DISSERTATION

ASSIMILATION AND LEARNING TO TEACH AT A FOR-PROFIT INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Submitted by

Shawn A. Schumacher

School of Education

In partial fulfillment of the requirements

For the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Colorado State University

Fort Collins, Colorado

Summer 2005

COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY

April 29, 2005

WE HEREBY RECOMMEND THAT THE DISSERTATION PREPARED UNDER OUR SUPERVISION BY SHAWN A. SCHUMACHER ENTITLED "LEARNING TO TEACH AT A FOR-PROFIT INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION" BE ACCEPTED AS FULFILLING IN PART REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY.

Committee on Graduate Work

Dr. William Timpson

Dr. Cindy O'Donnell-Allen

Co-Adviser Dr. Timothy G. Davies

Adviser Dr. Lynn Safarik

Director

ABSTRACT OF DISSERTATION

ASSIMILATION AND LEARNING TO TEACH AT A

FOR-PROFIT INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION

What conditions relating to faculty assimilation, teacher preparation, and teacher practice influence teacher effectiveness at a for-profit institution of higher education? This narrative case study examines faculty assimilation, teaching practices, and teaching preparation at the Chicago campus of DeVry University, a for-profit, non-traditional university. Faculty at this campus were the primary participants in this qualitative narrative case study of effective teaching. Findings will be used to develop a model for teaching preparation and practice at for-profit, non-traditional universities.

Shawn A. Schumacher
School of Education
Colorado State University
Fort Collins, CO 80523
Summer 2005

What office is there which involves more responsibility,
which requires more qualifications,
and which ought, therefore, to be more honourable,
than that of teaching?

Harriet Martineau

Table of Contents

Chapter One

Introduction

This qualitative study focuses on the experience of faculty who teach at for-profit, post-secondary institutions. The purpose of this study is to increase our understanding of how faculty learn to teach, what they think about teaching, and how they experience teaching in the particular context of a for-profit, vocational-oriented institution of higher education. In the past decade, the landscape of higher education has changed greatly, and although recent studies have examined the non-traditional student, few studies are concerned with the faculty teaching experience of non-traditional institutions of higher education. Chapter One outlines the rationale for the study, the purpose of the study, and research questions.

This qualitative study, utilizing a narrative case study approach (Denzin & Lincoln 2002; Merriam 2001; Lyons & LaBoskey 2002), will focus on the significance of discourse, context, and assumes the social construction of the participants' realities (Kempner & Tierney, 1996), to make meaning of and understand the issue of quality education, at for-profit, non-traditional institutions. While the literature is replete with discussion of quality in education (Broad 2000; Darling-Hammond 1996; Glaser 1993; Scherer 2001), it is anticipated that through this narrative case study, context-specific and personal definitions of quality in education will emerge. This study resists any kind of universal definition of quality in education; rather, its purpose is to identify what quality means to faculty at for-profit universities and how images of quality are depicted in their views of teaching and student learning.

Effective teaching is "an elusive concept" (Stronge & Hindman, 2003, p. 49). Definitions of teacher effectiveness are often classified in terms of high performance, greater

student achievement, comments from student evaluations and administrator reviews, and there are "many variables outside the teacher's control influence each of these potential measures of effectiveness" (Strong & Hindman, 2003, p. 49). There is also a contention that "quality teaching, like quality learning, is not something that can be easily observed and measured. In terms of teaching, as well as research, more doesn't necessarily mean better" (Hamp-Lyons, Hood, and MacLennan, 2001, p.60). Since it is not uncommon for instructors in higher education institutions to lack formal education in teaching, many university faculty are unfamiliar with basic educational theories and methods. In order to grow as instructors, faculty should participate in professional development activities because "professional development for them involves learning basic teaching skills and theories and how to apply them" (Hamp-Lyons, Hood, and MacLennan, 2001, pp. 60-61).

Similarly, "research on the extent of underqualified teaching is difficult because there is surprisingly little consensus on how to define a qualified teacher" (Ingersoll, 2001, p. 42). Very few researchers would argue that teachers ought not to be qualified. Most often, teacher qualification is tied to greater student achievement; therefore, the primary focus in research on teacher effectiveness or quality should be on teacher preparation (Ingersoll, 2001).

Given the complexity surrounding the topic of teacher effectiveness, preparation, and evaluation, this qualitative study, utilizing a narrative case study approach, focuses on experiences of faculty who teach at for-profit institutions. The narrative design reveals these teachers' worldviews, their values, and their meaning-making systems. These views are important to the realm of higher education, as these faculty members may not have been socialized in the traditional culture. Furthermore, faculty need to be understood in their own terms in order to address future training and professional development needs. This research has

implications for for-profit university faculty who want to improve their teaching effectiveness. Additionally, the research has implications for the for-profit institutions of higher education themselves, as well as on the students enrolled in these institutions of higher learning. Finally, given the changing faculty composition on the campuses of America's universities and colleges, this research has implications for traditional institutions of higher education.

Rationale for the Study

In today's for-profit institutions of higher education, two fundamental trends—reduced retention rates and lowered student satisfaction ratings—impact faculty. This qualitative study considers the impact these trends have on higher education and also examines the impact of these trends on current faculty experience in teaching at for-profit universities.

The dimensions and consequences of student departure from institutions of higher education have been studied (Tinto, 1993). For example, Tinto acknowledges:

> "more students leave their college or university prior to degree completion than stay. Of the nearly 2.4 million students who in 1993 entered higher education for the first time, over 1.5 million will leave their first institution without receiving a degree. Of those, approximately 1.1 million will leave higher education altogether, without ever completing either a two- or four-year degree program" (Titno, 1993, p. 1).

Although the ramifications of student departure most certainly affect the student, they also have significant consequences for the institution.

Although there are a variety of factors which could explain the shrinking college population, one aspect is arguably salient—the decline of a quality learning experience (DeVry, 2001). The persistence of college students is linked to student perceptions of the quality of their learning environments as well as their perceptions of interaction with faculty in regard to learning issues (Tinto, 1993). A lack of quality in faculty and their helpfulness is one of the chief

causes of declining student enrollment. Additional predicators are student involvement in learning activities and students' views of the quality of teaching, advising, and coursework, and their contact with faculty; contact with faculty outside of class, helpfulness of faculty, and concern for students are also a significant predictors for student success. Student success in higher education is attained by students primarily through the experience presented by faculty in the classroom related to educational concerns and by their educational experiences in the academic and social life provided by the institution (Tinto, 1993).

The changing professoriate is one of the primary factors in declining student satisfaction and lowered student retention rates. This is due to the decline of full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty as well as the increase in part-time faculty (Oblinger &Verville, 1998). Furthermore, "while there is a perception that things are modestly deteriorating in academe, there is certainly no groundswell from the professoriate for greater emphasis on teaching, new procedures for assessment, or a reorientation of American higher education" (Oblinger & Verville, 1998, p. 40). In sum, the American academic profession remains "largely insulated from the broad changes taking place in higher education....they seem to have little understanding of these trends, do not see them as a crisis, and do not recognize them as part of permanent change in the landscape of American higher education" (Oblinger & Verville, 1998, p. 41).

Since most for-profit institutions are typically teaching institutions as opposed to research institutions, the issue of teaching effectiveness becomes more prominent. Therefore, a clearer understanding of faculty in these settings and their teaching preparation and practices was needed. Then, a model for effective teaching was designed for for-profit university faculty.

Two factors which influence the demand for effective instructors—enrollments in higher education and faculty departing from teaching positions—are also identified (Schuster, 1995).

Although enrollments may increase throughout the next decade in higher education institutions, there are several variables which must be taken into account: the extent of enrolling "non-traditional" students, the degree of accessibility to higher education, the perception of post-secondary degrees being advantageous in gaining higher earnings, and the enrollment of undergraduate, graduate, and professional-education foreign students (Schuster, 1995). If enrollment levels drive faculty demand, then the critical issue is to replace those faculty who have departed. Replacement needs can be estimated, although there are some uncertainties, remaining about the number of retiring faculty over the next fifteen years according to the U.S Bureau of Labor Statistics. The key, perhaps, is to maintain student-to-faculty ratios rather than to allow the ratio to float upward.

According to Schuster (1995), five factors—economic and political conditions, the end of mandatory retirement, immigration and internationalization issues, the need for flexibility in staffing, and technology—are crucial influences of the academic labor market and effective teaching within higher education. These factors are crucial to the changing landscape of higher education as the characteristics of the academic marketplace determine who the faculty will be and how well prepared they will be for their developing roles. The primary implication of these five factors is the reemphasis on teaching at institutions of higher education, sometimes at the expense of research.

Size and distribution, demographic characteristics, educational background and work history, and types of appointments of new entrants to the full-time faculty of higher education have also distinguished the new generation of academics from the previous faculty cohort (Finkelstein, Seal, and Schuster, 1998). This research is critical to understanding the implications of future faculty and their quality teaching due to "the changing characteristics of

the new generation of academics" (Finkelstein, Seal, and Schuster, 1998, p. 79) Valuable insight to the new entrant cohort is studied, and the new academics have become "a product of different pressures and priorities" (p. 78), due to demographic differences, an expansion in the proportion of faculty in the professions and occupational programs rather than traditional programs, a lowered proportion of faculty who are tenurable, and differences in prevailing conditions such as salary and benefits. This research proves to be an essential basis for viewing the future of the academic profession and the richly diverse setting of higher education.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to examine the conditions relating to teacher preparation and how they influence teacher effectiveness at DeVry University. This qualitative study, using the narrative case study approach, focuses on teaching practices and preparation at the Chicago campus of DeVry University, a for-profit institution of higher education

This study has implications for all for-profit university faculty and administrators, who serve undergraduate, career-oriented students. The knowledge elicited from the perceptions and experiences of these instructors has implications to the future success of the teachers and achievement for the students at for-profit universities.

Research Questions

The research questions for this study focused on the conditions and processes relating to the teaching experience of for-profit faculty and the lived experiences of these participants at for-profit universities. The following research questions directed my study:

1. What is the experience of faculty members who teach at a for-profit institutions of higher education?

2. How do they develop their approaches to and philosophies of teaching?
3. How do institutional structures, policies, and culture shape their understanding of their roles as faculty?
4. How do they construct an identity as faculty?
5. What are their processes of development as teachers?

Chapter Two

Literature Review

The themes, or strands, that will be examined throughout this literature review, include the following: 1) the changing landscape of higher education in the United States; 2) the rise of for-profit institutions of higher education; 3) what is known about students enrolled at for-profit, non-traditional institutions of higher education and their learning needs; 4) the influx of differently prepared faculty at for-profit, non-traditional institutions; and 5) faculty professional development, including the use of "best practice" teaching methods, as it relates to teaching at for-profit, non-traditional institutions.

These five themes provide a context for the research questions established in Chapter One, which examine the teaching experience at for-profit, non-traditional universities.

The Changing Landscape of Higher Education

In the years ahead, institutions of higher education can expect to change dramatically. In general, five key elements are driving the changing landscape of higher education in the United States: the attitudes and needs of higher education's students, the characteristics of today's college student, the conditions of faculty in higher education, the development of new technology and instruction delivery modes, and the growth of for-profit, non-traditional institutions of higher education (Ruch, 2001).

Levine (2001) notes that "American higher education has become a mature industry" (p. 2) and that more than sixty percent of high school graduates in the United States attend some

form of post-secondary education. Due to government not wanting to increase the college attendance rate further, issues of cost, efficiency, productivity, and effectiveness are used to control higher education institutions. This government control has created a shift in the relationship between higher education and its patrons; this shift involves "moving from teaching (what faculty do in their classrooms) to learning (what students get out of their classes). The emphasis is moving from courses and credits (process) to what students achieve as a result of a college education (outcomes)" (p. 3).

According to Collis (1995), the change in the landscape of American higher education is being driven by three drivers, or factors, of change including the following: a shift of the type of student and the sort of higher education desired, an increase in the rate of knowledge accumulation that significantly advances the notion of life-long education as opposed to a one-time undergraduate degree, and the increase and adoption of new technologies. He believes these "three forces will induce a flood of new entry and stimulate a dramatic increase in rivalry that will, in turn, rapidly degrade industry structure and make life much harder for today's incumbent institutions" (p. 10). Higher education is an economic activity, which involves more than simply making a profit. Goals relating to public service and social responsibility demand to be at the forefront of our nation's institutions of higher education.

Implications of private sector entry to the ever-changing landscape of higher education in the United States are also identified within the literature. The changing demand and new technology have opened the doors to a different direction, which includes private sector entrants. Within these new strategies, the chief concerns for higher education include the need for more focused classes and curricula, more targeted customer groups, more effective sources of content,

better pedagogy, and competitive pricing (Collis, 2001). America's colleges and universities must find the necessary solutions and adapt to these changes in order to survive the next decades.

Significant factors for these changes include new delivery technologies, changing demographics, the emergence of corporate universities, and a complex global economy and how these factors relate to for-profit, non-traditional schools. The social trends within higher education including demographic changes, technological advances, pedagogical shifts, and the blurring of industry boundaries are also significant changes. Certain elements outline a for-profit institution's marketing strategy to potential buyers; these elements, which are termed "sources of competitive advantages" for for-profit institutions, include the school's reputation, curriculum and educational standards, cost, location, student activities, access, partnerships, customized curriculum, flexible deliver modes, and use of technology (Blustain, Goldstein, and Lozier, 1998).

Brody (1998) further discusses the landscape of higher education and argues that institutions must adapt to the changes in order to remain useful and relevant. Brody recognizes how the change in our society and the world has driven higher education to "new activities and new arrangements we couldn't have imagined ten or fifteen years ago" (p. 29). The most prominent changes within higher education include meeting the needs and demands of students, understanding the changing demographics of today's college student, and the rise of the Information Age. The notion of the "traditional student" (18-22 years of age, recently out of high school, enrolled as a full time student at a college or university, and living on or near campus) is also changing. The student demographics are becoming different than fifteen years ago; more than half of today's students are older than twenty-five years of age, more females are

enrolled than males, and over half are part-time students. Additionally, today's students see themselves as consumers, believing that administrators and educators should give them what they want; their focus is on cost, service, quality, and convenience (Brody, 1998).

Today's students are interested in information, not necessarily knowledge, and Brody clearly distinguishes between the two. Students are more apt to want to increase their access to information through better technology; knowledge, on the other hand, is content which is interpreted, and often times, allows a student to solve a problem or perform a task, and not all students are necessarily interested in the actual attainment of knowledge (Brody, 1998). Brody's interpretations and general statements are based on his observation of university statistics and demographics and present the case for adaptation in order for higher education to remain relevant.

Today's changing landscape in higher education must also focus on knowledge (Brody, 1998; Lindenstein Walshok, 1998). The rapidity in change and how these changes "may require different thinking about the role of knowledge in society and the economy, and new approaches to how higher education is structured in order to do the knowledge work of the twenty-first century" (Lindenstein Walshik, 65). Knowledge has become more extended in society, the support structures within higher education need to assure high-quality research, better classroom instruction, and social integration of knowledge. Faculty need to be engaged in scholarship, pedagogy, and service and must facilitate the socialization in the learning community (Brody, 1998; Lindenstein Walshok, 1998).

The need for mutual enrichment between traditional public and private institutions of higher education and for-profit institutions of higher education is another critical issue in today's changing landscape of higher education. The real challenge for higher education is to find

strategies and methods to reintegrate the "ivory tower" of isolated intellectual university culture with the real-world teachings of for-profit institutions. In order to accomplish this daunting task, Lindenstein Walshok (1998) insists that new concepts, along with more appropriate notions of institutional balance, must be utilized so the intellectual teachings and real-world instruction can become unified.

More recently, however, David G. Moore (2003) and Donald E. Heller (2003), two university administrators, debate the issue of what higher education exactly is today and how it continues to change. Currently, legislators are debating a change in the definition of a higher education institution to include for-profit, or proprietary, institutions. Under the new definition, for-profit colleges would be entitled to compete and receive federal aid to improve their institutions and further develop educational programs.

Since the differences between nonprofit institutions and for-profit institutions have become blurred over the years, for-profit institutional leaders believe these changes would be fair and appropriate. Leaders of non-profit institutions, however, contend that the for-profit schools simply want to make even more money and that these changes would take crucial resources away from traditional schools at a time when funds have already been depleted and their schools are struggling to survive (Moore, 2003).

Congress should establish a single definition of an institution in higher education as this change would "significantly diminish—but still not completely eliminate—the disparate treatment of for-profit institutions compared with public and nonprofit institutions" (Moore, p. B7). Since for-profit institutions account for forty-six percent of all postsecondary institutions in the United States and now enroll approximately 1.3 million students annually, the distinction

among institutions of higher education can no longer be justified and that students at for-profit institutions should be allowed to receive additional federal financial aid (Moore, 2003).

According to Moore (2003), for-profit institutions contribute greatly to the public good in many more ways beyond simply looking to make a profit for their shareholders, and for-profit institutions, in addition to paying taxes which nonprofit and public institutions elude, play a critical role in the preparation of students for business and industry.

Congress' definition of higher education is one of grave importance to nonprofit and public institutions of higher education. For Heller (2003), if Congress changes the current "dual definition" provision, which distinguishes between nonprofit and for-profit institutions, and creates a single definition for all accredited postsecondary institutions, a momentous mistake will have been made.

Nonprofit colleges are subjected to reporting regulations and meeting many standards that for-profit institutions do not, and Heller lists numerous examples. Another important distinction between for-profit and nonprofit institutions—access to capital markets—is also indicative of the changing landscape of higher education. Unlike for-profit schools, nonprofit institutions have no access to equity markets, and their opportunities to raise capital are extremely limited as they must rely on their states' appropriations (Heller 2003).

Finally, as Heller argues, Congress should help fulfill the original goals of the Higher Education Act of 1965—"to strengthen the educational resources of our colleges and universities and to provide financial assistance for students in postsecondary and higher education" (p. B9). The elimination of the dual definition provision would not help accomplish the original goals and would only dilute the vital federal aid and support for nonprofit institutions of higher education.

Today's post-secondary students, and the traits and characteristics, which make up today's student population, and the landscape of higher education are clearly changing—and changing rapidly. The conditions pertaining to faculty and the call for greater accountability, along with important issues related to federal funding and support, also characterize the changing nature of America's institutions of higher education. Finally, the swift development and growth of for-profit institutions as a competitor for traditional, nonprofit and public institutions has created even more quandaries for the leaders of today's institutions of higher education—all of which make for exciting times in the realm of higher education.

The Rise of For-Profit, Non-Traditional Institutions

A further critical area of this study, which must be examined, is the current scholarship depicting another development in higher education in the United States within the past two decades—the rise of the for-profit university.

The rise of for-profit institutions of higher education, those for-profit colleges and universities which are regionally accredited, degree-granting institutions of higher education that offer programs at the associate, bachelor's, master's, and doctoral levels, are significant in the changing role of higher education. The similarities and differences between the five key for-profit players in higher education—the Apollo Group, Inc.; the Argosy Education Group; DeVry, Inc.; Education Management Corporation; and Strayer Education, Inc—must be examined when discussing for-profit institutions of higher education (Ruch, 2001; Kirp, 2003).

The for-profit sector has been growing rapidly in enrollment as well as increasing respectability in the landscape of higher education today, and "since 1990, the number of for-

profit, degree-granting college and university campuses in the United States has quietly increased by 112 percent, from approximately 350 to 750 campuses. During the same period at least 200 non-profit colleges closed their doors" (Ruch, p. 4). For-profit colleges and universities comprise the only sector of higher education that continues to grow (Ruch, 2001).

The emergence of for-profit institutions of higher education has been driven by four recent changes. These include the changes of a currently evolving economy into a more knowledge-based economy; the expansion and development of adult education; the rapid growth of technology which allows teaching institutions to deliver courses in a variety of ways and through different places and times; and a new-found attention to the management of these institutions, which have been troubled by rising costs of operation and student services (Ruch, 2001).

The faculty who teach at these institutions as well as the students who enroll there and why are also notable. Descriptions of how these institutions make profit, rather than lose money and utilize federal funds are also identified (Ruch, 2001). The growth of these institutions has brought issues relating to the students they serve, the faculty who teach there, and their organizational philosophies, structures, and services.

Most for-profit schools are multi-campus operations, which offer online and traditional classroom instruction. Most students at these two institutions enroll in degree-granting programs, earning degrees from the associate to doctoral levels, rather than enrolling in certification programs such as Microsoft or Cisco. These institutions are accredited by NCA, which give them greater legitimacy in the realm of higher education and also allows their students to apply for and receive federal aid and support (Ruch, 2001; Kirp, 2003).

Kirp describes different reactions to the growth and development of the for-profit schools. He states the "market-minded, who often deride universities as flabby places filled with slackers and ideologues, have enthusiastically welcomed the arrival of the for-profit universities" (p. 102) whereas traditionalist opponents condemn "the transformation of the hallowed university into a mere marketplace" (p. 102) and the "dark side" of higher education institutions. The main complaint against for-profit schools is that they are operated as businesses and emphasize profit over student learning (Kirp, 2003).

Offerman (2002) reflects on his experience in the for-profit realm of higher education. He details his move from Dean of Continuing Education at the University of Wisconsin to President of Capella University, a for-profit institution which serves adult learners primarily through educational programs delivered through the worldwide web. The traditional university is "classroom-based in a residential campus environment with a four-year undergraduate curriculum consisting of 120 semester credits involving lecture and seminar, student experience augmented by an array of extracurricular activities, provision of traditional services such as healthcare, graduate education designed around academic disciplines, and professional schools and faculty engaged in research" (p. 70). The for-profit institution, one which suggests the "adult university where an institution might focus on advanced education and training for academically mature students" and one which limits the campus atmosphere as most adults "cannot put their lives on pause," (p. 71) is also identified (Offerman, 2002).

Within the for-profit institution, Offerman found "an institution with the ability to attract capital to invest in infrastructure, market research, curriculum development, and customer satisfaction research. The capability and the reality of what was being done in these areas were things that I could only dream of at a public institution" (p. 79). Additional differences between

for-profit and nonprofit institutions exist, and one of the principle differences is the discussion and consideration about what constitutes quality. There is a strong commitment to promoting quality learning experiences at for-profit institution, although these experiences may be delivered in different modes instead of the traditional face-to-face mode (Offerman, 2002).

According to Offerman (2002), it is possible that for-profit institutions will become a valued component of higher education in America, as these institutions will have service to adult learners as their chief purpose, will be market-driven, outcomes-based, responsive to customers' needs, and will employ meaningful and continuous learning assessment. Teaching and learning will be different from the traditional methods, but the key experience for learners will be customer-focused and will deliver immediate results and long-term benefits.

A new competitive landscape of higher education can be examined through the rise of for-profit institutions (Blustain, Goldstein, and Lozier, 1998; Sperling & Tucker, 1997; Blumentyr, 2000). The goals of for-profit institutions of higher education consist of three leading objectives—provide knowledge to the workforce, retool people for new careers, and cater to the need for mental stimulation. The key component for today's institutions of higher education, according to the authors, is that, in a competitive environment, the leaders "need to pay attention to what their customers want, rather than what others think they need" (Blustain, Goldstein, and Lozier, p. 20).

Sperling and Tucker (1997) point out several advantages that for-profit universities offer over nonprofit institutions, including "the for-profit's accountability for educational effectiveness, operational efficiency, cost benefits, and the time it takes them to respond to changes in the nation's education needs" (p. 1). For-profit, adult-centered universities are "a bargain for the taxpayers" as they are labor but not capital intensive, their facilities typically are

built with private capital, they pay local, state, and federal taxes, and they offer federally subsidized loans to their students while returning more to the public treasury (Sperling & Tucker, 1997).

Other advantages the for-profit institutions offer over nonprofit schools, which, in turn, has lead to their dramatic emergence in higher education, include being responsive to market demands, having a highly focused product which is easily examined and accounted, relating well to other for-profit businesses that employ a large majority of its students, and have two primary goals—growth and profit—which can only be achieved by meeting the needs of the customer and providing high quality to the customer. Additional advantages of the for-profit institutions, include being managed and governed well, operating with a faculty of working professionals who bring sound educational and industry backgrounds to the classroom, utilizing faculty members who are constructive agents of positive change rather than faculty who may be adversarial, and by operating year round and providing students with the coursework they need in a minimum time frame (Sperling & Tucker, 1997).

The for-profit institution of higher education is a remarkable environment in many ways, including the notion that working adults are educated in a more cost-effective and educationally efficient manner in universities that are adult-centered, and for-profit institutions, like any private enterprise, are managed for efficiency and profitability (Sperling & Tucker, 1997).

