). Disciplinary cultures and the moral order of studying – A case-study of four Finnish university departments. *Higher Education, 39,* 339-362.

Ylijoki, O.H. (2003). Entangled in academic capitalism? A case-study on changing ideals and practices of university research. *Higher Education, 45,* 307-335.

Villalpando, O. & Solorzano, D.G. (2005). The role of culture in college preparation programs: A review of the research literature. In W.G. Tierney, Z.B. Corwin, & J.E. Colyar (Eds.), *Preparing for college: Nine elements of effective outreach* (pp. 13-28). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.