For-profit institutions also pursue the nation's community college student population; the for-profit institutions compete with community colleges and often attract students by providing articulation agreements with local high schools, offer specialized programs and degrees, and provide a variety of financial aid support through federal loans and grants as well as scholarships (Blumentry, 2000)

Two of the nation's most prolific for-profit institutions are DeVry University and the University of Phoenix. At DeVry, one of the main goals is to produce graduates. The more graduates that are produced, more student referrals are received. Blumentyr perceives "a snowball effect. The word gets out. People are happy. And then they can go into a master's degree" (p. A30). Both of these for-profit institutions attempt to be "transfer-friendly," meaning they accept students' relevant coursework from nonprofit and public colleges and universities in order to alleviate problems of persistence. This practice aids in retention of current students as well (Blumentyr, 2000).

According to Blumentyr (2000), several advantages have helped the for-profit schools to emerge in the landscape of higher education. Meeting the needs of a changing student population, providing flexible and responsive educational programs and curricula, employing faculty with strong educational and real-world experiences to teach their students, and offering effective student services to ensure a successful learning experience are a few of these advantages.

The emergence of for-profit institutions has had a dramatic effect on the landscape of higher education in America for the past two decades. The numerous advantages that for-profit institutions offer over nonprofit and public colleges and universities make for an invigorating competitive market as higher education advances further into the new millennium.

On the other hand, further research must be conducted and more empirical data collected in regard to for-profit institutions of higher education. Questions relating to the diverse student population and concerns for tracking for-profit students after graduation abound; student outcomes and their results also need to be addressed and analyzed through further research.

The Students of For-Profit, Non-Traditional Institutions of Higher Education

Another theme, which needs to be examined, is the student population of for-profit, non-traditional institutions of higher education and their learning needs. Since for-profit institutions market their product and services to a variety of customers, the students who enroll in for-profit institutions do embody a diverse group. This section of the literature review will focus on overall demographics, characteristics, and traits of students enrolled in higher education institutions and will also present a more specific account of students who attend for-profit institutions of higher education and their learning needs.

Student Demographics

Demographic information relating to both nonprofit and for-profit institutions of higher education has been examined by several researchers (Giuliano, 2002; Oblinger & Verville, 1998; Speer, 1998). In the last half of the twentieth century, a dramatic increase of high school graduates going on to college was seen. Only 45 percent of high school graduates enrolled in college in 1960, whereas 63 percent had enrolled in 1999. Although enrollment rates have fluctuated from year to year, in general, however, the trend has been upward, and this trend is expected to continue (Giulano, 2002).

In1999, an estimated 14.8 million students were enrolled in colleges and universities throughout the United States, and as indicated by the National Center for Education Statistics, the enrollment is projected to reach 17.7 million by 2011. Additionally, more than 2 of every 5 students (41 percent) were part-time students in 1999. Increased female enrollment has

contributed greatly to the growth of college enrollment; male enrollment increased by 10 percent from 1986 to 1999; however, the number of females enrolled rose by 25 percent during the same thirteen year period (Giuliano, 2002).

Enrollment of nontraditional students, defined by Giuliano as those students over 30 years of age, increased during the late 1980s in degree-granting institutions of higher education faster than enrollment of students younger than 22 years of age. The number of older students attending colleges grew nearly as fast as the number of younger students during the ten year period between 1991 and 2001. Almost 2.8 million students age 35 or older pursued degrees in 1996, while 8.2 million students under age 25 pursued degrees. These statistics are attributed to the increased enrollment of older students to the higher education levels required by many occupations and the growing number of students who leave school to work and return later. The main reason older students begin or return to degree programs are career transitions and the need for updated skills to obtain new jobs (Giuliano, 2002).

About 80 percent of older students were part-time and 63 percent were women in 1996. Older students tend to study education, computer science, library science, public administration/social work, and mechanics/transportation more than any other subjects, and colleges have attracted older students to their programs in order to maintain enrollments which otherwise would have decreased due to the decline in high school graduates after the baby boom (Giuliano, 2001).

Students enrolled in America's institutions of higher education can be separated into six distinct learner groups (Oblinger & Verville, 1998): 1) includes 3.9 million traditional undergraduate students, ages 17-24, enrolled full time at campuses, and seeking bachelor's degrees; 2) includes 650,000 traditional graduate students, ages 22-34, enrolled full time at

campuses, and seeking academic or professional master's or doctoral degrees; 3) includes 2.0 million semi-traditional undergraduate students, ages 17-24, enrolled part time at campuses and usually working part time in non-career, entry-level jobs, and seeking bachelor's degrees; 4) includes 487,000 semi-traditional graduate students, ages 22-34, enrolled part time at campuses and employed either part time in a variety of non-career jobs or employed full-time in career-oriented positions, and seeking master's or doctoral degrees; 5) includes 5.3 million non-traditional undergraduate students, ages 25 and older, enrolled full or part time and employed as career-oriented labor force members, and seeking first degrees in programs; and 6) includes 880,000 non-traditional graduate students, ages 25 and older, enrolled full or part time and working full time in chosen careers, and seeking master's or doctoral degrees(Oblinger & Verville, 1998).

As demonstrated by the six groups of learners, they represent a significant proportion of non-traditional students, and these statistics exhibit the 44 percent of adults, mostly working, whose numbers are increasing and who will soon make up half of the student population in higher education. Although the 18-24 year old student population remains the largest group on university and college campuses, enrollments have been increasing among students 25 years of age and older. Furthermore, more than half of all undergraduates are 22 years or older and almost 25 percent of the student population is 30 years or older (Oblinger & Verville, 1998).

The enrollment in postsecondary education will continue to increase; however, the authors also note the share of students in different types of institutions will change as well. More students are enrolling in for-profit institutions of higher education, where programs range from computer science to network management. Since many of these programs, including

certification programs, are not offered in traditional postsecondary institutions, students will turn to for-profit schools in order to satisfy their learning needs (Oblinger & Verville, 1998).

Another interesting point is that students in higher education are more likely to be female and/or minorities. In higher education institutions throughout the United States, women now outnumber men in undergraduate and graduate schools, and in professional programs, women make up nearly 40 percent of students enrolled. The number of minority students is growing as well; in 1997, people classified as "minority" or "foreign" accounted for 28.8 percent of all students in higher education (Oblinger & Verville, 1998).

Since forty percent of the adults in the United States participate in some form of adult education, chiefly due to job or career-related purposes, administrators of institutions of higher education must accommodate these students' conflicts with place and time and need to pay attention when students tell them what they wish to learn (Speer, 1998). Nearly half of college and university students pursuing degrees attend on a part-time basis, typically working full or part time jobs while attending classes. Speer acknowledges that "lifelong education is what's required today" (p. 34) and notes that the more education people, especially adult learners, have, the more they want. College graduates, participating in adult continuing education, typically register for courses at twice the rate of those adults who never attended college and triple the rate of those who dropped out of high school (Speer, 1998).

Adult continuing education is about convenience and location for the learner; more than half of adult part-time students indicate that a location in close proximity to their homes and work was the principal factor influencing their choice of institution. Proximity and location is not the only convenience issue with most adult learners. Because most adult learners work in at least a part-time capacity, these students need to have class schedules that can be flexible in

order to accommodate their work schedule. Therefore, most adult learners want early morning or evening classes. Weekend courses, too, are in demand from working adult learners who crave even more flexibility and further options. The most flexible option in adult continuing education perhaps is offered through distance learning programs, which allow students to take courses from one campus through the use of high-tech delivery modes such as video, television, and online at a campus that may be in greater proximity to them (Speer, 1998).

Students who participate in adult education generally prefer to have their educational programs customized to fit their specific needs, and administrators recognize this need by interacting with their customers and by responding directly to those needs with flexible customization. Additionally, with the growing population of older learners in America's institutions of higher education, educators should feel comfortable and confident they will stay in business—if they continue to meet the learning needs of their students, as well as the demands of work and family placed upon their students (Speer, 1998).

Traits and Needs of Non-traditional Students

Traits, characteristics, and needs of non-traditional students, particularly the new older learners, have also been identified (Novak, 2001; Ogren, 2003). Adult students are typically., between the ages of 25-45, are employed in career positions, and have returned to institutions of higher learning to continue their education. Most of these students have a desire to study a highly technical field, which sees rapid growth and change, so they can then remain current and on the cutting edge within their position. Most of these students attend classes with the support and financial aid given from their companies. Many of these older learners are over the age of 50 as well. The students aged 50 and older typically take courses that are hobby or interest

related and showed this age group to have a greater tendency to only enroll in a workshop or a few courses rather than to seek a degree. Adult learners younger than age 50, on the other hand, primarily report taking classes in order to advance their careers, and these students, in general, are degree seeking (Novak, 2001).

Additionally, the needs of the non-traditional student include the need for self-discovery, flexibility in course scheduling through times and place, and manageable resources. Constraints with these three main needs often inhibit an older learner from completing a degree or from enrolling in an institution at all (Novak, 2001).

In addition to non-traditional students being primarily female, minorities, or of low socioeconomic standing, the non-traditional students of today are typically older than the 18 to 22 year old age group, and institutions stand to lose if they were to fail in their mission of serving these students (Ogren, 2003).

Students who attend for-profit institutions of higher education are as diverse as those students who attend most institutions of higher education (Ruch, 2001). These students range from unemployed 18 year olds who have recently graduated from high school to middle-aged and older professionals who desire career advancement. Student demographics at several for-profit institutions have been examined; however, Ruch (2001) argues that it can be risky to generalize about these students. From national data, students attending for-profit schools are older than those attending non-profit institutions. More than 50 percent of the students at for-profit institutions are older than 30 years of age, 30 percent are in the 18-23 year range, and the remaining 20 percent are 24-29 years old. Additionally, students who attend for-profit institutions are often single parents, have dependents other than a spouse, and are financially independent (Ruch, 2001).

For-profit institutions tend to attract a higher proportion of women and minority students compared to non-profit schools. (Ruch, 2001). Also, in 1998, the top producers of minority graduates in engineering-related technologies and computer and information sciences were for-profit institutions (Ruch, 2001).

Moreover, the majority of students, approximately two-thirds, enrolled in for-profit schools are also employed at least 35 or more hours per week; non-profit institutions, on the other hand, show only about one-third of their students to work at least 35 hours or more per week. Furthermore, in 2001, reports from the NCES show that nearly half of the undergraduates enrolled in for-profit institutions were classified as low-income, whereas 21-26 percent of the undergraduates attending non-profit schools were low-income (Ruch, 2001).

Ruch summarizes the typical student pursuing a degree at a for-profit institution to fit the following demographic profile:

> "27-year-old female, ethnic minority (African American, Hispanic, or Asian), U.S. citizen, married, with one or two dependents, holding a full- or part-time job while going to school full time, and having some prior college experience. This student did not excel academically in high school and has mixed success in prior college work but has come to the realization that a college degree is the most sensible and effective route to a better job, a higher standard, of living, and opportunities for career advancement. She is motivated and serious about education perhaps the first time in her life. She sees higher education as a means to an end—a practical step toward a better future, greater economic security, and more options in life. In pursuing her degree, she is struggling to juggle the responsibilities of school, work, and family. How long will this take, how much she will have to sacrifice to achieve this goal, and how much will it cost are vital questions for her. She is financing her education the same way most students do, through a combination of financial aid-grants and loans and personal savings" (p. 32).

Understanding the traits and characteristics, along with the learning needs, of today's non-traditional students is essential to the success of American institutions of higher education.

As more and more non-traditional students begin to embark on life-changing journeys into continuing adult education, educators at these institutions must take deliberate steps to compete for these students' enrollment. For-profit institutions, primarily, have come to understand these students' needs and have, in response, customized their educational programs to fit these demands. Students attending for-profit institutions also share different characteristics and traits compared to students who attend nonprofit and private schools, and it is critical to the success of for-profit schools to know about their students and how to meet their diverse learning needs.

The Influx of Differently Prepared Faculty at For-Profit Institutions

This section of the literature review highlights demographics of faculty in higher education at both non-profit and for-profit institutions and specifically illustrates how faculty is differently prepared at for-profit institutions of higher education.

The New Generation Faculty

The new generation of academics in the United States is quite different from their more established colleagues (Finkelstein, Seal, and Schuster, 1998; Austin, 2002). There are several key demographic categories which contrast the two cohorts—the new faculty cohort and the senior or veteran faculty cohort, including race and ethnicity, nativity, and chiefly, gender. Another significant difference is seen in the greater influx of the new faculty in fields outside of the liberal arts compared to the veteran faculty. The new generation of academics includes approximately 172,000 full-time faculty members (much larger than the expected estimate); the senior cohort of full-time faculty includes 342,000 members. These statistics indicate, then, that

the new faculty is comprised of roughly 33 percent, or one-third, of the 514,000 total core faculty in colleges and universities throughout the United States (Finkelstein, Seal, and Schuster, 1998)..

The new faculty in higher education has exhibited a change in program areas. Whereas the veteran faculty held a large proportion of liberal arts and humanities positions, the new faculty has shifted away from the liberal arts into more technological and scientific fields. The majority of new faculty has focused on fields of communication, health care, computer science, engineering, and business. Furthermore, differences are viewed in the demographics and background of the new generation of faculty. Age has become a significant difference compared to the senior cohort. The new cohort, naturally, is younger as their median age is 40 compared to the senior cohort average of age 51. Women in the new cohort are slightly younger, on average, than their male counterparts. Gender has seen a change from the new cohort compared to the veteran cohort. Women have made gains in garnering faculty positions in recent years as their representation is growing; they compose nearly 41 percent of the new generation of faculty. Although it has been a slow change, this is a sharp contrast among the senior cohort women who make up only 28 percent of the faculty (Finkelstein, Seal, and Schuster, 1998).

Racial/ethnic minority representation among American faculty has also seen change. The growth in the number of minority faculty, although not as dramatic as the growth of female faculty, is significant. Minorities in the new academic generation consist of 17 percent of the total faculty, compared to 11 percent of minorities in the senior cohort. Another important change in the demographics of American faculty is the rise of foreign-born faculty members. There has been explicit rise in the number of faculty members who are not native-born U.S. citizens. Within the new cohort, 1 in 6 new entrants is foreign-born, whereas within the senior

cohort, 1 in 9 faculty members is foreign-born. Males account for considerably more of this influx (Finkelstein, Seal, and Schuster, 1998).

Differences are viewed among today's new faculty from the senior cohort. Changes in faculty can be seen as they are more diverse demographically than the previous generation particularly with a substantial increase in women faculty, there is greater racial diversification, there has been significant increase in foreign-born faculty, and there is a larger proportion of new faculty in positions outside of the traditional liberal arts (Finkelstein, Seal, and Schuster, 1998).

A significant portion of senior faculty members will be retiring shortly, and these changes come at a time when expectations of higher education institutions are amplified. The quality of teaching provided by colleges and universities is being placed under a microscope by employers, parents, and legislators, and that each of these groups has called for greater accountability for today's new faculty (Austin, 2002). Austin contends that "without a doubt, the individuals replacing retiring faculty members must demonstrate a wider array of talents than their predecessors, as well as higher levels of productivity" (p. 94). The experiences of new faculty is accentuated by pressure, stress, and uncertainty.

Faculty Socialization

Since administrators of higher education institutions will look to hire new PhD graduates for faculty positions, the "socialization process in graduate school must change substantially for new faculty members to work effectively in the ever changing world of higher education" (p. 95). Understanding how graduate school works as a socialization process for those who aspire to be faculty is a key component in aiding new faculty to develop positive conceptions about the academic career and their role as a faculty member (Austin, 2002)..

Austin provides a characterization of the workplace that graduates will enter—one that is represented "by student diversity, new technologies, changing societal expectations, a shift in emphasis toward the learner, expanding faculty work loads, and a new labor market for faculty" (p. 97). The workplace that new graduates will enter includes changing approaches to teaching and learning, an increasingly diverse student population, rapidly changing technologies, and continuous changes in the expectations of the academy. There will be a greater demand on faculty life styles, resolute changes in the conditions of the academic job market, and different implications for PhD graduates at most institutions.

The process of socialization and preparation of faculty is an ongoing process, and one that should be valued by the academy. Through observation, listening, and interacting with faculty, aspiring faculty members can learn greatly. The interaction with peers and interaction with personal friends and family are significant to the development and socialization of future faculty. Experiences as teaching or research assistants also provide invaluable learning opportunities; however, these experiences must be accompanied with regular and focused feedback with current faculty. Mentoring by current faculty and personal guided reflection on teaching experiences are integral to graduate students' socialization process (Austin, 2002). The faculty socialization process must continually adapt to the shifting landscape of higher education.

Defining and developing conceptions of the faculty role and academic career in the socialization process has also been examined. This process of role definition involves unclear motivations and a desire for knowledge in the field, including wanting to complete research. In addition, graduate students' perceptions about teaching and research as aspects of faculty work have changed, along with perceptions of faculty lifestyle. There often is insufficient

understanding of faculty careers or other career options, and often, students struggle with the perceptions of the faculty workload (Austin, 2002).

Five recommendations for preparing new faculty and improving graduate program socialization include the following: more attention to regular mentoring, advising, and feedback; structured opportunities to observe, meet, and talk with peers; diverse teaching opportunities; guidance and information about faculty responsibilities; and regular and guided reflection of their experiences (Austin, 2002).

Use of Adjunct Faculty

The influx of adjunct faculty is another major change in American higher education today (Halfond, 2000; Beem, 2002). Part-time faculty number more than 400,000, which makes up more than two-fifths of the college teaching workforce in the United States. Adult education programs, and especially for-profit institutions of higher education, are even more dependent on adjunct faculty members to teach specific courses (Halfond, 2000). Halfond believes that "adjunct faculty ultimately determine the quality and reputation of these programs...success or failure can rest on the ability to attract high caliber part-time faculty, especially in highly competitive urban markets" (p. 47).

The background of today's adjuncts and how they bring a differently prepared faculty to for-profit institutions is also seen in American higher education (Halfond, 2000; Beem, 2002). Half of the part-time faculty in adult education are drawn from industry, bringing managerial and professional experience to the classroom, not necessarily refined teaching skills. This particular group of adjunct instructors is termed as "the Moonlighters" because they have relevant and meaningful daytime jobs. These part-time faculty bring workplace issues, dynamic cases, and

current thinking within business and industry directly into the classroom. Although they typically enjoy teaching on a part-time basis, their foremost allegiance is not to the academic institution, but rather to their employer and career (Halfond, 2000).

Another group of adjunct faculty is "the Migrant Faculty," who are mirror images of "the Moonlighter." These individuals are full-time faculty from either the same or nearby institutions who are willing to teach for additional compensation. These part-time faculty bring seasoned teaching abilities and skills to the classroom, not necessarily real world experiences. They simply adjust their teaching materials and syllabus to fit into an evening class delivery mode. The third type of the part-time faculty is "the Apprentice Faculty." These are graduate students, found primarily at nonprofit institutions, who are anxious to develop their teaching skills and earn additional income. These adjuncts typically lack the Migrant Faculty's poise and skills leading a class and may lack also the Moonlighter's workplace perspective (Halfond, 2000).

Another group of adjunct faculty found at for-profit institutions is "the Wannabes". These part-time faculty are subdivided into two specific groups. The first group is comprised of adjunct faculty who wish to leave behind their part-time status for full-time status. These individuals are prepared to teach any class at any time in order to gain valuable experience in hopes of becoming full-time. The second subsection of "the Wannabes" includes those who have full-time, nonacademic jobs and are interested in a career change into teaching. They use their part-time teaching status as a means to exploring their options as they may have become tired of the drudgery or pace of their current employment. These adjuncts may often underestimate the demands and expectations of a full-time academic appointment (Halfond, 2000).

The final group of part-time faculty is "the Retirees". These adjuncts, who are widely seen at for-profit institutions, have retired from positions in a variety of organizations or were professionals in their respective field and now wish to work in adult education because they have the time and financial assets to teach for part-time wages. Each of these six types of part-time faculty bring unique assets and liabilities to institutions of higher education. He believes that the goal of administrators should be "to manage this mix as best as possible—to be an effective casting director for an institution—and not simply to let circumstances or availability dictate the composition of the part-time faculty" (Halfond, 2000, p. 49).

Quite often, the use of part-time faculty creates a win-win situation for the institution and the instructor. Often, especially at for-profit institutions, administrators need individuals to teach content-specific courses in engineering, computer sciences, or telecommunication. More often than not, administrators call upon a bank of part-time instructors, typically instructors who bring real world experience and savvy to the classroom, to teach these specific courses (Beem, 2002). Often, adjunct "specialists" are used to accommodate specific scheduling needs. These situations have lead to an increase in the number of part-time faculty in the United States in recent years (Beem, 2002). Beem states that "in 1970, 22 percent of college professors in all disciplines were adjunct or part-time....by 2000, that percentage has increased to 42.5 percent" (p. 6). Another positive aspect for institutions, and a key component at for-profit institutions, is that hiring part-time instructors can greatly save institutions money. Because adjunct instructors earn an average between $1,500 and $2,500 per three-hour course and do not receive additional benefits, hiring part-time faculty is a sound financial move for higher education institutions (Beem, 2002).

For-Profit Faculty

Insight to faculty at for-profit institutions, particularly at DeVry University and the University of Phoenix, has also been noted by for-profit administrators and faculty, including information relating to faculty demographics at for-profit schools, faculty salary information, faculty working conditions, faculty duties and responsibilities, and faculty scholarly endeavors. Faculty at for-profit institutions are often differently prepared; many full-time and part-time faculty have tremendous business and industry experience, which allows students to gain real-world insight through cases and examples. Often times, however, these faculty members have little or no teaching experience. However, many for-profit faculty, primarily full-time members, have strong backgrounds and experience teaching in higher education as well as in other levels of education, including grade school and high school. Many of these professors have degrees in education, where pedagogy and classroom management courses served as their basis to enter the world of education and teaching. These faculty, then, have little or no experience working in business and industry and often rely on their skills and abilities as teachers to impart knowledge and content to students (Ruch, 2001).

About one-third of faculty at for-profit institutions hold doctoral degrees, and the rest have master's degrees and significant experience in industry. A handful of faculty are given release time for doctoral work, particularly those at the dissertation stage. For-profit institutions, DeVry University included, typically offer one, and occasionally more, semester sabbaticals for individuals working on dissertations, and these schools generally reimburse their full-time faculty for doctoral-level coursework (Ruch, 2001).

Faculty at for-profit institutions are often "viewed by the business side as being delivery people, as in delivery of the curriculum" (p. 118). Furthermore, the business side of for-profit

institutions often view the basic work of their faculty as fundamentally straightforward activities involving intelligent presentation of material, repetition of essential concepts, and reinforcement of learning through assessment. Ruch also acknowledges that faculty are the center of the academic life of the organization at for-profit institutions, but he emphasizes that "they do not run the institution or even hold most of the power" (p. 118). He understands they are the "skilled workhorses" in the for-profit system, as they teach the curriculum assigned to them and participate in curriculum development, but do not make final decisions regarding the curriculum (Ruch, 2001).

The influx of differently prepared faculty at for-profit institutions of higher education is of particular significance to this study. Analyzing and understanding the current scholarly literature relating to demographics of faculty in higher education at both non-profit and for-profit institutions and how faculty is differently prepared at for-profit institutions of higher education, specifically, will notably aid the process of establishing emerging themes as dictated by participants in this study.

Professional Development of For-Profit Faculty

The final theme of this literature review highlights another critical component of the for-profit faculty experience—the need for continuing professional development. This section will discuss three essential areas including balancing the need for faculty's continuing knowledge of subject matter and "best practice" teaching strategies, gaining invaluable professional and field-based experience, and the functional necessity of integrating faculty professional development activities at for-profit institutions. Although some research presented in this section relates

primarily to faculty professional development in general, these aspects of professional development can also be utilized for faculty professional development within higher education.

Subject Matter Knowledge

Gaining invaluable subject matter knowledge is one of the most important forms of professional development that faculty can, and should, engage in (Darling-Hammond, 2002; Stodolsky & Grossman, 1995). Of the four primary studies cited, subject matter knowledge is significant toward developing quality higher education instructors; however, subject knowledge may not necessarily be more important to producing effective teachers than knowledge of how to teach.

Studies, which determine how students who were taught by instructors who held bachelor's or master's degrees in specified content areas, typically showed gains in achievement. Likewise, other studies show influences of subject matter knowledge, combined with knowledge of teaching and learning, to be a positive increase in student achievement. In general, the studies discussed do not suggest that subject matter knowledge is unimportant, but that instructors need to combine their expertise in a subject with pedagogical knowledge as well (Darling-Hammond, 2002).

Conceptions of subject matter are also significant for faculty when connecting features of curricular activities. Because instructors differ in their perceptions of their subject, certain curricular features also differ depending on subject features. Faculty report more coordination with their colleagues, and implications for policy are necessary (Stodolsky & Grossman, 1995).

The instructor's role, others indicate, is to simply facilitate learning (Miller & Miller, 1999; Broder & Dorfman, 1994; Minor, Onwugbuzie, Witcher, and James, 2002). The

instructor's role is not limited to distributing information. There is much more to the significant role and heavy responsibility of teachers than simply passing along information to students. The facilitation of the learning process creates an immense amount of responsibility for the teacher (Miller & Miller, 1999).

The most basic responsibility of the teacher is to be well prepared in one's subject or field. For any competent instructor, preparedness is only "the tip of the iceberg" toward success in the classroom. As Miller and Miller (1999) indicate:

> The course(s) to be taught must be well conceptualized in terms of its position within the body of the knowledge. There must be carefully stated objectives to guide the selection of content and learning experiences. The instructor has the responsibility to access the extent to which the student has achieved the course objectives. Finally, the instructor must assume responsibility for securing student input about the course and instructional process in a never ending quest for improvement. Facilities, instructional materials, and equipment designed to meet student needs are basic requirements for educational programs. However, effective instructors are indispensable to successful educational programs. Without instructors fully competent in their subject and the teaching process, no educational program can be completely successful (p. 1).

Another critical element for quality faculty members at any higher education institution is to clearly identify the characteristics of a quality instructor; the key variable in effective educational programs is the instructional leader—the teacher (Miller & Miller, 1999).

Institutions of higher education are sensitive to the necessity for faculty to have a solid background in subject matter, and two studies indicate this awareness (Broder & Dorfman, 1994; Minor, Onwuegbuzie, Witcher, and James, 2002). Through research of student ratings of instructors' attributes, knowledge of subject matter accounted for 23% of overall relative importance (Broder & Dorfman, 1994).

Preservice teachers' perceptions of characteristics of quality instructors have also been investigated. Seven themes of characteristics of effective teachers emerged, and the notion of an instructor being knowledgeable about subject matter rated fifth overall, with 19.4% of students indicating this theme as significant (Minor, Onweubuzie, Witcher, and James, 2002).

Instructional quality begins with worthwhile teacher preparation (Evertson, Hawley, and Zlotnik, 1985). Three critical actions must be taken by teachers in order to be properly prepared before undertaking any teaching endeavor—they must place more emphasis on developing their subject matter expertise, they should take more courses in the liberal arts to strengthen their overall knowledge base, and they should exert more time to developing knowledge about teaching and the capacity to teach (Evertson, Hawley, and Zlotnik, 1985).

Subject matter knowledge is not the only principle necessary to teach however (Holt-Reynolds 1999). Subject matter knowledge is certainly of vast importance in order for teachers to be effective but that knowledge "about the subject is the easy part" (p. 30). Regardless, in order for quality instruction to occur, teachers must possess abilities to articulate the personal strategies that he or she would use to approach the subject matter to make it most meaningful to students (Holt-Reynolds, 1999).

The majority of the current literature relating to subject knowledge indicates that subject matter knowledge is a significant asset in bringing forth quality instruction; no study has indicated that subject matter knowledge has little or no importance in achieving greater student success. Much of the research shows that subject matter knowledge best works when combined with pedagogical knowledge. The overriding point in the current literature is that teaching one's subject effectively can only work when one first knows how to teach, or as American humorist

Will Rogers once succinctly said, "You can't teach what you don't know any more than you can come back from where you ain't been."

"Best Practice" Teaching Concepts

The current literature attests there is a need for effective higher education faculty to have a substantial background in pedagogy, based on combining knowledge of how to teach a subject effectively and by using the teaching concept of "best practice." Faculty and administrators in higher education, and particularly at for-profit institutions, have called for a more focused attention on creating positive, productive learning experiences for their students, and in doing so, the notion of "best practice" in teaching has flourished. Although "best practice" teaching is not new to the education realm, the standards-based reform movement of the 1990s certainly solidified the need for teachers to identify and chronicle the most effective methods and strategies for quality teaching. Although the general principles for "best practice" teaching vary slightly from educator to educator, the essential notion underlying these principles is the philosophy of theories relating to successful learning experiences.

The goals of "best practice" teaching, as indicated in the literature, are not only about reason and principles of quality teaching; excellence in teaching also means conveying passion for one's subject matter, teaching students how to learn and doing so in a relevant manner, and then motivating students to learn in their most natural mode. The goal of "best practice" teaching and learning, according to most of the higher education literature, then, is to instill the notion and priority of lifelong learning.

This section of the literature review examines essential sources which analyze the purpose and need of "best practice" theory. More specifically, three "best practice" teaching theories—brain-based teaching and learning, active learning, and constructivism—are investigated as these have been identified as critical components of effective teaching within higher education.

"Best practice" teaching principles, which detail a variety of successful strategies to be used in the classroom, are explored in two studies (Chickering & Gamson, 1991; LeBlanc, 1998). According to these researchers, good teaching practice encourages frequent student-faculty contact, is collaborative in nature, assures active learning experiences, and communicates high expectations for students. In addition, teachers must give students prompt feedback relating to their classroom performance and must emphasize the notion of time on task, where learning to use time management strategies will produce more effective learning (Chickering & Gamson, 1991).

LeBlanc (1998) contributes comparable ideas of "best practice" teaching. Although "best practice" teaching must apply sound instructional strategies based on one's subject matter, "best practice" in teaching should create memorable and relevant learning experiences. Active listening and questioning must be a focal point in the classroom, and strong interaction between the student and instructor is critical. Furthermore, excellence in teaching means to conduct oneself as a professional in the classroom, yet one should do so with a style that is comfortable and engaging. "Best practice" in teaching means being an expert in both subject content and pedagogical methods, while caring, nurturing, and developing students' minds and talents. Finally, "best practice" teaching is about creating fun, worthwhile learning experiences for one's students and sharing in those positive experiences as an educator (LeBlanc, 1998). As LeBlanc

testifies: "good teachers practice their craft not for the money or because they have to, but because they truly enjoy it and because they want to" (p. 3).

"Best practice" teaching focuses on the most effective strategies and methods that can be employed in every aspect of education—from reading to writing, from mathematics to science, and from social studies to the arts. Teachers must identify these strategies, determine how to properly implement them in their repertoire, and ascertain the best approach for producing students who will become lifelong learners (LeBlanc, 1998).

Insight to the brain-based teaching and learning movement, as well as understanding how human brain functions and how learning is translated into effective classroom strategies and methodologies, is another significant factor in utilizing professional development for faculty at for-profit, non-traditional institutions (King, 1997; Jensen, 1998, Cohen, 1995; Brandt, 1995). King defines brain-based teaching and learning as "the teaching and learning processes that work in concert with the brain's natural methods for acquiring information, skills, and insights" (p. 276). In the last four million years of human evolution, the brain has developed successful methods for learning and that brain-based teaching and learning utilize strategies and techniques that balance those successful methods. King, therefore, understands that it is a logical choice for educators "to use methods that work with, instead of against, the human brain's natural processes for accessing, storing, and retrieving information" (p. 276).

Brain-based teaching and learning is considered to be a "best practice" methodology for today's educators (Jensen, 1995). Jensen uses a splendid analogy to make his case for brain-based teaching and learning: "If you wanted to get your car fixed, you'd likely go to a mechanic. For legal help, you'd find an attorney. To understand the brain and how we learn, would you go to a teacher? Probably not. Yet every year, millions of parents trust that the professionals who

teach their children know something about the brain" (p. 7). Today's educators are entrusted with teaching students content matter, and they must also teach students the best, most natural ways to learn in and out of the classroom.

According to Cohen (1995), brain researchers are unveiling new, innovative teaching and learning methods at a rapid pace as technological advances have allowed scientists to, literally, see how the brain works and functions best. These scientific breakthroughs, then, have resulted in "a new wave of attempts to put brain research to work in the classroom" (p. 1). Inferences from recent brain research have allowed for educators to make quality reforms from the general to the specific. For example, recent brain research discoveries have had implications relating to stronger reading strategies for students and new mathematical problem-solving skills. Recent research also indicates that brain-based teaching and learning allows students to make connections, usually through the implementation of hands-on learning experiences (Cohen, 1995). For students to gain the most understanding from a learning experience, they must have hands-on experiences, which permit them to engage in dialogue with each other and allow them to express what they have learned in written form. Examples of hands-on learning include allowing students to use computer labs in English courses or to provide technology students with vital experience in engineering or telecommunication laboratories. Students must have "the opportunity to touch, to recreate...to make connections with their own life experiences" (Cohen, 1995, p. 4). Brain-based teaching and learning is one "best practice" that allows students to do just that.

Brandt (1995) argues that educators must take the time and effort to learn all they can about the human brain and how student learning is affected. From that point then, what the individual teacher does with that information is the next step. Quality teachers have known that

encouraging students to make connections with the matter they are learning in the classroom to knowledge in their lives, to create hands-on learning experiences, and to find meaningful patterns in their learning are essential to crafting positive overall learning experiences. Brandt realizes:

> New knowledge about our brain may help us discover new ways to help students expand their knowledge...the best teachers know that kids learn more readily when they are emotionally involved in the lesson because emotion drives attention, which drives learning and memory. It's biologically impossible to learn anything that you're not paying attention to; the attentional mechanism drives the whole learning and memory process. Teachers know that emotion is important...teachers need to study many things—biology, anthropology, psychology, and other subjects—and make their own discoveries about improving instruction (p. 17).

As scientists and brain researchers learn more about how the brain works and how it learns in its most natural, active methods, it is up to all educators to keep enlightened, to study, and to apply this research to classroom practice (Brandt, 1995).

Active learning strategies are also significant teaching methods that instructors must employ (Glasgow, 1996; Fogarty, 1995). Active learning strategies involve more than one sensory input, which is comparable to brain-based teaching and learning strategies. Active learners must energetically strive to take a greater responsibility for their own learning by deciding how and what they need to know, based upon what they should be able to do and how they are going to do it. Often, active learners allow their roles to extend further into educational self-management, thereby requiring self-motivation to become a more significant force behind the learning process. Glasgow (1996 as cited in Haun) characterizes the need for active learning as the following:

> When learning is active, students do most of the work. They use their brains...studying ideas, solving problems, and applying what

> they learn. Active learning is fast-paced, fun, supportive, and personally engaging...To learn something well, it helps to hear it, see it, ask questions about it, and discuss it with others. Above all, students need to 'do it'—figure things out by themselves, come up with examples, try out skills, and do assignments that depend on the knowledge they already have or must acquire (p. 1).

Using active learning techniques and strategies allow students to participate in a learning process that is fun and captivating, yet one that also yields greater cognition and clarity.

The need for students to be more responsible for their learning endeavors as a crucial element of active learning. Fogarty (1995) states:

> The tag line, 'I teach, but you must learn,' is the essence of this active learning philosophy. The teacher is the resource expert, the facilitator, and the coach, active in presenting information and structuring opportunities to learn. But in the end, it is the student who must take on the more active role of inquirer, investigator, and internalizer, for it is the student who must incorporate the new information into a pre-existing, personally tailored schemata (p. 162).

Students who engage in active learning see, hear, discuss, and experience the information that is to be learned; in doing so, the learning experience is enhanced to a greater degree (Glasgow, 1996; Fogarty, 1995).

The principles of constructivism are another significant factor within for-profit, non-traditional institutions which have attracted a great deal of attention, primarily due to its advocacy as a "best practice" teaching method (Scheurmann, 1997; Arnold, 1995; Marlow & Page, 1998; Shapiro, 2000).

Scheurman (1997) identifies the basic constructivist principle in the following statement:

> People learn from new experiences by constructing personal meaning on the basis of prior knowledge and beliefs. The implication of this principle is that for effective learning to occur, students must become explicitly aware of their own conceptions (and misconceptions)

> about a particular topic or domain (or, in some cases, their conceptions about the nature of knowledge itself). Furthermore, student errors should be illuminated rather than avoided, and contradictions explored rather than ignored (p. 64).

In utilizing these constructivist principles, the student takes on a more active role in the learning process and begins to recreate knowledge based on what he or she already knows; in turn, learning is enhanced.

Constructivist learning is considered as a "best practice" teaching strategy due, in large part, to its active nature. In many learning situations, students merely wait for the teacher to "fill them up" with information; in most instances, this information is rarely held in students' long-term memories, principally due to the passive makeup of this form of learning (Arnold, 1995). Arnold thinks that "learning has to be connected to personal experience and be relevant to the needs and conditions of the learner...learning takes place in the process of constructing meaning from the manipulation of concepts and seeking solutions to problems" (p. 34). In addition, the need for constructivists to value social interaction and to recognize the importance of language is critical for learning. Essentially, constructivists hold the following assumptions on the nature of learning and knowledge: "We can only know what we construct ourselves; we are certain we know something only if we can explain it to others; and learning takes place within a social context" (Arnold, 1995, p. 34).

The main proposition of constructivist learning creates, invents, and develops our own individual knowledge (Marlow & Page, 1998). The authors state:

> Learning in constructivist terms is both the process and the result of questioning, interpreting, and analyzing information; using this information and thinking process to develop, build, and alter our meaning and understanding of concepts and ideas; and integrating current experiences with our past ex-

periences and what we already know about a given subject (p. 10).

Therefore, all students construct his or her own meaning when learning about topics, issues, and problems. Since no individual has had exactly the same experiences as any other, one's understandings, interpretations, and knowledge constructs of any concept cannot be exactly the same as any other's. In effect, one's prior knowledge, experiences, and learning affects how one interprets and experiences new affairs, and in turn, affects construction of one's knowledge structures and defines one's new meaning (Marlow & Page, 1998).

Specific strategies often associated with constructivist learning are also significant (Shapiro, 2000). Many constructivist educators believe that organizing the classroom into small, individualized learning communities is a critical vehicle to practicing constructivism; this learning environment replaces the traditional rows of students, whose primary function is to permit students to sit passively and listen to the instructor. In using teams or collaborative learning activities, students engage in and discuss the issues and topics at hand. Similarly, utilizing team projects involves students quickly in the learning process and drives students to make decisions regarding their learning. Collaborative learning propels students to work cooperatively with others, to resolve issues and conflicts that often arise, and to learn skills of working in team situations. These experiences produce higher cognitive and affective skill levels as students must analyze ideas, create and seek out alternative solutions to problems, synthesize action plans, and evaluate outcomes; each area, moreover, depicts the higher levels of Bloom's taxonomy, and greater learning is achieved (Shapiro, 2000).

"Best practice" teaching, as indicated in the current literature, attempts to take what is best throughout education and applies these "tried and tested" strategies to today's learning

processes. Many of these "best practice" teaching methods are not new; in fact, many strategies date back to ancient Greece in one form or another. What is significant from the current literature, however, is that these practice still work in today's educational institutions—and work well.

As indicated in the literature, three "best practice" teaching theories—brain-based teaching and learning, active learning, and constructivism—have been helpful and valuable to educators as faculty professional development endeavors.

Approaches to Faculty Professional Development

Throughout the current literature, another essential ingredient in preparing faculty in higher education is by providing instructors with quality professional and field-based experience. Many instructors arrive on campus with strong backgrounds in business and industry and may very well have never previously taught. Although these high-level field-based experiences are crucial to relating real-world information to students, often times, these instructors have difficulty in delivering their information to the students.

Nevertheless, the current literature shows that whenever professional or field-based experiences are available, such as internships, community partnerships, and even informal education-based employment experiences, faculty should take advantage of these opportunities as these real-world opportunities generally provide stronger insight to the world outside of the college campus.

The most common form of professional experience in higher education, primarily at nonprofit and private institutions, is seen through the advocacy of graduate teaching assistants

(Prieto & Altmaier, 1994). Graduate teaching assistants (GTAs) are responsible for a large percentage of instruction at the undergraduate level throughout major universities in America. Additionally, a large percentage of GTAs are serving as the primary instructor in many classrooms as well as in related laboratories. The experience gained by individuals who participate in GTA programs, according to the authors, often display higher levels of teaching effectiveness, student achievement, and self-efficacy. Teacher training of this nature is highly significant in preparing new faculty in higher education (Prieto & Altmaier, 1994).

Quality professional and field-based experience for faculty is also necessary for today's faculty (Eimers, Braxton, and Bayer, 2001; Petrisko, 1999). Because college instructors typically have little formal training in college teaching and student learning, it is essential to gain valuable professional or field-based experience.

Petrisko (1999) argues that professional development opportunities for part-time faculty are invaluable services, which higher education institutions should offer. Since many faculty who teach on a part-time basis do so as choice (these instructors may prefer full-time teaching positions but cannot secure them, may have not yet completed terminal degrees, or prefer part-time teaching due to other nonpaying commitments such as parenting), presenting these individuals with professional development opportunities would allow them to gain useful and worthwhile learning experiences. Faculty development in the traditional sense, including a more comprehensive structure similar to full-time faculty, should be approved by administration; however, budgetary constraints frequently limit and hinder additional professional development for part-time instructors.

The current literature indicates that quality professional and field-based experiences do relate to more positive perceptions about the need for effective faculty, yet there is insufficient

evidence shown that supports the extent of its influence on effective teaching. Most research completed in this area illustrates the significance that quality professional and field-based experience plays in the role of creating effective teachers and producing quality instruction.

There are three crucial components that comprise additional faculty preparation and support—professional development opportunities, mentoring by veteran faculty, and peer coaching. Each of these three areas will be examined in the following section of the literature review.

Professional development opportunities are essential for the continuing learning of faculty (Feiman-Nemser, 2001; Ediger, 1995; Hargreaves & Fullan, 1992). Feiman-Nemser (2001) realizes that "policy makers and educators are coming to see that what students learn is directly related to what and how teachers teach; and what and how teachers teach depends on the knowledge, skills, and commitments they bring to their teaching and the opportunities they have to continue learning in and from their practice" (p. 1013). Policies can improve schools only if instructors are provided with the necessary support, and since typical programs of faculty development and professional activities are not created to promote complex learning and that the majority of basic in-service professional development activities are generally weak interventions designed by administrators, most instructors rarely have access to truly exceptional learning opportunities (Feiman-Nemser, 2001). The purposes of faculty development programs are to stress meaning and comprehension of subject matter, to emphasize the purpose for improved teaching, to attain favorable attitudes toward the profession of teaching, and to build participant morale and thus increase energy levels for directing optimal student development (Ediger, 1995).

According to Hargreaves and Fullan (1992), faculty professional development endeavors allow instructors to possess a greater knowledge of and higher confidence in teaching their content area, to develop stronger expertise in classroom management, to become more proficient using innovative teaching strategies, and to acknowledge and respond to the differences among students.

For many researchers, in order for faculty to remain adequately prepared and to remain current within their content area, they must participate in some form of professional development (Orlich, 1989; Lieberman, 1994; Grossman & Richert, 1996). Educational leaders hold the key to this development. Orlich (1989) suggests that "all educational planners need a vision—a rationale—to increase the effectiveness of the services offered in order to enhance the human potential of their organization" (p. 1). Faculty professional development, therefore, is the most basic and necessary component of the continuing preparation and development of faculty as they expand their technical and professional knowledge.

Faculty professional development is intended to redefine the antiquated notion of in-service teacher preparation. Instead, faculty professional development concerns itself with a teacher's continuous exploration into current practice, thereby regarding teachers as adult learners (Lieberman, 1994). Moreover, faculty professional development not only means that instructors build and improve upon their classroom practices, but it also means creating a more collaborative culture within their institution, one in which faculty members are supported to learn from one another and are encouraged to actively share leadership roles.

Faculty members are being asked to collaborate with administrators to find methods which will allow new instructors methods for gaining further professional development. Veteran

faculty must aid beginning teachers in developing the knowledge and skills required in order to become successful within the profession (Grossman & Richert, 1996).

In general, the purpose of faculty professional development is to allow learning opportunities for teachers, so that they may be better prepared to meet the challenges and needs of their students (Darling-Hammond, 1997). The purpose of faculty professional development should be much more than simply preparing classroom teachers, and Darling-Hammond perceives faculty professional development as the following:

> As a policy strategy, professional accountability is aimed at ensuring that practitioners are sufficiently competent and committed to give the public high levels of confidence that these practitioners will behave knowledgeably and ethically. Public confidence is warranted only when a profession has ways to continually expand its knowledge and when it has specific methods of ensuring that the people it admits and allows to practice can be relied on to possess that knowledge, along with a commitment to public safety and well-being (pp. 298-299).

The need for ongoing professional development is recognized and advocated among educators (Guskey & Hubeman, 1995; Heinecke & Stohl Drier, 1998). Several researched divisions of faculty professional development are necessary, including systemic and organizational approaches, individual teacher focus and growth efforts, philosophical and theoretical premises of teaching and learning, and overall program reform to necessitate accountability (Guskey & Hubeman, 1995).

Heinecke and Stohl Drier (1998) advocate the need for faculty professional development throughout higher education institutions. Heinecke and Stohl Drier confirm the following:

> Educational researchers must gain a better understanding of knowledge for action. We need scholarly activity spanning boundaries so practitioners' concerns and dilemmas can influence educational researchers' work in schools. We also need policies that improve teaching. This new pedagogy for policy must offer more productive ways of informing and shaping policies that

> inform and shape schools. Appropriate educational research can create a broader community of knowledge producers and users among teachers, teacher educators, administrators, policy makers, researchers. Such a community makes knowledge itself more democratic (p. 276).

Although there is a tangible need for faculty professional development in higher education as shown, there has not been a consensus among educators as to the model that should be used as the standard (Hiebert Gallimore, and Stigler, 2002; Wood, 1998).

There is a growing perception that the best faculty professional development activities yield the best results when they are school-based, collaborative, long-term, focused on student learning, and linked to curricula (Hierbert, Gallimore, and Stigler, 2002).

The desired goal of new teacher induction takes root in the areas of teacher growth and institutional leadership. These ideas include the notions such as sensible training, reflexive partnerships, and successful change in order to support new faculty (Wood, 1998).

Mentors can promote further thinking skills, observe clinical practice, determine objectives for subject-matter pedagogy, and encourage the stages of development and teacher reflection (Sears, Marshall, Otis-Wilborn, 1994; Scherer, 2001).

Scherer (2001) interviews David C. Berliner, the Dean of the College of Education at Arizona State University, and details the need for mentoring and support for new teachers. Berliner describes the importance of education reform and the significance of veteran faculty mentoring new teachers. Berliner believes:

> mentoring programs are promising for two reasons. First, they cut the dropout rate of teachers from roughly 50 to 15 percent during the first five years of teaching. Mentoring is very important; without it, our shortages will grow. But the second reason that we need mentoring is a moral, not a pragmatic, one. We must not abandon beginners who have been placed in the complex world of teaching. Through apprentice-ships, novices can learn from masters. Mentoring helps new teachers

> think about the experience, and it helps handle the emotional side of teaching. Teaching is an emotionally draining occupation....they need clear advice about how to do something better or different the next time they teach it (p. 10).

The use of mentoring is not near as widespread, and every school in the country should have a mentoring program to aid new faculty in becoming even more effective in the classroom (Scherer, 2001).

Participating in teacher preparation programs is another critical aspect necessary within faculty professional development (Buck & Frank, 2001; Giertz, 1996). Long-term effects of a competent teacher preparation program, including orientation sessions designed to instill methodologies for instructional delivery, content pedagogy, and classroom discipline, as well as opportunities for mentoring and coaching from veteran instructors, lead to positive effects on teaching, and in turn, to higher levels of student success (Buck and Frank, 2001). New teacher mentoring is a key component in teacher preparation and is generally supported by 4-6 veteran instructors. These full-time, experienced teachers serve a fundamental supporting role for the assigned mentees, providing advice, teaching materials, and strategies. Mentors act as sounding boards for their new teachers and act as their faculty liaison—half teacher, half cheerleader (Buck & Frank, 2001).

New teachers who have participated in teacher preparation programs report that the training has been of use to them by increasing their self-confidence, leading to a deeper understanding of the teaching and learning process or providing new teacher skills (Giertz, 1996).

Peer coaching also fosters growth for both novice and veteran faculty members (Darling-Hammond, 2003; Bambino, 2002; Sherin, 2000). Peer coaching allows faculty to become more

effective in the classroom by having one instructor observe another's classroom behaviors, and then, in a post-observation meeting, the observing instructor can provide needed, yet helpful, constructive criticism. Peer coaching experiences not only aid new teachers by allowing veteran faculty the opportunity to pass along teaching suggestions and advice, but assists the veteran teachers as well (Darling-Hammond, 2003). Support groups such as peer coaching allow for greater access to effective feedback on helping faculty improve instruction and student learning. By providing structures such as peer coaching, teachers can more successfully supply feedback, collaborate on instruction, determine innovative solutions to instructional and curricular problems, and create a sense of community among colleagues (Bambino, 2002).

Utilizing video clubs is another method to assist peer coaching (Sherin, 2000). The use of the video club enhances peer coaching techniques because in this mode, faculty are not only observed by other instructors but are also videotaped teaching their lessons. At a post-observation meeting, both faculty members review the video and constructive feedback ensues. This innovative form of peer coaching allows for greater reflection by both instructors and provides a clearer focus for the post-observation meeting. In addition, using this method allows for teachers to investigate their teaching, rather than simply evaluate their teaching; this, in turn, provides for greater understanding of how one teaches and, more importantly, how one can continually improve teaching (Sherin, 2000).

After examining the current literature relating to additional faculty preparation and support measures, it is clear that much research has been conducted on the need for ongoing professional development and training for all instructors. This research, however, indicates a wide variance as to the most desired methods of achieving further faculty preparation and support. Much of the research, on the other hand, shows that professional development and

training is most effective when the training encompasses stronger comprehension of subject matter and improved teaching methodologies.

Likewise, the use of additional support from mentoring programs and peer coaching initiatives also are clearly shown to aid novice faculty in becoming more effective. Furthermore, the current research indicates that the utilization of programs such as mentoring and peer coaching allows new instructors opportunities to create and integrate innovative ideas and strategies in the classroom.

To conclude this section, several key factors relating to the current scholarly literature must be relayed. In the areas of subject matter knowledge and pedagogical knowledge, the current literature reveals that there is no identifiable extent of how much subject knowledge or how much pedagogical knowledge one must have in order to be an effective instructor. The research, on the other hand, does dictate that both subject knowledge and pedagogical knowledge of an instructor generally equate to greater student achievement. The current literature verifies that the most effective faculty members have a solid background in both subject and pedagogical knowledge.

In like manner, the current literature determines that quality professional and field-based experience is ideal for effective faculty; however, the current body of literature lacks sufficient support as to the extent of its influence on effective teaching. In order to remedy this situation, further research should be conducted, and furthermore, additional distinction and separation between specific types of experiences should be identified and reported.

Finally, the current scholarly literature provides solid research on additional faculty preparation and support structures. Although there is a significant variance in what components are essential, the research does provide some engaging examples, which may or may not

influence greater teacher effectiveness, and suggests that there is a wide-ranging discrepancy between what works well for some faculty and what is not feasible for others. The necessity for lifelong learning opportunities, however, is clear—institutions of higher education must make quality professional development activities a priority as the research indicates that these opportunities provide a greater chance for faculty improvement, and in turn, allows for higher student achievement.

Chapter Three

Design and Methods

Restatement of Purpose of Inquiry and Research Questions

This qualitative study focuses on the experience of faculty members who teach at for-profit, post-secondary institutions. The purpose of this study was to increase our understanding of how for-profit faculty learn to teach, what they think about teaching, and how they experience teaching in the particular context of a proprietary, vocational-oriented institution of higher education. Although the landscape of higher education has changed greatly in the past decade and recent studies have examined the non-traditional student, few studies are concerned with the faculty experience in for-profit institutions of higher education.

The research questions for this study concentrate on the conditions and processes relating to the teaching experience of for-profit faculty and the lived experiences of these participants at for-profit universities. The following research questions directed my study:

1. What is the experience of faculty members who teach at for-profit institutions of higher education?
2. How do they develop their approaches and philosophies of teaching and learning?
3. How do institutional structures, policies, and culture shape their understanding of their roles as faculty?
4. How do they construct an identity as faculty?

5. What are their processes of development as teachers?

Through the use of these five key research questions, I believe I increased understanding about the teaching experience for faculty at for-profit universities.

Design

This qualitative study, utilizing narrative case study approach, focuses on the significance of context and language, as well as the participant's social construction of reality (Kemper & Tierney, 1996), of faculty who teach at for-profit institutions. This introduction section also gives emphasis to current definitions of quality teaching. Although this study will resist any kind of universal definition of quality in teaching or education in general, it is important to identify what quality means to faculty at for-profit universities and how images of quality are depicted in their views of teaching and learning. Additionally, it is significant to highlight others' definitions of quality and then distinguish the views of for-profit faculty with their institution's message of quality.

This study employs an alternative way of researching and thinking about research questions—qualitative research. Qualitative research is "a systematic, empirical strategy for answering questions about people in a particular social context. Given any person, group, or locus for interaction, it is a means for describing and attempting to understand the observed regularities in what people do, or in what they report as their experience" (Locke, Spiraduso, and Silverman, 2000, p. 96).

There are several recurring features used within the qualitative research design. These recurring features include sustained contact with the field or life situation and allows the researcher to gain insight and understanding of the phenomenon and its contexts (Miles & Huberman, 1994). The qualitative design allows the researcher "to capture data on the perceptions of local actors 'from the inside,' through a process of deep attentiveness, of empathetic understanding, and of suspending or 'bracketing' preconceptions about the topics under discussion" (Milea & Huberman, 1994, p. 6). The qualitative design helps the researcher isolate certain themes which can be reviewed with the study's participants and aids others in understanding the phenomenon. In this approach,"little standardized instrumentation is used at the onset. The researcher is essentially the main 'measurement device' in the study....most analysis is done with words. The words can be assembled, clustered, subclustered, broken into semiotic segments. They can be organized to permit the researcher to contrast, compare, analyze, and bestow patterns upon them" (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 7). As the authors demonstrate, "these may be the 'core' of recurring features for naturalistic studies, but they are configured and used differently in any particular research tradition" (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 7).

A simple, yet significant, definition of qualitative research is also provided; it is "a situated activity that locates the observer in the world" (Denzin & Lincoln, 2002, p.3). Qualitative research consists of "a set of interpretive, material practices that make the world visible. These practices transform the world. They turn the world into a series of representations, including field notes, interviews, conversations, photographs, recordings, and memos to the self" (Denzin & Lincoln, 2002, p. 3). The key to sound qualitative research is to allow the researcher to "study things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of, or to

interpret, phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them" (Denzin & Lincoln, 2002, p. 3).

The qualitative research paradigm "defines the methods and techniques most suitable for collecting and analyzing data. Qualitative inquiry, which focuses on meaning in context, requires a data collection instrument that is sensitive to underlying meaning when gathering and interpreting data" (Merriam, 2001, p. 1). Individuals who undertake qualitative studies focus on discovery and understanding, and interviewing, observing, and analyzing human beings are central tasks to qualitative research (Merriam, 2001).

The constructs of how and why qualitative researcher is conducted is also detailed. Qualitative researchers "stress the socially constructed nature of reality, the intimate relationship between the researcher and what is studied, and the situational constraints that shape inquiry " (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994, p. 4). Seeking answers to questions posed about the social experience and how it is created allows the researcher to distinguish new meaning and to form new perspectives of the experience.

The primary reason for selecting the narrative case study approach, as opposed to the other traditions within qualitative research paradigm, is based on the fact that

> the case study is the method of choice when the phenomenon under study is not readily distinguishable from its context. Such a phenomenon may be a project or program in an evaluation study. Sometimes, the definition of this project or program may be problematic, as in determining when the activity started or ended—an example of a complex interaction between a phenomenon and its (temporal) context. Other examples abound, including varied situations such as....a community organization and its neighborhood, the implementation of personal computers in schools, and a manufacturing firm and its market-place. All are situations warranting the use of case studies (Yin, 2003, p. 4).

Furthermore, as Yin attests, "the inclusion of the context as a major part of study, however, creates distinct technical challenges" (Yin, 2003, p. 4). For example, due to the richness of context of the study, the research will, more than likely, have a variety of results. Furthermore, Yin understands that "the richness means that the study cannot rely on a single data collection method but will likely need to use multiple sources of evidence" (Yin, 2003, p. 4).

Additionally, "there is little consensus on what constitutes a case study and how this type of research is done" (Merriam, 2001, p. 26). However, a variety of terms including naturalistic inquiry, exploratory research, grounded theory, and fieldwork are often equated with the case study. Merriam explains that some of the confusion of what constitutes a case study is "that the process of conducting a case study is conflated with both the unit of study (the case) and the product of this type of investigation" (Merriam, 2001, p. 27). Through its end product, the case study is clarified: "a qualitative case study is an intensive, holistic description and analysis of a single instance, phenomenon, or social unit" (Merriam, 2001, p. 27).

The primary rationale I selected to employ the case study was straighforward in that it is "an appropriate vehicle because they allow what anthropologist Clifford Geertz calls 'thick description'" (Chaffee & Tierney, 1986, p. 13). If we are to improve higher education, "we must understand colleges and universities as socially constructed organization and discern what can make them more effective. This cannot be done through armchair research but only through intimate contact with daily institutional life" (Chaffee & Tierney, 1986, pp. 12-13).

Based on the definitions and analysis of the narrative case study approach, I selected to use the narrative case study approach to drive my study and better understand the case itself. I believe this particular approach effectively increased understanding of how faculty learn to

teach, what they think about teaching, and how they experience teaching in the particular context of a for-profit institution, such as DeVry University.

The Narrative Approach

The use of the narrative method and interpretative skills allowed greater understanding of and meaning to the participants' stories as they emerged through in-depth interviews. Through use of the narrative method, I, as the researcher, learned about the detailed, lived experience as described by the individual participants, and from these rich experiences, gained valuable insight to the cultural and social conditions of the participants at the particular time and place of the participants' experiences. Furthermore, through use of the narrative approach, I learned about the values, world views, and meaning-making systems of the participants through the manner in which their stories were constructed; this included examining the participants' language, structure, and content. Finally, the narrative approach was significant because it was intersubjective and co-constructive; I brought my own values to the study, so my analysis included reflection on how my perspectives interacted with the participants' perspectives to shape the study's findings.

The purpose of using the narrative method is "to create interpreted description of the rich and multi-layered meanings of historical and personal events. The search is for truths unique in their particularity, grounded in firsthand experience, in order to extend and enhance conceptualization and/or to sensitize practitioners to their occurrence. The emphasis is on content and its meanings, which are sometimes revealed in structural forms" (Josselson & Lieblich, 2003, pp. 259-260). The authors indicate "the qualitative/ researcher eschews methodolatry in favor of doing what is necessary to capture the lived experience of people in

their own meaning-making" (Josselson & Lieblich, 2003, p. 260). Narrative research is "a voyage of discovery—a discovery of meanings that both constitute the individual participant and are co-constructed in the research process" (Josselson & Lieblich, 2003, p. 260).

Two principles of the narrative in qualitative research are also identified. Narration is a critical method for people to understand experience and communicate meaning of experience. Narratives are social in character, and narrative analysis combines a focus on an individual's stories with analysis of the social character of that story (Chase, 2003, pp. 79-80). In addition, the integration of these two principles attests to the value of narrative analysis within qualitative research. Chase (2003) verifies that "when we listen carefully to the stories people tell, we learn how people as individuals and groups make sense of their experiences and construct meaning and selves. We also learn about the complexities and subtleties of the social worlds they inhabit. We gain deeper understandings of the social resources (cultural, ideological, historical, and so forth) that they draw on, resist, and transform as they tell their stories" (Chase, 2003, pp. 80-81).

The narrative method is an essential design for constructing meaning from faculty and their teaching and learning experiences (Lyons & LaBoskey, 2002). As the authors indicate,

> narrative practices are intentional, reflective human actions, socially and contextually situated, in which teachers with their students, other colleagues, or researchers, interrogate their teaching practices to construct meaning and interpretation of some compelling or puzzling aspect of teaching and learning through the production of narratives that lead to understanding, changed practices, and new hypotheses (p. 21).

Five important characteristics of modes of inquiry and ways of knowing are detailed including the following: reflective human actions, social and contextual situations, engaging participants in interrogating aspects of teaching and learning by "storying" the experience, implicating the identities of those involved, and constructing meaning and knowledge (Lyons & LaBoskey,

2002, pp. 21-22). The narrative is a practical method, particularly in educational settings, because "narrative as story seemed especially useful to capture the situated complexities of teachers' work and classroom practice, often messy, uncertain, and unpredictable" (Lyons & LaBoskey, 2002, p. 15).

Utilizing the narrative case study also provided another critical perspective—the use of "the reflective turn" (Schon, 1991). Researchers employing this strategy "observe, describe, and try to illuminate the things practitioners actually say and do, by exploring the understandings revealed by the patterns of spontaneous activity that make up their practice" (Schon, 1991, p. 5). When these patterns emerge, investigators believe there is "an underlying *sense* to be discovered and that it is their business as researchers to discover it" (Schon, 1991, p. 5). Consequently, researchers are often led to reflect on their own understanding of the participants' understandings; researchers, then, question their own understanding of the case in order to explore the sense in another's practice (Schon, 1991).

The use of the narrative method within educational settings is quite appropriate. The story approach is appropriate in educational research because "narrative is useful only to the extent that it opens up (to its audiences) a deeper view of life in familiar contexts: it can make the familiar strange, and the strange familiar. As a means of educational report, stories can provide a means by which those truths, which cannot be otherwise told, are uncovered" (Clough, 2002, p. 8). Moreover, the use of narratives are of further importance to research in educational settings because they permit researchers to report experiences which might otherwise not be made public by other established methods of reporting (Clough, 2002).

Employing the narrative case study approach is also exceptional in that educational institutions and organizations are often marginalized and silenced. Using narrative methods

often call attention to the experiences of those educators who may have been left out of the educational mainstream. The value of using the narrative in these instances is that the experiences are examined and refuse to remain silenced. Participants' voices are heard, and "theory and method act in dialectical nature with policy and practice" (McLaughlin & Tierney, 1993, p. 3). Educational institutions in this regard are researched "not merely as a functionalist tool of effectiveness, but rather as a cacophony of voices mediated within different layers of reality....at the core of this approach is the recognition of power, knowledge, ideology, and culture are inextricably linked to one another in constantly changing patterns and relationships" (McLaughlin & Tierney, 1993, p. 3).

Finally, through the use of the narrative design, the primary data collection method utilized will be the recording of oral history through the in-depth interview, as well as through subsequent, or follow-up, interviews. The necessity of using the in-depth interview in order to construct meaning from the reality of the narrator's story (Yow, 1994). The term oral history, although often referred to in a variety of terms, implies "that there is someone else involved who inspires the narrator to begin the act of remembering, jogs memory, and records and presents the narrator's words" (Yow, 1994, p. 4). The oral history, or the in-depth interview, is close to the basic principles of grounded theory; the difference lies in the importance of formulating the research's guiding questions and the other types of observations of behaviors other than the interview process (Yow, 1994). This study, again, was directed by elements of the narrative approach and the case study methods and included specific aspects of data analysis for each design.

Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework within a dissertation "must open the inquiry, not narrow and focus it" (Josselson & Lieblich, 2003, p. 263). By identifying the boundaries of the conceptual field within which the researcher proposes to work, it outlines in a general manner the researcher's complexity of the study. Additionally, the conceptual framework serves the function of demonstrating the researcher's knowledge of the literature and to read analytically (Josselson & Lieblich, 2003).

Conceptual frameworks are simply "the researcher's map of the territory being investigated" (Miles and Huberman, 1984, p. 20). The use of a case study, specifically within a qualitative research design, has a conceptual structure and is typically organized around a small number of research questions (Stake, 2001). Furthermore, the case study is a "bounded system....patterned. Coherence and sequence are prominent. It is common to recognize that certain features are within the system, within the boundaries of the case, and other features outside" (Stake, 2001, p. 436).

The conceptual framework for this qualitative study, then, is the exploration of the teaching experience bounded in the particular context of a for-profit institution of higher education. More specifically, the case examined in this study was faculty who teach at the Chicago campus of DeVry University. The purpose of the study, therefore, was to increase our understanding of how DeVry University faculty learn to teach, what they think about teaching, and how they experience teaching in their specific context.

Case study researchers are "interested in a general phenomenon or a population of cases more than the individual case. And we cannot understand this case without knowing about other cases. But while we are studying it, our meager resources are concentrating on trying to

understand its complexities" (Stake, 2001, p. 436). The conceptual framework for this study, then, was concerned with the exploration and discovery of how faculty at DeVry University experience teaching bounded in their particular context of a for-profit institution of higher education.

Through the course of the research, the conceptual framework did not change, even with the complexities of emerging data throughout the interview process with DeVry University faculty.

Researcher's Perspective

I wanted to be a teacher since junior high. Usually junior high boys dream of becoming an all-star football or baseball player or perhaps a police officer or firefighter. Not me though—I wanted to be a teacher. Thinking back, I am not even certain of what I wanted to teach; I simply knew though that I wanted to be a teacher because I enjoyed working with students, helping them to understand whatever they were learning.

I grew up in small, rural town, Yorkville, Illinois, which, at the time, had a population of 4,500 people. Although my town was considered tiny, I never really felt as if it was a small town because within a fifteen minute drive, we could get to the Chicago suburbs, where cities of 100,000 or more people lived and worked. Within an hour's drive, we could be in Chicago with all of its marvelous sights and sounds. Yet, growing up in little Yorkville, I had wonderful opportunities working with younger students as a peer facilitator, peer tutor, camp counselor, swimming teacher, and baseball coach. Through these experiences in junior high and high school and my rapidly growing passion of working with kids, my career path became quite clear; I was going to college to learn to be a teacher.

At Eastern Illinois University, I narrowed my teaching choice even further; I was going to be an English teacher, as literature and writing are dear passions of mine, and I was also going to be a coach, due mainly to my love for sports, especially football and baseball. Thinking realistically, I knew I was never going to be a professional running back or second basemen, but teaching and coaching would allow me to help other students reach their potential dreams.

At Eastern, I studied English education as my major and physical education as a minor. With each new semester and with every new education course, my passion for teaching became greater. Finally, in my last semester, I student taught at Charleston High School, and through this experience, my love for teaching made me realize I had chosen the right career path. Teaching was indeed my life's calling.

Within two months after graduation, I had three teaching offers; two were in California as a high school English teacher and football coach, and the third offer was at a school, a college actually, that I knew very little about—DeVry Institute of Technology. Originally, I wanted to leave Illinois and start a new life in California, but family and friends, as well as the opportunity to teach at the collegiate level, kept me in my home state. Making the decision to teach at DeVry was quite difficult. I would be teaching English, but there would be no coaching opportunities. Although I was torn, I took the job, and I have been teaching English and humanities at DeVry—with no regrets—ever since.

Teaching at DeVry has provided me with opportunities and challenges I never dreamed possible. DeVry has paid for me to continue my education; I earned my master's degree in English in 1994 and am currently in the fifth year of working on my doctoral degree. Through my fifteen years at DeVry, I have taught hundreds, perhaps thousands, of students whose passion was most certainly not English, but by the time they left my classrooms, I think—at least I

hope—I have been able to spark their interest in writing and literature, as my passion for the subjects continue to grow. In addition, I have had the opportunity to work closely with brilliant faculty and administrators—individuals who have a passion for education and serving others. Finally, I have had the opportunity to develop new courses and stronger curricula. Most significantly though, I have had the opportunity, as I have become a veteran teacher, to help newer teachers develop and hone their teaching skills and methods by serving as a mentor and teacher preparation coordinator. These opportunities and challenges have helped to shape my feelings and beliefs about teaching and the significance of effective teaching and learning. Through the years, I have come to realize that education is the greatest investment that any student can make, and that learning is truly a life-long endeavor. My learning has been continuous and will be until the day I die. My passion for teaching, and teaching well, continues to grow, and my hope is that I will continue to develop as a teacher even further.

After having served as a program coordinator with the two primary structures of teacher preparation programs currently in place at DeVry University, the New Faculty Orientation Program (NFOP) and the Excellence in Teaching Course (ETC), I have thoroughly enjoyed the privilege of teaching, observing, mentoring, and coaching several newly hired faculty members. Likewise in my fifteen years in the field of teaching, I have had the honor of working closely with a vast array of teaching colleagues; in my experience, like other veteran faculty, I have seen instructors who have inspired students to greatness, while others have faced the wrath of dissatisfied, angry student mobs. In every instance, these faculty exhibited specific characteristics and have had an extensive variety of prior experiences. The lived experiences I have had in my time teaching at DeVry University, as well as the observed experiences of my teaching colleagues, are what have piqued my curiosity as a researcher, and

through these experiences, I have developed an increased appetite of wanting to know more about the experience of faculty at for-profit institutions of higher education.

In order to successfully increase understanding of how faculty learn to teach, what they think about teaching, and how they experience teaching in the particular context of a proprietary institution of higher education, this study will use a qualitative research paradigm. More specifically, the qualitative research design will be guided by the narrative a case study approach in hopes of constructing meaning from the reality of the participants' stories. In addition, I hope to use the finding of this study to develop a model for teacher preparation and practice to influence continuous improvement for faculty at for-profit institutions of higher education.

Site Selection

The identification of the case setting is defined by use of the following:

> A case may be simple or complex. It may be a child, or a classroom of children, or an incident such as a mobilization of professionals to study a childhood condition. It is one among others. In any given study, we will concentrate on the one. The time we may spend concentrating our inquiry on the one may long or short, but while we so concentrate, we are engaged in case study (Stake, 2002, p. 436).

The particular case "is almost certainly going to be a functioning specific....the case has working parts; it is purposive; it often has a self. It is an integrated system" (Stake, 2002, p. 436). The setting of a case study is "patterned. Coherence and sequence are prominent. It is common to recognize that certain features are within the system, within the boundaries of the case, and other features outside....ultimately, we may be interested in a general phenomenon or a population of cases more than in the individual case. And we cannot understand this case without

knowing about other cases. But while we are studying it, our resources are concentrated on trying to understand its complexities" (Stake, 2002, p. 436).

The setting for my narrative case study was DeVry University; more specifically, I focused on the Chicago campus of DeVry University, located at 3300 North Campbell Avenue, Chicago, Illinois. This campus was selected due to the varied background and differently prepared faculty, diverse student population and their learning needs, and proximity to the DuPage campus of DeVry University, which is the campus where I teach.

DeVry University has two components: DeVry Institute of Technology and Keller Graduate School of Management. The undergraduate segment of DeVry University offers associate's degrees in Electronic and Computer Technology and bachelor's degrees in Business Operations, Computer Information Systems, Electronic Engineering, and Telecommunication. DeVry University is a career-oriented institution of higher education, which fills a specific niche within higher education (DeVry 2003).

Students attend classes year round and complete a four-year degree in three years, thus enabling students to enter the workplace more quickly than graduates at traditional universities. Students at DeVry are non-traditional learners, typically adult students who work more than twenty hours per week, balancing work with school and family. Many of DeVry's students are age 24 or older, with solid work and industry experiences under their belt.

DeVry's students are culturally diverse as well; students of several races and ethnic backgrounds attend the Chicago campus. Several languages are spoken among students, and social, political, and cultural differences are welcomed by students, faculty, and administration alike. Cultural diversity is highly embraced at DeVry University.

Due to the amount of hands-on training and development DeVry students receive, teaching at DeVry requires the special ability to be able to teach in a variety of modes and styles. Students are typically kinesthetic learners, requiring teaching strategies which utilize visual, auditory, and physical manipulation teaching methods in order for students to learn complex concepts, theories, and philosophies (DeVry 2003).

Another point that drove the selection of DeVry University as the case setting for this study related to faculty ineffectiveness at DeVry. In many instances at DeVry University, faculty members are hired as full- and part-time instructors and have little or no background in teaching or have little or no prior professional or field-based experience, and it appears that many of DeVry's students are often dissatisfied, as shown through the release of the Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Survey, and in some cases outraged, over the lack of quality teachers in their programs (Hayes 2001). The Fall 2001 survey, which was reported and analyzed in November 2001, highlights discrepancy gaps determined by 1,190 surveyed DeVry/DuPage students. Of the twelve areas surveyed, the area of Instructional Effectiveness was ranked as the second lowest scoring area, only ahead of Financial Aid Service Effectiveness (Hayes 2001). Hayes, who currently serves as a Senior Professor and Chairperson for the DeVry-DuPage Institute Review Team, indicates that based on the survey's results, better planning and more thorough identification of teaching needs on the part of DeVry administrators must be employed to aid in resolving this problem (Hayes 2001).

This problem, although primarily seen at DeVry with instructors in technical fields, has also carried over into general education courses, and although instructors may well display tremendous past work experiences in their respective fields, many students, according to the Noel-Levitz study, have reported that in the past four years instructor quality at DeVry is

lagging. The predominant problem shown by the results of the Noel-Levitz survey clearly presents a call for understanding faculty perceptions of instructional effectiveness.

Another possible problem, which needs to be remedied at DeVry University, is the hiring practices of untrained, inexperienced faculty and the notion that for-profit institutions can hire new recruits and then effectively train them to become accomplished teachers in a one or two day orientation session. Models such as the one or two day orientation sessions, which typically necessitate modest teacher training proficiency, are "regularly relied upon" (Stenberg & Lee, 2002, p. 326) at most institutions. In her 1996 study of curricular requirements for new teachers, Latterell (as cited in Stenberg & Lee, 2002) found:

> the overwhelming majority of teacher-training programs still rely on "what-works" or skill-based methods to prepare new teachers. A "what-works" pedagogy—or what Tori Haring-Smith calls the "basic training approach"—functions primarily to provide new teachers with the skills, policies, syllabi, and assignments they are thought to need to enter the classroom, and to familiarize the TA with the university's or department's requirements. The underlying assumption is that teaching is a skill that can be acquired by the proper training, rather than intellectual work deserving of study (Stenberg & Lee, 2002, pp. 326-327).

In May 2002, DeVry University implemented a training program for new teachers similar to the models referred to by Stenberg and Lee—the New Faculty Orientation Program (NFOP). Although there was some value to this twelve-hour teacher training program, the New Faculty Training Program was simply not enough to prepare new instructors for immediate success in the classroom. This course, developed primarily for newly hired faculty, contained twelve hours of face-to-face contact with veteran DeVry faculty members, where DeVry policies and procedures were reviewed and strategies for successful lesson planning and test formatting and validity were identified. Furthermore, this program included a required classroom observation of all new

faculty members by the veteran coordinating faculty and feedback sessions to relate teaching strengths and weaknesses.

Another teacher preparation program was also recently implemented at DeVry University to address the problem of teacher ineffectiveness. An online induction course, Excellence in Teaching (ETC), was implemented in March 2003 to provide newly hired faculty with a more convenient mode of understanding DeVry University's policies, procedures, and preferred strategies for teaching specified courses. Unfortunately, however, both programs were placed on indefinite hold at most DeVry University campuses as a hiring freeze policy is currently in place.

Although both programs implemented by DeVry University administrators were a step in the right direction for improving teacher effectiveness, the majority of the components of both programs focused too often on institutional policies and procedures rather than emphasizing more appropriate pedagogical methods and strategies for the new faculty. According to veteran faculty coordinating the programs, as well the newly hired faculty participating in the programs, both the New Faculty Orientation Program and the Excellence in Teaching Course proved to be ineffectual shortcuts created by well intentioned administrators.

A new initiative, TEC Plus (Teaching Excellence Class Plus) is currently under development at DeVry University. This course is designed to aid faculty in preparing the online components of their courses, and if the hiring freeze concludes, this course will also support faculty pedagogical strategies.

Due to the unique qualities, diverse faculty and student population, and its particular issues and problems, DeVry University, and the Chicago campus specifically, was selected as the setting for my narrative case study because the setting for a case study is "an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context, especially when the

boundaries between the phenomenon and context are not clearly evident....you would use the case study method because you deliberately wanted to cover contextual conditions—believing that they might be highly pertinent to your phenomenon of study" (Yin, 1994, p. 13). Using DeVry University as the setting for my interviews and observations provided a rich, meaningful context in order to better understand the nature, conditions, and processes of the phenomenon of faculty preparation and practice at DeVry University and beyond. Furthermore, this setting was worthwhile, because as suggested throughout the Literature Review in Chapter Two, not enough research has been conducted, nor enough empirical data collected and analyzed, to fully understand the growing landscape of for-profit higher education institutions. Additionally, more research must be conducted to fully understand the teaching practices and preparation at for-profit institutions of higher education.

Participants and Sampling Design

The primary sample for this a case study included seven DeVry University faculty members from the Chicago campus. This sample included DeVry University instructors at the Chicago campus, based on selected criteria and significant issues related to for-profit institutions. One purposeful sampling strategy, criterion sampling, was an effective method used because the researcher selects cases that meet some criterion and thus creates fullness to the selected sample (Patton, 2002).

The sampling design chosen for my study was a criterion sample, one of several purposeful sampling strategies. Purposeful sampling was used because "based on the assumption that the investigator wants to discover, understand, and gain insight and therefore must select a sample from which the most can be learned" (Merriam, 2001, p. 61). In order to assemble the

seven participants, all DeVry University instructors at the Chicago campus were invited to participate in the study. This campus was selected based on three key issues: a varied background and differently prepared faculty, a diverse student population with specific learning needs, and a proximity to DeVry/DuPage, the campus at which I teach.

All faculty members from the Chicago campus were given the opportunity to become participants in the study. Emails were sent to each faculty member at DeVry/Chicago, inviting them to participate in the study. From the twelve faculty who responded to the email and acknowledged interest in participating in the study, seven participants were selected to actually participate. In order to garner the most diverse experiences, the sample was varied based upon disciplinary backgrounds, years of teaching experience at for-profit institutions of higher education, additional professional experience, other employment status, race, and gender.

In addition, the ideal sample composition included a balanced mix of: 1) Full-time, technically-based faculty; 2) Full-time, general education faculty; 3) Part-time, technically-based faculty; and 4) Part-time, general education faculty. Upon selection for the study, the seven participants were then categorized in two groups based upon their years of service at DeVry University: Senior faculty participants and Junior faculty participants. This process of maximum variation sampling (Lincoln and Guba, 1985) allowed me, as the researcher, to discover dimensional range or variation of a concept and the relationship among concepts (Strauss and Corbin 1998). The maximum variation strategy promotes trustworthiness in the study because the method purposefully seeks "variation or diversity in sample selection to allow for a greater range of application of the findings by consumers of the research" (Merriam, 2002, p. 31).

Trustworthiness

The primary form of data collection used for this study were semistructured, one-on-one interviews with the selected seven participants. Multiple interviews were the principle measure for my study as they have a significant intent of developing understanding. Additional data forms besides interviewing, such as "participant observation, researcher reflection or journaling, participant journaling, and focus groups, may be used to help develop the theory" (Creswell, 1997, p. 122). Five classroom observations and several informal conversations via telephone and email with participants were used as additional data sources, as data emerged. Finally, the use of written documents such as course syllabi and curriculum vitaes, supplied by the participants, were employed to gain further understanding of the case. A useful strategy for promoting trustworthiness was triangulation, which uses "multiple investigators, sources of data, or data collection methods to confirm emergent findings" (Merriam, 2002, p. 31).

Regardless of the type of research, trustworthiness and credibility were concerns and were acknowledged by the researcher during all phases of data collection and data analysis. Using participants' language and actual wording of their narrative, as well as incorporating member checks, were ways to lend credibility to the study. Although this type of research is intersubjective and co-constructional, the underlying notion in the case of qualitative research remains—"understanding is the primary rationale for the investigation" (Merriam, 2001, p. 200).

Data Collection

Semistructured, in-depth, one-on-one interviews were the chief form for collecting data in my study, and several steps in this procedure were administered.

First, interviewees were identified using purposeful sampling as indicated previously. Next, as discussed, the type of interview (semistructured, one-on-one interview) were employed as this format was the most pragmatic and allowed me to gather the most useful information to help answer the research questions I posed.

Three rounds of interviews were conducted with each of the seven selected participants, using the study's research questions to frame the interviews. In the first interview, questions related to the participant's background, including their childhood experiences and how their education may have affected their current position, further educational experiences, employment experiences, and life experiences. In the second interview, more focused attention was based on the participant's experience at DeVry University including their approaches to and philosophies of teaching and learning, understanding their roles as faculty, how they may have constructed their identity as faculty, and their process of development as a teacher. The third interview, often less formal than the first two interviews, was utilized for follow-up or clarifying questions for five of the seven participants, once the first two interviews had been conducted and analyzed.

Once the participants were selected and prior to the each interview, a location for conducting the interview was determined in consultation with the participant. Typically, this was a quiet location, such as the participant's office or a conference room, which lent itself to audiotaping. Upon arrival at the interview site for the first interview, I obtained a signed consent form from the interviewee to participate in the study. In fact, as the participant agreed to be interviewed, I took careful measures to follow Yow's recommendations: "the practitioner of oral history has an obligation to tell the narrator honestly what the goals of the project are, the stages of the research as the researcher expects them to unfold, and the uses to which the taped information will be put" (Yow, 1994, pp. 89-90).

Then, I had the interviewee complete the Human Subjects consent form and then discussed the purpose of the study and the amount of time needed for the interview with the participant. Additionally, I shared the plans for using the interviewee's results and for providing transcripts of the interview to participants. Providing participants with transcripts after the first two interviews allowed me to create "member checks," a significant form of trustworthiness, which aided in understanding and comprehending the participants' words in their original context. Finally, once the entire dissertation is complete, I will offer the interviewee a copy of the study.

Prior to the interview process, I created the interview protocol for each of the three phases of the interviewing cycle. During the interview process, I used practical recording procedures, including a microphone for me, as the interviewer, and for the interviewee. I preferred this method, as it produced the most effective results in the interview recording process. In addition, I did not take written notes during the interview; however, field notes were taken before and after each interview, and these were reviewed after the interview was completed. Classroom observation notations were also taken.

During the interview, I used the interview protocol as a guide but allowed participants to tell their stories and pursue the meanings, topics, and questions that were significant to them. This process lendt itself to being "interviewee-led," allowing for greater flexibility within the interview process and increasing authenticity (Creswell 1997).

Perhaps the most significant component of the interview process was to be fully engaged as the researcher during the interviews. Because qualitative research is "personal rather than detached engagement in context, it requires multiple, simultaneous actions and reactions from the human being who is the research instrument" (Meloy, 2002, p. 145). Additionally,

throughout the interview process, I employed myself as the researcher to be the instrument of inquiry philosophy. Through the use of constant memoing, I was able to track emerging themes, concepts, and theories. The use of my voice and my experience to understand the participants' narrative and their experience further aided the process of inquiry.

This philosophy was stressed because "at the heart of the inquiry is the researcher's capacity for encountering, listening, understanding, and thus 'experiencing' the phenomenon under investigation. Rather than assuming the traditional stance of a detached and neutral observer, an interpretive inquirer, much like a tuning fork, resonates with exquisite sensitivity to the subtle variations of encountered experiences" (Piantanida & Garman, 1999, pp. 140-141). Throughout each interview I conducted, I kept this philosophy at the forefront of my mind.

Data Analysis

The data analysis for my narrative case study utilized the methodology of constant comparative analysis in order to code data. Prior to completing the constant comparative analysis process however, data was managed by creating and organizing files for the data. Furthermore, interviews were transcribed over a four month period; in order to ensure trustworthiness and to gain as thorough an understanding of the narrative as possible, I transcribed four of the seven interviews myself. Other individuals transcribed the remaining three interviews for me, and then later, I read the transcriptions as the audiotape played.

Once the transcribing of information from audiotape to written form was complete, I read through the text of each interview and began to make margin notations, which served as the initial step in the data analysis process. Since narrative analysis combines a focus on a participant's actual story with some form of analysis of the social character of that story and that

story is being told to an audience (the interviewer), the narration became interactional (Riessman, 1993). Additionally, since narratives frame a story and typically have a beginning, middle, end and a point—an answer to the question "so what?"—I looked across narratives to examine and analyze emerging themes or concepts through the use of participants' language and word patterns. The form and content of a participant's story must be socially recognizable if it is to be meaningful (Riessman, 1993).

From this point then, the constant comparative analysis process began. Coding "starts the chain of theory development. Codes that account for data take form together as nascent theory that, in turn, explains these data and directs further gathering" (Charmaz, 2002, p. 515).

Newer procedures, which actually go beyond the constant comparative methods, have also been introduced. New procedures including dimensionalizing, axial coding, and the conditional matrix (Strauss & Corbin, 1990) were utilized in the process to gain a better understand between the Senior and Junior faculty participants. The conditional matrix was used to further "propose techniques for reassembling data in new ways through axial coding" (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 516).

In the first level of coding, called open coding, the data set of words were examined thoroughly and "meaning units" were created to represent categories. These categories were then subcategorized, or dimensionalized, into smaller, more decipherable properties or categories representing multiple perspectives (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). This process then reduced the database to a smaller set of categories.

Once a beginning set of categories were established, I identified a single category as the central theme of interest and began examining the interrelationship of the categories; this process was the second level of coding, called axial coding. Axial coding includes conditions that

influence the central themes that have emerged from open coding and address the main phenomenon (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Another way to approach axial coding was "thinking about data—theorizing—as a step toward developing a theory that explains some aspect of educational practice and allows a researcher to draw inferences about future activity" (Merriam, 2001, p. 188). Additionally, the context of the interview shaped the process and the strategies to develop the axial coding categories. Through this process, a coding paradigm or theoretical model, which visually illustrated the interrelationship of the axial coding categories of information, was created. Essentially, axial coding was "aimed at making connections between category and its subcategories. These include conditions that give rise to the category, its context, the social interactions through which it is handled, and its consequences" (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 516).

Once axial coding was completed in the data analysis process, the third and final level of coding, called selective coding, was utilized to create a story, narrative, theme, or summarization based on the central phenomenon. In this process, the story is developed and interpreted by developing a conditional matrix. The conditional matrix is "an analytic diagram that maps the range of conditions and consequences related to the phenomenon or category" (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 516). Researchers " create matrices to sensitize themselves to the range of conditions conceivably affecting the phenomena of interest and to the range of hypothetical consequences. Such matrices can sharpen researchers' explanations of and predictions about the studied phenomena" (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 516). The final stage of the constant comparative analysis process was to create and present a visual model or theory.

Another process that was essential to constant comparative analysis was memo writing. Memo writing is "the intermediate step between coding and the first draft of the completed

analysis. This step helps to spark our thinking and encourages us to look at our data and codes in new ways. It can help us to define leads for collecting data—both for further initial coding and later theoretical sampling" (Charmaz, 2002, p. 517). Furthermore, through memo writing, "we elaborate processes, assumptions, and actions that are subsumed under our codes; we expand upon the processes they identify or suggest. Thus, our codes take on substance as well as structure for sorting data" (Charmaz, 2002, p. 517). Between three to five memos were used for each of the first two interviews to provide for clarity and increased understanding of participants' language and context.

Chapter Four

Assimilation and Learning to Teach at a For-Profit Institution of Higher Education

DeVry University/Chicago Campus

> "The idea of not being here...not coming to work everyday, not teaching... that doesn't sound like anything I ever want to do...I've always liked it here, and while there have been challenges, especially with some of the changes that have been going on lately with the new stuff... on the whole I still love DeVry and am thankful that I've had the opportunity, especially after being out of education for so long... Now that I've gotten back into it, I never want to be out of it again... I can't think of anything more important to do."
>
> --Mark, DeVry/Chicago

The participants in this study were raised in various regions of the United States and Europe. One would assume that because of their diverse backgrounds, there would be more differences among them than similarities. On the contrary, more similarities exist among them. Although the participants in the study were brought up in various regions of the world and grew up in different family environments, each with its own value system, certain commonalities emerged in regard to how they view teaching at and their understanding of institutional structures, policies, and culture of a for-profit institution of higher education—the Chicago campus of DeVry University, the setting for this narrative case study.

The purpose and general nature of this study is to examine how participants, seven faculty members at DeVry/Chicago, perceive the institution, culture, and mission where they teach and how they view DeVry learners and their specific needs. This study examines how participants perceive how they were influenced to become teachers and how their career

trajectory lead them into the field of education Participants reflected on teaching as well, including their perceptions of how they learned to teach, how they view effective teaching, and how these effective teaching ideas translate into their educational philosophy.

Introduction to the Setting: DeVry University/Chicago campus

The setting for the narrative case study is the Chicago campus of DeVry University, which is located at 3300 North Campbell Avenue in the northwest section of Chicago, Illinois. This campus was selected due to the varied backgrounds of the faculty, diverse student population and their learning needs, and proximity to the DuPage campus of DeVry University, which is the campus where I have taught for the past fourteen years.

The Chicago campus of DeVry University opened in 1931 as DeForest Training School, and the school became known as DeVry Technical Institute in the 1950s. In 1968, the name was changed to DeVry Institute of Technology, and in 2002, the name was again changed to DeVry University. The current facility of DeVry/Chicago is located on Chicago's northwest side and was opened in 1972 (DeVry/Chicago Academic Catalog, 2004).

DeVry/Chicago currently employs 77 full-time faculty members and more than 120 adjunct faculty in the fields of Business Administration, Computer Information Systems, Electronics and Computer Technology, Electronics Engineering Technology, Informational Technology, Network and Communications Management, Network Systems Administration, and Technical Management. Full-time faculty are required to teach 44-47 credit hours per academic year; faculty teaching more than 47 credit hours are granted adjunct overtime pay. Adjunct faculty are allowed to teach up to 15 credit hours per academic year (DeVry/Chicago Academic Catalog).

The Chicago campus of DeVry University was, again, selected as the setting for the narrative case study due to the unique qualities, diverse faculty, and distinct student population. This setting was also selected because gaps in the literature exist relating to how for-profit faculty learn to teach as well as how faculty can begin to meet the significant factors regarding the DeVry students' experiences and needs; therefore, it is vital to determine how instructors at DeVry can most effectively meet their students' needs.

Another significant basis for selecting the Chicago campus of DeVry University for this study is due to the lack of literature relating to the culture and climate of the institution. Tierney (1990) indicates that culture and climate of institutions of higher education are difficult to comprehend as neither has an accurate definition or measurement. Although this may be correct, Tierney believes that "because variables are difficult to define does not mean that we should ignore them. Indeed, the opposite has taken place with regard to the study of culture and climate in the organizational world in general, and in academe in particular" (p. 1). As Tierney points out, the key principle is to better understand how climate and culture influence the decision-making process and the objectives of the institution.

In a broader perspective, this campus was selected because little research has been conducted on the culture and the preparation of faculty at for-profit institutions of higher education. Tierney (1991) maintains that unique settings, which often are organizations, or in this instance, an academic institution higher education like DeVry University, can create an attitude of "being on the border, marginalized, ever removed from constancy and acceptance" (p. 3). Tierney raises questions of how cultural borders of higher education institutions have been shaped and formed and argues that "most previous research about postsecondary education has overlooked or suppressed border areas and consequently marginalized different constituencies"

(p. 3). Participants in this study communicated feelings of being different or unique from other institutions of higher education in a variety of traditions, and at times, have even intimated defensive attitudes toward these notions. Implications stemming from the results of this study affects both for-profit and traditional institutions of higher education. Based on the finding of this study, there are broader implications for faculty within higher education as well as educators in general; institutions have to examine how faculty is prepared, how faculty learns to teach, and how faculty can meet the ever-changing needs of their student population. Additionally, administrators may need to re-examine current policies and procedures relating to faculty professional development.

Furthermore, since the site selection, the Chicago campus of DeVry University is representative of similar for-profit institutions, and the DeVry University system specifically, this setting was deemed appropriate and worthy of study.

Using this setting for this study has provided meaningful, rich context and understanding of the nature, conditions, and processes of faculty preparation and practice at the Chicago campus of DeVry University.

Introduction to the Participants of the Study

The primary sample for this study included seven DeVry University faculty members from the Chicago campus. Faculty members were selected after departmental lists from the Chicago campus were used to identify potential participants based on gender, race, academic disciplines, full- or part-time teaching status, and years of service or seniority at DeVry.

The seven participants who were interviewed for the study have been categorized based on findings relative to their rank, or seniority level, at DeVry. The first four participants are considered senior faculty, based primarily on their years of service at DeVry/Chicago as faculty or as a DeVry/Chicago employee. The senior faculty in this narrative case study has been identified as those participants who have served at DeVry, in any capacity, for fifteen or more years. These pseudonyms for these participants are Virginia, Scott, Peter, and Mark. The remaining three participants are considered junior faculty, those who have served at DeVry in any capacity for less than fifteen years, and employ the pseudonyms of Sue, Janet, and Deana. Participants' pseudonyms were selected by each participant.

It is important to note that, unlike traditional institutions of higher education where the tenure system dictates status, DeVry University, which has no tenure system, identifies faculty seniority status based on the number of years of service at the institution. Additionally, participants have been grouped in these two categories due to significant findings in the study; specifically, these groupings represent generational findings. The theme of transmittal of culture emerged throughout the study, and participants, therefore, have been grouped together based primarily on a developed history, which has been shaped by their experiences at DeVry University. More specifically, the senior faculty participants have developed a status or position of knowledge and wisdom, providing junior faculty participants with information relating to the evolution of the DeVry University culture over time.

Senior Faculty Participants

The four participants who comprise the senior faculty category have been in service at DeVry University—in a variety of capacities—for more than fifteen years. The senior faculty

participants include three white males and one white female. Their ages range from early 50s to mid-60s, and their years of service vary from sixteen years to thirty-nine years. Two of the males teach in the electronics department, and the other male and female teach in the general education department. The following is a brief summarization of each senior faculty participant.

Senior Faculty Participants

Virginia

Virginia, a white female in her early 60s, is the first senior faculty member in the study. She was born and raised in a mid-sized city in central Illinois and is the daughter of Greek parents. Virginia attended public schools throughout her educational career. She graduated from Illinois State University in 1961 with a degree with majors in mathematics and Spanish and minors in English, history, and psychology. Being the only participant in the study who went to college to become a teacher, she is the only participant in this study to have earned teacher's certification as an undergraduate student. Virginia eventually earned her master's degree in education at National Louis University in Illinois and has most recently been pursuing a doctoral degree in education as well.

Virginia spent several years teaching a variety of subjects to students in public junior high schools in northern Illinois before beginning her teaching career at the Chicago campus of DeVry University. In 1966, she was hired as an adjunct instructor at DeVry and was hired as a full-time instructor in 1972, teaching courses in the General Education department. With nearly thirty-five years of teaching experience at the Chicago campus, Virginia is the senior-most faculty member interviewed for this study.

Scott

Scott, a white male in his early 50s, has the next highest level of seniority of the participants in this study. Growing up on a farm in Iowa, Scott attended public schools, where, as he explains throughout the interviews, was seen as a "loser" and traditional "under-performer" by faculty and administration. Coming from a family where education was not viewed as a priority, Scott, nevertheless, performed well throughout high school, and with his passion for mathematics and electronics, went on to become a college graduate in 1969 at a private institution of higher education—the Chicago campus of DeVry University.

As a student at DeVry, Scott learned the value of education and began his professional career at DeVry, first serving as an assistant in the electronics lab, then providing instruction in the DeVry Home Schooling system, and finally becoming a full-time faculty member in the Electronic Technician program in 1973.

Additionally, Scott earned a master's degree in education and teacher's certification from Loyola University in Chicago. He currently teaches in the Electronics and Computer Technology program of study at DeVry.

Peter

The third highest-ranking participant in the study is Peter, a white male in his early 50s. As a child growing up in the western suburbs of Chicago, Peter's parents, like Scott's parents, did not place a priority on education. As a child, Peter recalls being a "miserable student" and a "traditional underachiever" doing "just barely enough to get by." He attended public schools throughout his academic career, and although he had a passion for electronics, even as early as a toddler, he did not go on to college.

After graduating from high school, Peter took a job as a bench technician and electronics store manager. Working in the field of electronics solidified Peter's desire to learn more, and through this experience, he realized he truly wanted to study electronics in a formal school setting and to become an engineer. After working for a few years, education, to Peter, began to take on "a new meaning." He enrolled in a community college in the western suburbs and began studying electronics. He eventually transferred to Southern Illinois University, where he graduated with an engineering degree in 1978.

Peter immediately took a position at Motorola in the northwest suburbs of Chicago and worked there as a design engineer for two years, prior to being hired as a full-time faculty member in what is now the Electronics and Computer Technology department at DeVry/Chicago in1980. Peter has currently taught at DeVry/Chicago for nearly 25 years.

Mark

The final senior faculty member is Mark, a white male in his early 50s. He was born in Pennsylvania, but at the age of seven, his family moved to Kentucky. He is from a German-Irish background and is the oldest of five children. Mark's parents stressed the value of education as he was growing up, and he attended parochial schools throughout his academic years. Each of Mark's siblings, with the exception of his only sister, were expected to attend college; therefore, after graduating from high school, he enrolled in a Catholic men's college, Bellemon College in Kentucky, majoring in English and hoping to become a journalist.

After earning his undergraduate degree in 1966, Mark enrolled in graduate school at Western Illinois University, serving as graduate teaching assistant and working in a tutoring center. Although he still had aspirations to become a writer, this marked his first experience as a teacher. Upon graduating with a master's degree, Mark immediately began working on a Ph.D.

in English at Bowling Green University in Ohio. There, he studied to become a writer and taught undergraduate courses in English as a teaching fellow. After completing all of his doctoral courses, Mark left the university and began working for Chrysler.

From that point, Mark held other jobs outside of his degreed areas, including selling vacuum cleaners door-to-door and working as a manager at an automotive transmission repair shop in Toledo, Ohio. After being fired, he and his family moved to Chicago, where he took a position as an Admissions Representative at the Chicago campus of DeVry University in 1989.

Mark was hired as an adjunct English instructor in 1992 and left the Admission Office in 1998. Since leaving Admissions, he has served the Chicago campus in a variety of administrative roles, moving from dean position to dean position. He currently is the Dean of Evening and Weekend Studies at the Chicago campus of DeVry University and continues to teach English as an adjunct instructor.

Junior Faculty Participants

The remaining three participants have been categorized as junior faculty, based on their years of employment as teachers or in administrative positions at the Chicago campus of DeVry University. The three junior faculty participants are all female. Two are black women, and another is a white woman. The junior faculty participants have been in service between five and twelve years, and they vary in age from the late-30s to the late 40s. Two of these women teach in the Computer Information Systems program at DeVry, and the other teaches in the General Education department.

Junior Faculty Participants

Sue

Sue, a white female in her late-30s, was born and raised in central Michigan. Since her father and her grandmother were teachers, education was considered a high priority in her family. She attended public schools as a child, and after graduating from high school, she enrolled in Elmhurst College in the western suburbs of Chicago, majoring in communications and advertising. There, she was involved in many extracurricular activities, including performing in the school's theater and in dance troupes and working at the school's radio station as a disc jockey and station manager.

After completing her undergraduate degree, Sue worked in advertising before eventually moving back to Michigan and enrolling in Michigan State University for graduate school. Upon earning her master's degree in communications, Sue felt as if she was at a crossroads; in her interview, she stated "I always wanted to work at schools, but I never wanted to teach." Therefore, she moved back to the Chicago area and took a position at National-Louis University in 1990, working in the continuing education/graduate extension department. Here, Sue gained valuable experience in higher education as an administrator, and after working at this position for a few years, she was also given the opportunity to teach communications and speech classes as an adjunct instructor.

In 1998, Sue was hired as an administrator at the DuPage campus of DeVry University, and after working there for only nine months, she transferred to the Chicago campus as the Assistant Dean of Evening and Weekend Studies. Serving as a dean, Sue also taught courses as

an adjunct instructor at DeVry in the General Education department, as well as at a different private university in Chicago. Through these experiences, she began to realize that teaching had become her passion, and in 2000, she was hired as a full-time faculty member at DeVry/Chicago, teaching communications and speech.

Janet

The second junior faculty member, who participated in this study, is Janet, a black female in her late 30s. Growing up in London, England, Janet is the only participant in the study to have been born outside of the United States. Born to parents of Nigerian descent, who each were educated up to the master's degree level, education was highly encouraged, and even expected, in her family. Janet attended private schools, in London, as a child, and after graduating from high school, she moved to the United States and enrolled in Pratt University, studying data information systems.

Upon graduating with a bachelor's degree, Janet immediately began working toward her master's degree in computer science at City University in New York City. While working on her master's degree, Janet also served as a teacher's assistant at a college in New Jersey; this was her first experience in teaching.

After completing graduate school, Janet had many experiences living and working abroad, including working as a data analyst in a bank in Nigeria, working in the Canadian Embassy, and working with UNICEF in Africa. Janet and her family moved back to Canada in 1992, where she was hired as a full-time faculty member at the Toronto campus of DeVry University, teaching in the Computer Information Systems program. In 1997, she and her family moved to Chicago, where she has spent the past eight years as a full-time instructor of Computer Information Systems at the Chicago campus of DeVry University.

Deana

Deana, a black woman in her late 40s, is the final participant in the study. Growing up on the south side of Chicago, the daughter of an African-American single mother, Deana was expected to go to college and to "do great things." She attended public schools throughout her childhood, and upon graduating high school in 1973, she enrolled in Illinois State University, majoring in political science with aspirations of becoming a lawyer.

Upon graduating with her bachelor's degree in 1977, Deana moved back to her native Chicago and began working a variety of jobs. After a few years, she decided to enroll in a paralegal program at Roosevelt University in Chicago; later, she began taking courses in computer science and eventually earned her second bachelor's degree in 1984.

Beginning in 1984, Deana worked for several years in various corporations, primarily as a computer programmer. While working as a programmer, she studied information systems on a part-time basis at DePaul University in Chicago, earning her master's degree in 1994. Working as a computer programmer and as a computer consultant for the next few years, Deana also experienced teaching for the first time. Her first teaching experience was at Olive Harvey College on Chicago's southwest side, where she taught as an adjunct instructor. Then, she began teaching as an adjunct at DePaul University, where she had earned her master's degree. Additionally, she began teaching at the Chicago campus of DeVry University as an adjunct instructor in the Computer Information Systems program in 2000, and in March of 2001, Deana was hired as a full-time CIS faculty member at DeVry/Chicago.

These seven participants have provided a diverse sampling of faculty at the Chicago campus of DeVry University. Through the interview and data collection process, the participants

each provided narratives, which portray the varied background and preparation of the faculty that is seen at DeVry/Chicago. Their stories are unique, diverse, intriguing, and often, inspirational.

Findings

The findings of this narrative case study include three prominent themes: 1) Who are we?: The institution, its mission, and its students, their learning needs, and their differences within differences; 2) Life stories: Decisions to teach, parental expectations, and career trajectories; and 3) Reflections on teaching: Teacher education, perceptions of effective and ineffective teaching, and how methods translate into philosophy.

In the first section of Chapter Four, participants shared similarities of how they view and interpret their institution and its mission. Participants also identify the diverse nature of the student population at DeVry/Chicago, students' specific learning needs, and which approaches and teaching methods work best to connect with the students at their campus. More specifically, DeVry faculty see their students as desperate and struggling individuals, who lack outside support systems which could aid in their academic and personal success. Additionally, faculty view their students as being culturally diverse, exhibiting a variety of modes which indicate how they socialize, behave, and make meaning of their environment. DeVry faculty also perceive their students to be academically unprepared when they enter the classroom; however, faculty indicate their students approach education with high motivation levels and are willing to commit to learning as they realize education is the key to their future success.

Furthermore, themes have emerged which demonstrate how the participants' stories have shaped their lives. Parental expectations and career trajectories form the participants' life stories

in the second section of Chapter Four. The participants discussed perceptions of how parental expectations influenced them to enter the field of education and later to become teachers. Participants also convey perceptions of how their career trajectories, or career paths, which have lead them to become faculty at DeVry/Chicago. Participants highlight their educational experiences and how these experiences shaped their lives as teachers, and how field-based experiences, including administrative experiences within higher education, shaped how they view the DeVry University organization and its philosophies and policies today. Other participants held field-based positions completely outside the realm of education. These positions include working in the electronics or computer fields; one participant sold vacuum cleaners door-to-door. Participants also expressed their notions of how they became DeVry faculty; some participants expected to enter the field, while others did so unexpectedly, as they "fell into teaching."

Within the third section of Chapter Four, participants reflect on teaching and their "teacher education." Participants perceive their "teacher education" to have transpired through one of two approaches: a formal approach or an informal approach. Participants, who learned to teach through a formal approach, enrolled in and attended college to learn to become a teacher and then earned teacher certification; participants, who learned to teach through an informal approach, described significant experiences related to teaching others, including other students they may have tutored in college study groups. These participants perceived these experiences to be influential in their development as future teachers, and these experiences often served as their initial teacher training.

Participants' reflections on teaching also reveal their perceptions of effective and ineffective attributes of teachers and their methods and modes of delivery. Participants also

reflect upon how these attributes translate into the educational philosophies they have adopted with their teaching at DeVry/Chicago.

Who are We?: DeVry/Chicago Faculty Perceptions of their Institution, its Mission, and their Students

One of the key differences between traditional universities and for-profit institutions of higher education such as DeVry University is the consideration of what constitutes quality in education. At most research universities, for example, faculty are not only expected to teach in their specific content areas, but they are also expected to conduct and produce high quality research in their respective fields. To administrators in the more traditional, nonprofit university, having faculty who are engaged in research, as well as faculty who provide effective learning experiences in the classroom, denotes quality (Offerman, 2002).

On the other hand, at for-profit institutions, there is a strong commitment to promoting quality learning experiences, although Offerman also acknowledges that these experiences may be delivered differently than the traditional face-to-face mode. Teaching and learning in this environment are different from the traditional methods, as the crucial experience for faculty will be customer-focused, rather than faculty focused, and are intended to deliver immediate results and long-term benefits (Offerman, 2002).

The landscape of higher education is also assessed, and differences between for-profit institutions, like DeVry University, and traditional universities are examined. At traditional institutions, faculty are responsible for engaging in research in their subject area as well as teaching their subject matter, whereas faculty at for-profit institutions are primarily responsible

for three objectives—providing knowledge to the workforce, retooling people for new careers, and catering to the needs for mental stimulation (Blustain, Goldstein, & Lozier, 1998). The authors also point out that conducting research, then, is not a principal concern for faculty at for-profit institutions (p. 20).

The Institution and Its Mission

Throughout the study, participants at the Chicago campus of DeVry University shared this perception of possessing an attitude of defensiveness regarding faculty who focus on teaching, rather than expend time and energy conducting research. Sue, a junior faculty participant who teaches speech and communications, explains her perception of teaching and not being required to conduct research in her position as a faculty member at DeVry:

> Our job is not researching. We are not research; we are pure instructional. My goal is to hit those course objectives...if it's not in the objectives, I won't teach it. .. I think, we have this expectation that our students have to adapt and to change and adjust to a traditional, we've had a traditional educational system, and they don't because we're not traditional. And we shouldn't be traditional.We should be doing different things than other schools. ... in talking to other faculty has helped; we've been through that. Talking to other people helps; we benefit through talking to other people. Because if you talk to other people, some of these people have been here for twenty plus years, they'll teach you the tricks. They know. Why recreate the wheel? Follow their lead. And you know they got it down, and it's a science. It's not, this is not creative; it's not innovative. It's different. There's no research. It's pure instruction. And once I put my mind on that, then the job goes a lot better.

Sue perceives the process of teaching is different at DeVry University. She understands that DeVry's system of having course terminal objectives, which have been developed and designed by DeVry administration to meet both the institution's and the North Central Accreditation

system's academic expectations, for each course that she teaches, is her main priority because it is an expectation placed on her, as an instructor, by DeVry University's administration. Since conducting research is not a priority for instructors at DeVry, Sue indicates that her key goal is to maintain the standards set by the administration in her classes; in her mind, if a section of information found in her course's textbook is not also an objective, as outlined in the terminal course objectives, then she will not spend the time teaching that particular material. Sue, as a junior faculty member who realizes these expectations, accepts the message mandated by DeVry administration and teaches her courses, as she believes, in the "required" format. To those outside of the DeVry University system, this may seem rigid and inflexible, but to those who have taught in the DeVry system, like Sue, it may seem as though it is a more "scientific approach," where a prescribed curriculum—proven and practical—has been developed for her to follow and regulate.

Furthermore, Sue points out that often times, DeVry's students may also need to adapt to this cultural change. As Sue correlates an unspoken pressure placed on both her and her students to conform to DeVry's culture and its prescribed curriculum, she nevertheless goes about her role and does not question the administration's stance. In turn, Sue's discourse reveals a reactive voice, indicating that her students have "expectations" to change and adapt, when in reality, these pressures may not be at all authenticated.

In her view, she finds the conformity of her students to the conventional culture within higher education to be unnecessary and unacceptable, as she believes that those at DeVry should be doing things differently than other institutions of higher education. Sue values the notion of being different and teaching in a non-traditional format; more traditional universities, in Sue's view, are established in that research equates to creativity and allows faculty to explore new,

innovative ideas in their field of study, whereas DeVry's system "pure instruction"—a tried and true commodity or "science"—in her mind that should not be tampered with. The issue with Sue's discourse in this sense, then, is how have these notions been developed?

Sue's comments indicate a transmittal of culture; she has received suggestions or cues from senior faculty who have taught in the system for many years and have relayed methods for being successful within the DeVry culture. Sue believes that if new instructors discuss DeVry's instructional mentality with senior faculty and utilize their "proven" teaching methodologies, then her role as an instructor becomes easier. In her mind, Sue needs to teach what should be taught, according to the terminal course objectives, and if she does this well, then she is doing her job successfully. The problem here, however, is that due to this transmittal of culture, Sue does not question her own views; she simply takes senior faculty members' assessment of the culture and how to be a successful teacher within the culture at face value. This, then, creates confusion and contradiction for Sue; her role as faculty is not always clear cut, and she continues to struggle to make sense of her role and purpose as faculty at DeVry/Chicago.

Based on her discourse, Sue is uncomfortable and unsatisfied within her role as a teacher in this system; her words indicate an internal conflict based on what she knows about effective teaching and how the culture of DeVry actually shapes how she actually does approach her instruction. This tension, based on the transmittal of culture by senior faculty, therefore, creates a unique paradox for Sue as faculty at DeVry and as an employee for DeVry.

Tierney (1989) notes that "the manner in which faculty come to terms with their own lives and working relationship at an institution affects how the curriculum is conceived, changed, and carried out" (p. 83). Tierney believes if faculty can "unmask the assumptions and practices of daily life," they can then gain a better understanding of the institution's culture and its policies

toward curriculum. This is certainly viewed in Sue's case and can be identified in other participants' discourse as well.

For example, Janet, a junior faculty member who teaches Computer Information Systems at DeVry/Chicago, agrees that the culture of teaching and learning at DeVry University is simply different, not necessarily better or worse, from traditional institutions. Janet has also served as a faculty coordinator in the New Faculty Orientation Program (NFOP) at DeVry/Chicago for the past two years, working with newly hired faculty.

As an NFOP coordinator at the DeVry/DuPage campus, I have also worked with newly hired faculty and have ascertained that it is often more prudent for new faculty to observe and learn from senior faculty in order to better adapt to the culture at DeVry. The New Faculty Orientation Program, which was developed in 2001 by executives at the DeVry, Inc. home office in Oak Brook, Illinois, is designed to allow new faculty to begin to understand the differences and nuances of the DeVry educational system. Coordinators within this program, like Janet, facilitate a new hire's assimilation through detailing the use and necessity of terminal course objectives, policies and procedures, and utilization of higher levels of course preparation. Janet believes, that in order for new faculty to be successful at DeVry, they must adapt to that particular culture. Again, the transmittal of culture, very much as interpreted through Sue's discourse, is detected. Janet explains:

> And I think also what I see from a few faculty members is um I think of faculty members that I've worked with who have failed; I would say that their failure stemmed from the fact that they came in with the notion of what they wanted to do in the classroom and then coming in, DeVry is a totally different culture and then not willing to adjust to that culture. Ok, I'm teaching at this level, it's gotta be at that level. There's no room for compromise here, and that is actually what did them in...the adjunct or evening people I

> sat in on, same type of thing. They came from industry, technical, business, whatever, and they had a real difficult time adjusting to this culture at DeVry. ... DeVry is just an entirely different place to work and to teach at than just about any other place, certainly much more different than a traditional university...we are our own niche; just different....It's just different. I think once we understand that, then we are able to function.

Janet, like Sue, perceives DeVry's culture as being different. Janet believes that DeVry's system is proven and works. After working with newer faculty through DeVry's orientation program, she feels the faculty who fail are those who are unable to change or are unable to adjust their teaching styles to meet DeVry's students' needs and the DeVry culture. Similar to Sue's views, Janet believes in the administration's notions of teaching to the terminal course objectives; in fact, she is adamant, almost protective, of teaching in this particular manner as she believes there is "no room for compromise." In her mind, those who do not understand the culture at DeVry are doomed to fail as instructors.

One of the problems with this thought process is that it, often times, can be unhealthy for faculty. To adhere to an "adapt or die" mentality creates tension and contradiction for faculty; instructors who perceive this culture struggle with feelings of tension and contradiction in how they prepare and deliver their material. Faculty who feel these terminal course objectives have been imposed upon them, with little or no academic freedom, experience conflict between how and why particular subjects and topics should be taught in the classroom. Faculty perceive that employing different ideas or concepts which may stray from the prescribed curriculum may result in failure as an instructor.

Janet feels, however, that once new faculty can begin to understand the culture of teaching and realizing the differences between DeVry and traditional universities, as

demonstrated by senior faculty through this transmittal of culture, then it is more likely they will fit into DeVry's "niche" and will be able "to function."

In a similar vein, Virginia, a senior faculty participant who teaches mathematics, also discusses the culture at DeVry University. She points out that when she first started teaching at DeVry in the late 1960s, DeVry was "not like a structured university or even a college setting; it was a business setting." Then, in the early 1970s, "DeVry was still DeVry...we now became part of Bell and Howell Education Group. Now we had a hierarchy. It became a more professional atmosphere." At first, Virginia notes, "Bell and Howell continued their factory type environment. A lot of people, at the time, took this job not as an education type thing. This was okay because it was business, but our business is education."

Virginia's discourse here, like Sue and Janet's, is unclear and also emotes a sense of confusion and contradiction—an identity crisis of sorts. Virginia's acknowledgment of the ever-changing culture of DeVry leaves her contemplating what exactly is the environment where she teaches and where exactly does she fit in to that environment.

Virginia, who has taught at DeVry/Chicago for more than thirty-five years, has seen DeVry change, however subtle,—again and again and again. When she first began teaching at DeVry, the institution was operated more like a business; now, after teaching for three decades, she understands that what faculty at DeVry do is much more than business. Virginia understands the ambiguity of DeVry's culture and the differences between research universities. She realizes that although DeVry is operated like a business, there is much more going on in the classroom—she is educating, and her students are learning what it takes to be successful in business and in

life. Although Virginia has taught for more than three decades in this culture, she still remains confused and contradicted about her place in the culture.

Even though it has taken Virginia several years to begin to understand her role as a teacher in the different culture of DeVry, she now understands that education should not be conducted in a business sense, but rather with the true mission, as stated in DeVry's Mission Statement, at heart—to foster student learning.

DeVry University has seen its share of changes throughout its 74-year history. What began as an institution designed to prepare students for technical work in the field of electronics continues to stress this mission today—"to teach and foster student learning through high-quality, career-oriented undergraduate and graduate programs in technology, business, and management" (DeVry/Chicago Academic Catalog, 2004).

Summary

Today, the senior and junior faculty participants see DeVry University as an institution of higher education that has two faces; these differences are most notable as generational differences in understanding the culture and mission of DeVry University and its students' needs. For Virginia, who has taught at DeVry for more than thirty years and who has seen DeVry change from technical preparation institution, developed primarily for repairing radios and televisions and which was run like a business, to an institution which fosters student learning for career-oriented learners, her perceptions of her role as faculty is to provide her students with knowledge and understanding of how to be successful in their careers. Virginia's experience at

DeVry, throughout the course of many years, has shaped these perceptions, and she continues to use her experience to provide students with the appropriate lessons necessary for future success.

For junior faculty, like Sue and Janet, who are still attempting to find their way in the DeVry culture by teaching the rigid terminal course objectives as established by DeVry's administration, their understanding of the mission of DeVry is different than Virginia's. Although they perceive using the terminal course objectives as a means to foster student learning, their notion of educating their students is different; they feel as if they may fail, or they may not "fit the mold" of DeVry faculty, if they do not apply DeVry's methodologies and strategies to their teaching. Their experience, just as significant in their minds yet not nearly as sweeping as Virginia's due to their lack of service at DeVry, has shaped these perceptions. Their experiences, as suggested by those who have taught for several years longer than they have, is to "not recreate the wheel" and attempt to fit into DeVry's culture as best as possible. Sue and Janet perceive that there is "no compromise" in this situation and feel they must conform to this culture in order to be successful faculty members.

Virginia, who I view as the historian of the seven participants, understands her role at DeVry better than Sue or Janet. Due to her lengthy tenure at DeVry, she acknowledges the inherited culture that comes with teaching at DeVry and perceives the institution's mission to be more than simply preparing students for a career. Virginia understands that her role is not simply to address and fulfill her obligations according to terminal course objectives; she knows that she must provide her students with the knowledge and confidence of becoming a learner, one who must adapt and learn how to learn. Virginia understands her role as faculty as one who

must create a love of learning for her students, which they then can utilize throughout their lives in many capacities.

The faculty participants who commented on the culture of DeVry University share similar yet different experiences of their roles as faculty. Although they do perceive DeVry to be a nontraditional institution of higher education, which places a premium on instruction and does not include research as a priority for their faculty, the understanding of their roles is different.

For junior faculty, a transmittal of culture has developed; junior faculty take cues and suggestions from senior faculty members, providing strategies and methods for "fitting in" to the DeVry culture and shaping views of how an instructor can become successful in this particular culture.

Senior faculty perceive that teaching their students how to learn is the most critical element; for junior faculty, their perception of becoming a successful faculty member at DeVry is through teaching only the terminal course objectives and fitting into the DeVry culture. The problem communicated here, however, is one of confusion and contradiction based on participants' discourse. An identity crisis has occurred within the DeVry culture for faculty—what exactly is DeVry and how do we fit into the culture itself?

This confusion causes tension and internal conflict for faculty, even for those who have been employed within the system for several years. Faculty discourse, then, becomes reactive and often defensive, as those outside of the DeVry system may question how DeVry faculty conduct their instruction and contest their lack of research.

These faculty perceptions have been shaped by years of service at DeVry, and through a greater understanding of the bigger picture of DeVry University's mission, faculty at DeVry may one day be relieved of this internal struggle.

Differences within Differences: The Student Learner at DeVry/Chicago

> "We could learn a lot from crayons...some are sharp. Some are pretty. Some are dull. Some have weird names. And all are different colors, but they all exist nicely in the same box."
>
> --Virginia, DeVry/Chicago

Participants in this study, both senior and junior faculty, perceived student learners at the Chicago campus of DeVry University to have genuine differences, including diverse economic and social backgrounds, a lack of support systems, and specific learning needs. These differences are quite apparent to the faculty participants, who teach and work with the DeVry/Chicago students on a daily basis.

Experiences and needs of students at non-traditional, for-profit institutions of higher education have been examined. Most of these students, particularly the adult learners who have already entered the workforce, have a desire to study a highly technical field, which see rapid change and growth, so they can remain current in their field and on the cutting edge within their position (Novak, 2001). The learning needs of the non-traditional student, including the need for self-discovery, flexibility in course scheduling through times and place, and manageable resources has also been noted. Constraints within these three basic needs, particularly for the older student, often inhibit the learner from completing a degree or from enrolling in an institution at all (Novak, 2001).

For students who attend for-profit institutions of higher education, their experiences and learning needs are as diverse a population as those who attend most traditional universities. For-profit students range from unemployed 18 year olds who have recently graduated from high school to middle-aged older professionals who desire career advancement. Additionally, students who attend for-profit institutions are often single parents, have dependents other than a spouse, and are financially independent. For-profit institutions tend to attract a higher proportion of women and minority students compared to nonprofit schools. Also, women comprise approximately 53 percent of the for-profit enrollment, whereas in nonprofit institutions, women make up 47 percent of the enrollment. In 1998, the top producers of minority graduates in engineer-related technologies and computer information sciences at the undergraduate level were for-profit institutions (Ruch, 2001).

Additionally, the majority of students, approximately two-thirds, enrolled in for-profit schools are employed at least 35 or more hours per week; nonprofit institutions, on the other hand, show only about one-third of their students work at least 35 or more hours per week. Furthermore, reports from the NCES in 2001 show that nearly half of the undergraduates enrolled in for-profit institutions were classified as low-income, whereas 21-26% of the undergraduates attending nonprofit schools were low-income (Ruch, 2001). Research within higher education corroborates this information.

Participants reflected upon the literature's student profile, and faculty at the Chicago campus of DeVry University noted students' experiences as well as their specific learning needs. Participants in this study perceived their students' experiences and needs to be similar to those found in the literature; furthermore, both senior and junior faculty participants commented on their attitudes toward their students, including perceptions of their students' high level of

commitment and motivation, and their unique learning needs . The following interview excerpts and analysis provide participants' perceptions and insight to the participants' attitudes and motivation in teaching the DeVry learner.

Mark, a senior faculty participant who teaches English at the DeVry/Chicago campus, explains his perceptions of the committed DeVry student:

> They don't have a support system behind them that says yeah, this is something expected. Another thing is that most of our students, none of our students live in dorms. Most live at home. Uh...either their own home because they're the bread winner or whatever...for most of them, it's a struggle because they have other things going on. They have jobs, they have families, they have issues. And the fact that they are here and willing to put themselves through this is uh...a tremendous commitment that they make. And I think...I sense that the...that they are simply more desperate to get the education than the folks I met at the other two schools. And this is a generalization I understand...and not all of our students fit the mold that I just said, but I think the majority do. The other thing is I, have more older students in my class. And...here people are in the night school because they are working all day. And they come to us and they're tired already...and we gotta struggle to keep 'em awake. But, but there's that commitment that they make. Committing their money and their time and their effort and all those other kinds of things. And maybe I just appreciate it more than I used to.

Mark perceives his students' experiences to be one of a "struggle," where his students may not have a support system to fall back on if they need guidance or emotional support or where they may have to work long hours while attending classes to support their families. Mark feels that his students at DeVry demonstrate a great commitment to their education; DeVry students, in Mark's view, are "more desperate" to obtain their education because to the commitment and sacrifices they make. Mark's perceptions of his students' struggles and their experiences create a deeper appreciation for his students in his mind; he acknowledges their struggle, understands it, and appreciates his students' level of commitment and desire to become educated.

Mark also details his thoughts and experiences teaching the students at DeVry/Chicago. He acknowledges their differences, understands the hardships and obstacles they must overcome in order to be successful, and respects their plight.

> You don't even have to like them as individuals, although that helps. You have to like and respect the fact that they're here because they want to get somewhere. That, given the benefit of the doubt, they're serious about it. Some aren't but most are.

Mark perceives his students as being likeable due to their diligence and level of commitment to their education. He respects that his students "want to get somewhere," and he believes his duty is to help his students get to where they want to go. Not only is Mark's students' plight at stake in his eyes, but his role as their instructor is also significant; Mark empathizes with his students and their experience, in part due to his own struggles during his collegiate years, and on account of empathic regard, he values their commitment and desire to striving toward their goals, objectives,

and dreams. Mark perceives his role as faculty to be one where he can aid his students in reaching their objective and places value on his role.

Through his experience working with the DeVry learner in a variety of roles, including serving in positions such as an Admissions Representative where for three rears he recruited students to attend DeVry, as a dean in the Evening and Weekend program, and as faculty teaching English, Mark highlights some of the personal rewards as he observes his students graduate. Although he has served DeVry's students in a variety of capacities throughout his tenure, Mark nevertheless remains empathetic to his students' experiences and his motivation for helping them reach their goals. He explains his perceptions of his students' success, which in turn, he relates as his own personal reward:

> I mentioned a couple of experiences I had at graduation. Watching the guy graduate that I had been his admissions rep about ten years ago. And uh...the valedictorian. Actually, I have been blessed to have ....not as their rep, but there's been one...at least two valedictorians who have taken my class, and probably in the past five years, there have probably been ten valedictorian candidates who have taken my class. Okay. And so uh...I, I think that's kinda neat to have had them and class and to watch them do well...but that, ya know, to see what they can achieve, sometimes after, ya know after you've had them...you could just tell that he had come a long way from when he was in my, my speech class. But...it was so cool because as, you know as he was giving his prepared speech, he uh...he's thanking me. He said and one of the people I want to thank is Mr. Billings. Okay, because he had me his very first semester here. He came here with transfer credits. He said, I want to thank Mr. Billings for showing me what it took to be a DeVry student...Oh, man! That, that just dazzled me!....it's just so neat watching them develop...and all have been good. It's just been an amazingly good round. It really has.

Here, Mark perceives his students successes to be his own success. In the instance above, one of his students has attained the goal of being valedictorian at graduation, and Mark feels that his student's success is his as well, by stating that he has been "blessed" by

having been a part of this student's life. Additionally, Mark feels that it is "neat" to be a part of his students' lives and to "see what they can achieve." The feelings and emotions for his students' success make him feel successful as their instructor. Furthermore, Mark is "dazzled" by the achievement of his past students; this indicates, again, that their success is also his success. Mark is rewarded by his students' success, and, in turn, this motivates him to teach his students well.

Moreover, Mark's position as an English instructor is validated; he perceives success for himself when his students have achieved. Mark is as pleased for his job well done of teaching his students as they are for meeting and exceeding expectations.

Mark also acknowledges the rewarding feelings he has after students graduate from his campus and have moved on to be successful in business and industry. He notes how students often communicate with him after graduation, thanking him for making a difference in their lives:

> But I think later on, that's, actually sometimes I get communications from them later on, uh...thanking me...I had one guy, this is cool. This is two semesters ago, I got an email from a student. It said, Mr. Billings I wanted to tell you that I just passed the uh...exam to become a CPA. And...part of the exam was an essay and he says, I really think that the uh...the confidence that I gained in your class enabled me to do well on that. That is what it's all about! Ya know, very rarely do you hear back from students, but sometimes you do. I had one several years ago that nominated me for uh...ya know, Who's Who Among College Teachers, or something like that. And uh...that was cool. Ya know it's just...what...what's really neat is when you've reached someone to the extent that they know that you have tried to do your best for them. And...they appreciate that effort. And that is probably the biggest reward. When somebody says, boy, thank you for what you did! There is <u>nothing</u> better than that.

Mark, again, interprets his students' success as his own success, as his reward for a job done. He acknowledges that it is "neat when you've reached someone to the extent that

they know that you have tried to do your best for them" and indicates that his students not only value the knowledge he has shared with them through his course but also the caring relationship they have constructed as teacher and student. Again, Mark's validation is the student's success; when the student is successful, Mark perceives that he has completed his duty successfully. The student's success validates the teacher's self-worth, and the gift for both is giving.

Finally, Mark, who is a senior faculty participant and teaches English and speech in the General Education department at DeVry/Chicago discusses his life prior to DeVry working as a door-to-door vacuum cleaner salesman. He highlights his overall experience working with and teaching the DeVry learner and how his experience portrays his perception of success at DeVry/Chicago:

> When I was asking Lowell Hawkins if he had any teaching positions, ...I told my wife that if he had said, yeah, I got one, but it won't pay anything, I would have done it anyway. I would, I would do this for free. I don't want to, but I would. Because it's just, when you, when you have reached them, there is just...the feeling is every bit as good as when you've sold a vacuum cleaner. And you know that you have now helped this family to a cleaner, healthier home.

Like his experience selling vacuum cleaners, Mark perceives his experience at DeVry as being a service. As a door-to-door salesman, he provided a service to his customers. Now, as faculty, he provides his students—his current customers—with another service, an opportunity to attain a higher standard of life. As a salesman, he provided his customers with a product of quality; likewise, as an instructor, he provides his students with a valuable service, and his service provides Mark with a strong sense of satisfaction.

Sue, a junior faculty participant who teaches speech and communications, also acknowledges her enjoyment of working with and teaching the DeVry learner because she realizes and appreciates their uniqueness. Sue comments on her thoughts teaching the DeVry student:

> I like the DeVry student; I really do...I like them for different reasons. You walk into a DeVry classroom and they're, first off, there's great diversity. You saw today, great diversity. Your campus too. We're pretty much the United Nations...and it's diverse racially. It's diverse economically. It's diverse in terms of age. Women are still outnumbered here but there seems to be more women at night here. And so, it's really diverse here.... Here we have students of all different ages and abilities, even some here are intellectually unprepared. Sorry, but it's true, and then there are other students who come to my classroom who came right from high school who are not mature but had good grades. And then there are the students who are neither. They're not mature, they don't really have good grades; they are kind of just cruising through, do the best they can and maybe they'll finish.

Sue sees her students and their experience as one of a diverse nature. She understands that her students have specific needs as well based on their differences in age, gender, race, background, educational ability, attitude, and maturity level. She views her students for who they are, dispelling any notion of stereotypes and resisting blanket categorization of her students. Sue perceives her students to be so diverse that she connotes a metaphor, claiming her campus is "the United Nations."

Furthermore, having worked as an administrator and also having taught at DePaul University in Chicago, Sue has seen firsthand the differences between students at the Chicago campus of DeVry University and students at more traditional universities. She realizes students these students bring experiences to their education that reflect the differences, which are often observed in her classroom.

> Our students haven't been taught necessarily how to behave appropriately...And so it's like they're behaving the way they are, that's what they do. They talk about the fact that their girlfriends have babies and they're picking up other women. They just say, and they don't think about what they say. They say the "N" word and don't think about it. That happened yesterday; it's happened twice. I'm like I don't want to hear that you know.

Again, Sue sees her students as being diverse in many respects, but she also identifies her students as socializing in a unique manner, which reflects their environment. Sue acknowledges that her students bring cultural norms for this group—sexist and racist worldviews—into her classroom as well as vast life experiences, both positive and negative, which affects their learning. Sue understands that her students' life experiences often characterize elements of their diversity—their educational background, their development in their social upbringing, their economic background, and their attitudes toward education.

Students' language is embraced in their home settings and is tied viscerally to their beings. Language is connected to identity and plays a large role in students' perceptions of how they interact with the world, as well as how those around them perceive them. Language is as much an identity to students as is the color of their skin (Delpit, 2002)

Sue feels that these differences are attractive to her because based on these experiences, she has an opportunity to provide an opportunity to help her students find their voice and reflect upon their experiences so they may see the world in a different way.

Sue also provides insight to her perceptions of her students' constraints:

> So that's kind of how I see the difference. These students here are attractive to me because they don't see that they have an opportunity to make decisions about their lives, and their learning environment. They walk in the door and they they're coming from an urban

> environment where a lot of decisions are made for them. They don't get an opportunity to protest things... it's kind of like pathetic, but the students are like, they feel the same way it's kind of like beyond helplessness.

Sue realizes her students are often in a position where they have not been provided many choices in life; they often feel powerless or "hopeless" in their plight as students. She believes she has an opportunity to help them find their voice, to question what they take for granted in life. Sue also notes that although her students may be diverse in several regards, she understands they also share some commonalities within their experiences:

> And I'm not there to –I want them to question what I've taught them, I want them to question what other people tell them, I want them to be prepared and not just question because they want to argue so I think that's how I see them. I do like them. I like conversations with them. They're interesting. No lack of interesting stuff, drive by shooting stories, you know. One student was shoved into a trunk of a car, and I said, "Pete where you been? I missed you," and he showed me the wound on his arm, on his hand the bone stopped the bullet from going into his abdomen, and so that's what they're dealing with. ... I don't think they're' stupid. It's not just street smarts either, they're smart....

Therefore, Sue attests, her students' perceptions of education and their learning needs have to be approached in a manner that fits this student population, while at the same time, responds to their needs. Addressing these issues can pose a challenge to faculty because DeVry/Chicago students require educational stimulation that meets their learning needs in their particular environment, which entails critical pedagogy.

When considering education and culture, it is important for faculty to understand that students are individuals and cannot be made to fit into any preconceived model of how they are "supposed" to behave. Creating "culturally matched" learning conditions for every ethnic group

is unnecessary; however, educators must be able to recognize when there is an issue or problem for a particular student and how to determine its cause and potential solutions. Knowledge of culture is one device that teachers can utilize when solving problems for an institution's trials and tribulations in educating a diverse student population (Delpit, 1995).

Sue explains her perceptions of how DeVry students behave and learn:

> They go about it a nontraditional way. They approach education non-traditionally and they approach it; they buck the system. They don't believe in it because they don't learn that way. And that's why they're here. And a lot of stuff about the proprietary schools, that's why there here, they learn differently. ...that's what our students are and that's how they work best. They're learning differently, they don't want to be sitting down and just having it poured into them. I don't learn in one way. I learn in a variety of ways, and students learn in a variety of ways, too.... I also know that in the home environment sometimes it's not possible to teach them anything; sometimes it's not possible to teach at all because your electricity gets shut off or it's hot or it's cold or it's dark and....I know that maybe they come to the classroom unprepared. I know some of them can't handle the way the text is written or they didn't have time to read it...And I do a lot of different things because they need a lot of different things.

Sue perceives her students and their experiences as one that is a struggle. Her students approach education differently, in Sue's mind, than students she has taught at DePaul University. For example, based on her discourse, Sue's students at DeVry "buck the system," creating a critical relationship between faculty and students. Students, in Sue's view, do not accept the system as prescribed; based on their struggles within their home environment, which may often include precarious, unsafe conditions, they feel untrusting of the system. She feels her students learn differently due their urban and economic environment than other students, and she believes her students, therefore, have different needs; in turn, her philosophy toward teaching her students at DeVry is different than how she approached students when she taught at DePaul University.

Participants also believe that recognizing the lifestyle differences and potential obstacles to learning is the instructor's task, while the responsibility of exerting effort into the learning process in order to get the most from the experience falls directly on to the students. The DeVry/Chicago student, according to Janet, a junior faculty member who teaches Computer Information Systems, is willing and highly motivated to meet her students' expectation, primarily due to the fact they often make tremendous sacrifices to pursue further education. Janet believes her students drive her to help them further; they are empowered and motivated, which, in turn, creates an active—rather than passive—learning environment.

> I would say that a typical DeVry is somebody who really is here to learn. To get as much as they can from you. Um, yes, they may have issues here and there that would deprive them from getting the most out of a physical class, but I think the general attitude is that they want to learn. And I find that the more you give them, the more they want from you. And when I say giving, it's not only giving the instruction, but you're using a lot of examples, you're relating it to real life and you're driving home for them in a manner which they can see and appreciate. By the examples that you use and, you know, they see it, it clicks, it remains with them. And that's how I profile a typical DeVry learner.

Janet perceives her students to constantly wanting more from their instructor. As a teacher, Janet finds herself giving and giving to her students, and she appreciates this because it indicates to her that her students want to learn, that they value her knowledge as an instructor. In turn, Janet feels self-worth because she perceives that she has reached them, has made a connection in their learning; her students appreciate what she gives them.

Deana, another junior faculty participant who also teaches in the Computer Information Systems program, has observed students in for-profit institutions and other institutions including DePaul University and Harvey Olive College. Her perception of the DeVry learner, like Janet's,

is a student who has made considerable sacrifices in his or her personal life in order to gain further education.

> I see a student who actually wants to learn.... They realize that education is a gift. You know, not just something that is given to you. It's something. If you are given the opportunity to get a good education then you know you don't take the same class over five times just because you can.

Deana believes her students are hungry for education and are appreciative when instructors provide effective learning experiences; faculty perceive this as well and are then able to work with their students to facilitate even better learning experiences. She perceives her students feel that education is a gift that must be earned, but she is gratified when her students are successful.

Furthermore, Deana, an African-American women who was raised in Chicago, also comments on the diversity at her campus and emphasizes her experiences teaching the DeVry student:

> One of the things you can say about Devry here in Chicago is that our students are really diverse. We have different types of cultures here. And when I look at it, one of the things, and maybe it's just me, I enjoy all of the students.....one of the things that I do enjoy. I love seeing our young men step up to par. Especially, and I have to truly say, I enjoy seeing a lot of my black young men also who comes in and they are not the typical black male unfortnates you see sometimes. Maybe sittin there with his hat cocked and pants falling ,all of that. I've had some students who have, you know, they have there hair all tied up but then when you get them into applications or get them into programs, they really did excel. And I enjoy seeing that. My women. They're a lot easier...and the different cultures don't bother me. I just have to learn a little more about the different cultures in my classses... It clicks with them. And I love to see them enjoy the classroom... I tell them, I don't want you to feel that you are a captive audience... you know, for this period of time, but I want you to enjoy the experience, not dread it.

Deana's passion for teaching is shown in the above passage; however, her passion for her students' success is based on her perceptions of her students', and particularly her black male students', ability to be responsive to their oppression and their specific needs. She perceives the black males who enter her class as being different from other students; she views black males as dressing differently and behaving differently than other students in the classroom. However, she also displays a sense of loyalty to these students by attempting to dispel stereotypes. She perceives that they may feel oppressed by their experience and by their responsibilities and commitments, but she feels that her task—her responsibility—is to support the plight of young black men.

In teaching black men, Deana employs her authority as a teacher. Black people often view issues of authority and power differently than people from mainstream middle-class backgrounds; many people of color expect authority to be exhibited by personal attributes and earned by personal endeavors. Blacks view the authoritative person as the one who gets to be the teacher because he/she is authoritative; therefore, because authority is earned, the instructor must consistently prove the properties which furnish his/her authority (Delpit, 1995).

Deana also perceives that her students may feel they are a "captive audience," and she does not want them to have this powerless attitude about education; she wants them to embrace education and longs for them become active and empowered within their educational choices. As an African-American woman, she feels an "easier" relationship with women in her class, but she also acknowledges that it is her responsibility to learn how to accommodate students of different cultural and ethnic backgrounds. Deana is willing to go beyond who she is as a teacher for her students; she is responsive and committed to their specific needs, and her energetic and enthusiasm goes a long way in her classroom.

Again, Virginia, a senior faculty participant who teaches mathematics, also identifies some of the experiences of the marginal DeVry student. She understands the DeVry learner to be someone who:

> Is a person who went through high school on the fringe of everything. Who may have been an athlete. May have been a jock. May have been a good student. May have been in the band, but always on the fringe. Always bored. Just not quite in to the "IN" crowd. Um, not enough challenge. Doesn't know what to do with their life because they haven't been challenged. Uh, first generation. Or second generation. Or um, immigrants themselves. Or first language. And it doesn't make any difference whether it's here or Canada or anywhere else. I just think that with DeVry and its three-year program that people push, which people rarely graduate in three years, is out there for students who think, I didn't know what to do but do it fast. And, uh, when you get them in a classroom, 90% of them have had some kind of an experience. Good or bad. Business or otherwise. They may have been dope dealers. They may have been in jail. And I don't care if you're in Addison, Lincoln Park, Seattle or Chicago. Uh, I'm not going to say our students are better than yours or yours are better than ours. If you ask a student in a classroom and I do this every term, how many of you have both of your parents who are college graduates? I may get one in three class. And I tell them, now if I'm still here 20 years from now and I ask your kids they're going to at least be able to say they have one parent who is a college graduate. And they kind of laugh. And they go, oh. And I'm serious. And I say do you see the difference that's occurred. And then when I asked how many have never even gone to high school, and you'd be very surprised. Even though they may be very successful. You know, doing well and everything. So you get this student who's, I don't want to say outcast because that's a negative word. But a person who just hasn't found themselves.

Similar to the other instructors who commented on their students' experiences and needs, Virginia points out another interesting element relating to the DeVry learner as well.

She identifies the DeVry student to be an individual who has always been "on the fringe of everything," as someone who comes from a different background with distinct experiences and specific needs as a learner. Through her discourse, Virginia discusses her perception of a student who may be "on the fringe." She refers to these individuals and how they may have not fit into any single labeled category as a student in previous educational experiences; they felt as though they were perpetual outsiders. Rather than terming her students as outsiders, however, and through her discourse, she resists using labels for her students. In fact, Virginia reconceptualizes the stereotypical labels throughout her comments; through this reconceptualization then, there is hopefulness in Virginia's attitude toward her students' future.

Virginia understands that her students come to DeVry University with numerous life experiences—some good, some bad. She acknowledges that many of her students simply have not yet found out who they are or where they want to go in life. Virginia perceives the DeVry learner to have had these experiences and still is searching for something in life.

Virginia also notes the following regional differences among within DeVry's student population:

> The other thing you find is that you've got a DeVry student who's been to three or four different colleges. Six months here, a year here. I went to Southern. Uh, you know, I went to Mississippi, I missed my family. Now we have a whole other thing here too. We have a Midwestern mentality thing going. We got to watch that too because we are from Illinois. Midwesterners don't do well everywhere else. They just don't do well. Yeah, I want to move out but....

Virginia perceives another example of her students' experiences as one who is, again, searching for the right fit, the right connection to further their education. She notes that

there are additional differences among the differences within the student population at DeVry, including regional dynamics. In Virginia's mind though, DeVry is the place where these students can find what they are looking for.

After working with the DeVry student for more than 35 years, Virginia highlights another significant point relating to the DeVry learner:

> My thing is this—I think that DeVry students are undervalued. Undervalued and underprepared. I think they're underprepared for what we do here...I'm asking them to become educated. And education tells me...I care about what you do in the next class. And I always hear good things from the next class, so that makes me feel good...I love 'em.

Virginia perceives the DeVry student to be likeable. Due to her students' past life experiences, she feels her students are undervalued. She also realizes that, in many cases, they are unprepared to face the challenges and rigors that await; however, she validates their self-worth by indicating that she cares about their success in her class and in future classes as well. Virginia is hopeful of her students' future successes; teaching in the development mathematics department, she is patient with her students and has high expectations for them, even beyond her classroom. Her attitude is toward her students is one of positivity and is future-oriented. Like the other participants, when her students are successful, she feels as if she has successfully accomplished her duty as their teacher. Again, as shown through the discourse of other participants, teaching is Virginia's reward.

Finally, Peter, a senior faculty member who teaches electronics, provides this profile of the DeVry student:

> This varies somewhat with program between day and evening students...30% Hispanic, 30% African-American, the rest are Asian, Middle Eastern, first generation European and a few of us white guys. In the electronics program, they are 90% male.

> Many, if not most, are first generation college students...below average SES.

Peter points out that, although there is some variance among the day and evening student populations, the students in his electronic classrooms, generaly, are racially diverse, but primarily male. He also indicates these students typically score below average on DeVry's admission tests.

However, Peter also acknowledges that the DeVry learner, particularly those he sees in the Electronics and Computer Technology program, enjoy working in the school's labs, using multimedia to complete projects. He notes the students require a hefty amount of feedback and also understand that his students need to have assignments returned quickly with supportive feedback.

Summary

The faculty who participated in this study perceive that the DeVry student has sincere differences based on students' experiences and specific learning needs, which are seen by DeVry's faculty on a daily basis.

DeVry's students, according to faculty, are likeable, diligent, and diverse. Their struggles through life have placed them "on the fringe" in most circumstances, and these experiences often bring about feelings of empathy and hopefulness for future successes from their instructors.

On the other hand, DeVry students' successes are often perceived by faculty as the faculty member's own success. When a student is successful, faculty view this success as having effectively taught; the student's success is validated by the instructor. Conversely, teaching is

the reward for the instructor. Education, therefore, is viewed as a gift—for both the student and teacher.

It is through these perceived differences among DeVry learner which keep DeVry/Chicago faculty members coming back for more—year after year.

Life Stories: Influences which Shaped DeVry/Chicago Faculty's Decisions to Teach

Another theme that emerged in this study were influences which shaped DeVry/ Chicago faculty members's decisions to teach. Influences which shaped decisions to teach are illustrated throughout their experiences as children and into adulthood. This theme is became apparent as the participants described their perceptions of their experiences as to how they were influenced and what shaped them to further educate themselves and how parents, other family members, teachers, coaches, and others have shaped and influenced their thoughts and ideas regarding further education.

Early schooling experiences and participation in extracurricular activities are also evident in how faculty at DeVry/Chicago have been influenced to gain education and have learned to teach. Moreover, positive collegiate experiences have also been identified as factors in determining how they teach.

Additionally, work experiences, including experiences outside the realm of education or in field-based positions in higher education institutions other than DeVry University, have also had a significant impact on how faculty at DeVry/Chicago learned to teach. The identification of

others within education who have served these faculty as mentors and have provided support and instruction are also identified as themes within this section.

According to Finkelstein, Seal, & Schuster (1998), demographic categories have been used to identify and contrast the new faculty cohort and the veteran or senior faculty cohort. These categories include race and ethnicity, nativity, and gender. The authors also note another significant difference in that new faculty are more likely to teach outside the liberal arts compared to veteran faculty. Whereas the veteran faculty held a large portion of liberal arts and humanities positions, the new faculty have shifted away from the liberal arts into more technological and scientific fields. The majority of new faculty have focused on fields of communications, health care, computer science, engineering, and business. These changes in demographics are most evident at for-profit institutions.

Significant changes in the new faculty within higher education have also been noted. As more veteran faculty are nearing retirement, new faculty must work effectively in the changing world of higher education (Austin, 2002). Austin provides a characterization of the workplace that graduates will enter—one that is represented "by student diversity, new technologies, changing societal expectations, a shift in emphasis toward the learner, expanding faculty work loads, and a new labor market for faculty (p. 97). Based on interviews conducted with faculty at DeVry/Chicago, Austin's insights could not be more true.

Another change in American higher education today—certainly one which can be viewed at DeVry/Chicago—is an influx of adjunct faculty (Halfond, 2000). Although only one participant in this study is considered adjunct faculty, for-profit institutions of higher education are becoming more dependent of adjunct faculty to teach specific courses. Halfond believes that

"adjunct faculty ultimately determine the quality and reputation of these programs...success or failure can rest on the ability to attract high caliber part-time faculty" (Halfond, 2000, p. 47).

Based on elements found within the current literature, DeVry/Chicago faculty perceptions of how they were influenced and what shaped them to become teachers are evident primarily through parental influence as well as through other individuals who created both positive and negative learning experiences and their influence. Additionally, work experiences, including those experiences outside education or in positions within higher education institutions other than DeVry University, also have had an important impact on how faculty were influenced and what shaped them to teach.

Parental Expectations: The Background of DeVry/Chicago Faculty

Five of the seven participants interviewed in this study identified their parents as the central individuals who helped shape their perceptions of education and influence their decision to teach.

Mark, who is a senior English faculty member at DeVry/Chicago, notes that, while growing up in Kentucky in the 1960s, his parents played the most influential role in developing his attitude toward education:

> I think they had a real strong influence....my relationship with my parents was I think probably as good as most even better than most, although there were some rough times. There was a time when my father and I came to blows when I was a teenage delinquent...but I always felt that there was plenty of mutual love and respect in the home....my father went to business school after I think he got out of the Army after WWII. And I think he never earned a degree but he got what he needed to progress in his field, which was accounting...but I think his deep appreciation of education even though he didn't have perhaps as much as he wanted

> us to have uh kind of uh was both a good and a bad thing some times..... First of all, he didn't...never understood why any of us would get anything less than a "B" in anything we ever did...So occasionally we were disappointing to him in that regard. We were talking about my education and my father and his attitude towards it...I have three brothers and one sister. The three brothers were all...myself and my three brothers were all expected to go to college... I didn't find out until about six months ago when I was having a conversation with my sister who is now 50. That, that was never part of the expectation for her.

Mark clearly perceives his parental influence on his education is what had the principal impact on future career in education; although there was tension between Mark and his father, he believes there was always respect and mutual love in their relationship.

In his family, Mark contends there was an expectation for him and his brothers to attend college and to earn a degree. Interestingly though, Mark acknowledges that his sister was never expected to attend college; this was due, in part, to the time period and location of Mark's upbringing, as well as Mark's father's belief that a woman's place was in the home.

Growing up in central Illinois in the 1950s, Virginia perceives, like Mark, that her parents had significant influence upon her and her education, especially during her childhood. In Virginia's family, "education was utmost to my parents." Virginia attended public schools throughout her early education, and when it was time for her to go away to college, her father, who owned the family restaurant, had only one rule: "if you don't want to go to college, then you run the restaurant. If you want to go to college, then you go to college. You don't work while you're in college. You don't do anything. You go to college...school is school."

Virginia, through the strong influence of her parents, attended a teacher's college, Illinois State University, and became the first in her family to earn a college degree. Virginia also

describes her parents' influence on her to have shaped her own expectations of encouraging and passing down the value of education to her own daughter to continue her education today.

Similar to Mark and Virginia, Sue, who grew up in the 1970s and is now a junior faculty participant teaching speech and communications, also had clear expectations from her parents and other family members as she had several teachers in her family, including her father and her grandmother. In her first interview, Sue shared an interesting story about how, as a child, she used to write letters to grandmother, and her grandmother would send them back with corrections in red ink. Sue believes education was always a priority in her family, and it was her perception that she, along with her siblings, was expected to go on to college and graduate

Similarly, Deana, who grew up fifteen years earlier than Sue and is now a junior faculty participant who teaches CIS at DeVry/Chicago, felt as though she was always expected to go on to college; this expectation came directly from her mother. Being from a single parent home with only her mother around, Deana recalls that she was the "only one in my family who had an opportunity to go to college...I think I was the one that my mom expected to do great things...I was always the one that she kind of pushed." Being the youngest of four siblings, Deana's mother pushed her toward continuing education. She states:

> I can truly say she pushed me...I think maybe with the first three she might have said with them...do your own thing, go your own way...but I think she pushed me, and I don't think she pushed me because ..she just wanted me to do this, do this, do this...I think at the time that I was growing up the opportunities were coming along more so than when my other siblings grew up. So she saw the opportunities there.

Being the first one to go to college in her family, Deana remembers her mother's attitude toward furthering her education and states "college was not a question at the time...there were many opportunities to go, and it was like 'you're going...just find one.'" Deana recalls herfeelings and her mother's attitude, however, with fondness: "I wanted to go; I wanted to be a lawyer...and that's what she wanted me to be, and that's what I wanted to be because that's what she wanted me to be."

Although Deana perceives her mother's encouragement to attend college as being aggressive, even pushy, she did not regret actually having continued her education. Deana exhibited a sense of pride as she spoke of being the first in her family to graduate from college.

Like the four previous participants, Janet, who grew up in the 1970s and is currently a junior faculty participant also teaching CIS at DeVry/Chicago, had strong parental expectations relating to the value of education from an early age. Unlike the other participants, however, Janet's parents were both educated to the master's degree level, so Janet and her five siblings were raised with expectations to attend college and obtain bachelor's and master's degrees. Janet discusses educational expectations and parental influences:

> My mother. My father encouraged education and my mother instilled it. So, with that, it wasn't a question of you didn't want to go to school, it was," Ok, which school do I go to?". And with both of them having degrees at the Masters level, the expectation...like, set, the expectation was that we would at least get to that level. So, after first degree, you just basically

> went on because that's what everybody before you did. You know, there was no room for you to drop out. .... So that's the kind of background that I come from. I grew up in a very, um, very friendly atmosphere. You know, we talked about, just about everything in the book. We talked about; we were not scared to talk to our parents about anything. And that kind of has influenced me a great deal in life. Hopefully, we'll be passing those on to our children now. Because that's important...I think all of the influence that I got came from my parents.

Like the other participants in the study, Janet was urged from a young age to attend college and earn her degrees; her parents expected her to move forward with her education by placing a premium on the value of education. In her family, Janet's parents empowered their children to value and respect their educational endeavors. In turn, Janet perceives this influence to also have shaped her own expectations of her children's continuing education.

Peter and Scott, unlike the previous five participants in this study, do not share the same perception of the type of influences from their parents or family. Education, as perceived by both Peter and Scott, was not a priority in their homes as they were growing up; therefore, as children, going away to college was the furthest notion in their minds.

Peter, who grew up in the 1960s and whose father was a bank president, was raised in the western suburbs of Chicago by his upper middle-class parents and admits that school was not stressed in his family as he was growing up. He was "what you would call a traditional underachiever."

Although education was a priority in his family, Peter, nonetheless, developed a passion for electronics (the subject he currently teaches as a senior faculty member at DeVry/Chicago) at a very early age. Peter recalls his first toy was a screwdriver—a real screwdriver. When he was two years old, he recalls that he "somehow got behind the couch and took the outlet out of the wall...the only thing I was interested in was electronic—period."

Peter's passion for electronics eventually overcame his family's perceived lack of value for education. Despite the lack of parental encouragement, Peter eventually went on to college and graduated, and currently, he is completing his 25th year of teaching at DeVry University.

Scott, who also is a senior faculty participant teaching electronics, very much like Peter, did not come from a family that valued education. Growing up on a farm in Iowa in the 1960s, Scott perceived that his family was mainly interested in running the farm and "making ends meet." Scott indicated that although a few of his cousins had graduated from college, he "never had the ambition to go to school," and by his junior year in high school he "was pretty much set on living in the community and being a farmer." In his family, Scott believes "it was a pretty much do what you want to do attitude."

By the end of his junior year in high school, Scott felt as though he "had very limited opportunity of going to get an education elsewhere." Labeled as one of the lower level students by teachers and administration in his high school, Scott felt he was unworthy of pursuing higher education:

> I was pretty much tagged as being the losers...they hadn't taken a look to see why you were having the grades you did. And a lot of these kids were from the farm. And you know, the school did not understand the farm community, even though they were at the center of the farm community in Iowa.

At the point when Scott felt he was "pretty much on the backburner" of education, DeVry University, at that point known as DeVry Institute of Technology, came to his high school, and Scott signed up for the electronics program. He recalls the day: "when I signed up for the DeVry program, I had the intent. But of course, with DeVry when you show the intent, they send a sales rep. So we got that out and we were talking around the table, and the opportunity

was available to me...and when I got to DeVry/Chicago, that's where I went to [post-secondary] school" for the first time in his life.

Despite the lack of parental encouragement, Scott graduated from DeVry/Chicago, the only participant in the study to do so. He earned his degree, went to work for DeVry as a lab assistant, earned his master's degree and teacher certification at Loyola University, and then, went back to DeVry as a teacher in the Home School Program. Scott, who remains at DeVry University today, has recently completed his 29th year of teaching in the Electronics and Computer Technology program.

Summary

For five of the seven participants in this study, education was perceived to be valued and was greatly stressed in their family; these five participants were influenced to continue their education by their parents throughout their lives. For those five participants who indicated their parents held strong educational influences and high expectations for furthering their education, the participants also want to pass down their encouragement and influence on to their own children's education; a "passing of the torch" of education is evident among these participants.

For the remaining two participants, education was not perceived as a priority in their childhood, but through finding a passion for their subject and through diligence and hard work, they were able to succeed in education to become faculty members at DeVry University.

Active and Engaged: DeVry/Chicago Faculty's Perceptions of Other Positive Learning Experiences and Other Individuals who Shaped and Influenced their Lives

The participation and positive experiences in extracurricular activities, as well as positive learning experiences throughout elementary school, high school, and into college, further shaped participants' perception of education. Each participant in the study recalled certain individuals in their past and how these individuals shaped their values and beliefs about education. In general, these individuals were teachers, individuals who sponsored extracurricular activities or organizations, coaches, or family members other than parents.

Mark, for example, was involved with athletics early in his life, playing football and basketball. Later, in high school, he wrote for the school newspaper. These activities, and particularly his experience writing for his high school's newspaper, generated a passion for interest in journalism and creative writing. In turn, this specific experience, as Mark notes, created a pathway to his teaching of writing today at DeVry/Chicago.

Like Mark, Sue was also involved in athletics and extracurricular activities at an early age. Sue participated on the swim team and the pom pons team in junior high and high school. Additionally, she played clarinet in her high school band. During her grade school education, she attended a non-traditional elementary school in Michigan, which utilized creative learning pods and open classrooms to facilitate teaching and learning. In high school, her campus was an open atmosphere, where students were allowed flexibility in their classes. While attending Elmhurst College in Illinois, Sue participated in the theater and worked at the college's radio station. She employs these experiences in her classroom today by creating an open and flexible environment for her students.

Deana, similar to Mark and Sue, also participated in extracurricular activities during grade school as a member of her school's dance team. As an elementary school student, Deana indicated she was a "good learner" and enjoyed going to school as she liked all subjects.

Attending an urban public high school on Chicago's southwest side, Deana also notes her involvement in extracurricular activities, stating she was in her school's honor society, a member of the dance team and the chess club. She believes the participation in these activities helped shape her teaching style today.

Janet, who was born and raised in London and attended private school during her childhood, participated in athletics from a very early age. She competed in tennis and was on the track team as a high jumper during high school. As a college student, she was instrumental in the Women in Engineering organization at her campus, leading activities for women studying in the technology fields. Janet acknowledges that participating in these extracurriculars played a significant role in how she teaches her students by using her experiences to provide an atmosphere where her students are allowed to lead, excel, and respond to change.

Peter, and Scott to a lesser extent, are exceptions to the study in that they were not involved in extracurricular activities during their early schooling. Peter, who grew up in the western suburbs of Chicago and attended public schools throughout childhood, indicated his parents did not stress the importance of education and were not influential in his choice to attend college. He perceived that education, and continuing education specifically, was not a priority in his family, and as a child, therefore, Peter claims he was a "miserable student." Peter was not involved in extracurricular activities as a child, and he felt he was "only interested in anything if it had electronics in it." Although Peter did not feel as though he had any real influential individuals who stressed education early in life, his passion for his subject matter—electronics—was evident at as early as age two.

Similar to Peter, Scott was not active in extracurriculars as a child. His primary responsibility as an adolescent was to help his family run their farm. Scott, however, did show

an interest early in his childhood for the subject he currently teaches—electronics. He states, "I always tinkered with things...the interest in electronics is two-fold. At the time, the government was in a race with the U.S.S.R. to get to the moon, and that seemed to be so thrilling and exciting."

Although Scott did not participate in extracurricular activities or organizations, his passion for his subject developed at an early stage, and he was able to find an outlet, through "tinkering" with electronics around his family's farm. Later, Scott describes his love of the game of chess as another outlet; this information is intriguing because as Scott indicates, chess is a game of logic, and his passion for electronics is due for his understanding of logic and how components are created.

Summary

In general, the seven participants in the study showed interest in extracurricular activities and organizations throughout their childhood and into college. Although Peter and Scott did not actually participate in extracurricular activities nor did they have parental educational influences, their passion for their subject was shown at an early age. Participants who had strong parental encouragement were active and engaged; on the other hand, those participants who had little influence or encouragement were less engaged.

Each participant, however, did identify at least one individual—a parent, teacher, coach, organization sponsor, or other family member—who took interest in their lives and educational endeavors and made a difference. Each participant described one individual who exhibited a sense of caring or nurturing toward him/her or made the classroom experiences interesting or fun

for him/her. These experiences are what shaped them to become the educators they are today DeVry/Chicago.

Career Trajectories: DeVry/Chicago Faculty and Their Work Experiences in the "Real World"

The influence of a variety of work-related experiences, or work-related experiences within institutions of higher education but outside the teaching realm, is another theme present among participants.

Many faculty at for-profit institutions are differently prepared. Many full-time and part-time faculty have tremendous business and industry experience, which allows students to gain real-world insight through cases and examples. In this study, six of the seven participants have had business and industry experience prior to beginning their teaching career at DeVry/Chicago.

Many for-profit faculty, primarily full-time members, have strong backgrounds and experience working as administrators and/or teaching in higher education as well as in other levels of education, including grade school and high schools (Ruch, 2001). These notions hold true in this study, as five of the seven participants have either worked as an administrator or have taught at other institutions of higher education. Virginia and Scott, however, have experience teaching at the junior high and high school levels. Many of these professors have degrees in education, where pedagogy and classroom management courses serve as their basis to enter the world of education (Ruch, 2001); in this study, two participants have education degrees, and three other participants have completed courses for advanced degrees in education.

Prior to teaching at DeVry/Chicago, for example, Mark, a senior faculty member who teaches English, had some quite interesting work experiences, which he perceives

have shaped his teaching and how he approaches his students in the classroom. After serving as a teaching assistant at two Midwestern universities, Mark dropped out of his doctoral program and began working at an automotive plant. After two years there, he answered an advertisement for a job that would change his outlook on life forever—selling vacuum cleaners door-to-door. Mark comments on this particular work experience and how he perceives that this position shaped his life as a teacher at DeVry today:

> if you want to talk about educational experiences, that was probably the greatest and most useful educational experience I ever had...Well for two reasons. Number one, well because uh, I uh, several things happened in those two and half years. Number one I went from being a negative thinker to understanding positive mental attitude...: and not that I always had it because I tell you what, you knock on a bunch of doors, you get enough of them slammed into your face.... the guy that I work for was uh, into this PMA stuff... and your counts won't work there very long without at least knowing how to fake PMA and sometimes faking it is almost as good as really having it...because you can jack yourself up.....so that was important for me. Uh, the second thing was...the last thing I ever thought that I could do was go up and knock on a stranger's house, get into their living room, show them a product for an hour and half and walk away with $600 of their money..... and yet I did it. And I did it over and over and over again.

Mark's successful experience selling vacuum cleaners door-to-door helped shape his confidence as a teacher and also helped shaped his philosophy and approach toward his students. His perception of how he developed as a negative thinker to a more positive thinker is essential to teaching his students to become life-long learners and viable professionals. He continues discussing his perceptions of this position with this notion:

> And I'll tell you what, one of these things they told us in that sales business is that enthusiasm sells.... and when I was in somebody's home demonstrating this product, I was enthusiastic. What I believe is that enthusiasm sells in the class room too..... and if I go in

> and be bored with my topic, I'm gonna bore my students. If I'm enthusiastic about my topic, I at least got an even chance of making a sale.... the sense of getting them involved with uh, maybe they may not like the topic, but at least they'll understand that I think its important and maybe understand why I'm putting them though the things I'm putting them through.... I don't know and I was, I think I was a good teacher before that, but I think I was a good teacher because I was enthusiastic and I didn't realize that how important that was until I got through the sales game and that showed me how important that was.... so, so the positive mental attitude and the enthusiasm and just the experience of it. You talk about you know giving a lecture....in a classroom; here you are in somebody's living room and you get a lecture that's about and hour and half long....and you got things to show and that kind of thing. And that says something about how to conduct a lecture too.... but you had to have those people totally focused on what you were doing. You couldn't have them watching the TV or worry about supper cooking on the stove or anything else.... anything else that was going on in that house had to disappear. But it had to be focused on you or you could not make the sale....the thing that I learned among other things was...you go into somebody's house, they're watching TV. You know you can't pitch while they're watching TV, so you say do you mind if I turn this off, and you don't wait for an answer...it was amazing, the control you could take in someone else's home... and that as a lesson too...

Throughout his experience, Mark perceives that he learned more about how to approach people and how to "make a sale" than he had at any time previously, even as a graduate teaching assistant. His perception of being an enthusiastic instructor and the importance of displaying enthusiasm in the classroom relates directly to his beliefs of what comprises good teaching. Mark's philosophies of "enthusiasm sells" and that teaching is a performance aid in his instruction.

Additionally, Mark's perception of remaining focused and taking control of the situation, whether it is in the position of selling vacuum cleaners or teaching students English, is critical. He perceives that his genuine teacher training came from working at this position:

> but the two and half years I did that were the most educational years I ever spent. Because I learned things that I don't think you can learn any other way..... But I think the excitement that you had to put into a demonstration is an influence on my teaching. I can't tell you that my students are always excited about my uh, professional writing class... but, it's not that I don't try and put the excitement into it.

Again, Mark believes that his experience selling vacuum cleaners was most influential in preparing him to teach. Like demonstrating the functions of a quality vacuum cleaner, Mark's perceptions of effective teaching begins with garnering excitement about the subject.

Another position prior to teaching at DeVry/Chicago that influenced how Mark approaches his teaching was as an Admissions Representative, recruiting students to enroll in and attend DeVry. Mark describes how his unique background lead to teaching:

> I got the job because of my background in sales. And that's what they were looking for, somebody that could sell. But they also liked the fact that I have uh... both a bachelor's and master's because uh... at that time you didn't have to have a bachelor's degree to work in admissions, but shortly after I joined, that did become a requirement. ....So they like to have people with advanced degrees because they felt that they could... more accurately talk about the importance of education...I was an admissions rep about a year and a half before the opportunity to teach...came along... and, I had been wanting to teach and had been wanting to. Ya know, once I, once I got back into an educational environment and really liked it...and really liked what we did here, then I decided well, ya know, I'd like to teach here.

Mark enjoyed this position primarily because he was allowed to speak about the value of education on a daily basis. At this point in his life, Mark wanted to get back into an educational setting first and then back into teaching, and DeVry University was just the place to begin. Mark

approached the dean of the evening program at the time and inquired about teaching English as adjunct instructor during the evenings. He felt his background in English was significant, and his dean agreed.

> He needed somebody to teach a course in the night school
> the following term. And now that's how I got the job!
> I think I've taught uh... I've taught a course here every semester
> since then, but maybe one exception. I think one semester I took
> off because I wanted to take a class. I've taught the professional
> writing class. It used to be business writing...all except
> one semester, one semester I taught speech 275, and I had a fun
> with that but I prefer teaching the writing class...so that's how
> I got, ya know, my foot in the door, and uh once, once I got my foot
> in the door I just wanted to keep teaching because, and
> my wife will tell you this, ... no matter what other job I do here,
> what I enjoy most is the night I teach my class.

As shown in this excerpt, Mark values education, and more specifically, he has a passion for teaching

Currently, Mark serves as a dean at DeVry/Chicago and admits he does enjoy his administrative duties. He states that although his admissions position "wore thin...giving the same presentation time after time after time," his job did make "this place come alive" for him. He comments on this experience:

> I'll tell ya something else that made this place come alive for me..
> again I was in admissions and this was probably my first or second semester here
> at DeVry. And...I'm interviewing, it's Saturday
> morning, and I'm interviewing this student and his parents--this
> potential student...and one of the questions they asked me along
> the way was if we had classes on Saturdays; in those days, we didn't...
> after the interview was over, and they hadn't signed up yet, it was
> time to take them on a tour of the building. So we go up, and we're walking
> through, and we're walking through the electronics lab.
> And here's a guy standing there with a suit and tie, with about
> seven or eight students there. And the father turns to me and says,
> "Is this a class going on?" after I've just told him there are no Saturday classes.
> And.... I said uh "you know that I was new"; I didn't

> know any other answer. So I says, "I don't, let's ask!" ...So we went over to the guy in the coat and tie, and I said "uh...you've got a class going on now?" And he said "no, here, these are people in their final semester of the electronics technician program and they're out looking for jobs during the week and this is forcing them to miss some class time. So I'm in here today covering the material for them that I'm going to cover next week in class".....Boy, I tell you, that just...you know...up to that point, I'd been selling DeVry without really knowing DeVry. And hoping that what I said was true...and that Saturday lab encounter with that instructor and those students just made my day, but it also made me a believer. ...but that didn't matter because this did more for me than uh....that student and his parents obviously. ....I thought God that is just fantastic! This is a great place! ...so a lot of what I saw in admissions...really brought home to me what a remarkable thing we do here. .... and so I, I never regret a minute I spent in admissions. There were some tough times when people you know signed up but they never showed up ....but still in all, it was a really positive experience. And it, it got me to know this place from different angles...and also know how to get things done around here...and I think from an administrative point of view, that's important to know...But uh...you know, those years in admissions just were really remarkable.

Mark's experience working in administration has played an influential role in his teaching career as well. He believes that seeing the institution in several lights—as an Admissions Representative and as an administrator—he understands how DeVry works, how students bring their experiences and needs to the campus and his classroom, how best to approach his students' needs, and how faculty is flexible and meets those student needs. Mark comments on how difficult it was at times to recruit students, but more often than not, his experiences accentuate his positive attitude about his various roles at DeVry and his belief of how "remarkable" DeVry is as an institution of higher education. Mark realizes he is part of a whole system and his role is integral within this system.

Comparable to Mike, Sue also had other work experiences within and outside of higher education which shaped the style of teacher she is today at DeVry/Chicago. Sue believes she

uses every past work experience and applies it in some manner toward her teaching philosophies and approaches. She details her experiences:

> I thought I wanted to work at a school, and I interviewed with all of these schools to work in Student Services, and I got a two job offers.....I kind of fell into it (teaching). I didn't have it as a goal.... yeah, this at that point, I never had it as a goal. I always wanted to work at schools, but I never wanted to teach at a school....I looked for a job. I worked at (a private college near Chicago) for a while, because I couldn't find a job, and then I got a job at (another private university near Chicago)....their continuing education/graduate extension department. That's how I worked, worked teachers who needed additional certification. You know how they need certification or whatever it is.
> So I worked with them scheduling classes; you know so a lot of time I was doing that. Or I'd got to an extension or satellite campus, and um you know we d have to go there and help with classed make, sure things were going ok. We wouldn't visit every site, but we visited a lot off the sites, and we only had a department of five people, ...when I left we were pulling in 1.8 million in revenue..... I didn't start off as a teacher. So I came in as an adjunct..... an assistant dean...and then over here in the...I have four titles here; I've had like five deans.
> I'm not lying, and all of these different roles and titles. And so at one point I was a director of some sort, of something.

Sue perceives that her experiences as an administrator in higher education lead to her "falling into teaching" at DeVry. She acknowledges that teaching was never one of her objectives, but she understands that her involvement in administrative roles shaped how she teaches today.

Additionally, while she was serving as a dean, she received opportunities to try her hand at teaching. Eventually, the administrative roles became too stressful for her, and based on practicality, Sue entered into teaching by default; she "fell into" teaching. She describes the experience:

> You know I taught while I did those things; then I was a dean for a while. And then I wanted to be a full time faculty member and then um I said you know I can't do this anymore. I can't do this dean thing. It was killing me.....it wasn't fun for me.
> I wasn't doing what I wanted to be doing...you know what the deans have to deal with; they don't even get to interact with students.

> They have to deal with students. Because every time they see a student, it's because of a big problem. That's what they have to do. Kids don't go see their deans just for fun...you know what, I said I just really don't want to do this anymore. There was an opening, and so I applied for it, and I had to go through the whole search game and everything....so it's been a good experience. I am constantly changing; this is where my administrative past comes into play. I know how that area thinks, how they think differently from the way the faculty thinks, and I'm okay in both worlds.

Sue's perception of her full workload and negative experience as an administrator is one of the critical factors as to why she entered the teaching field. Although her experience as an administrator became tiresome and annoying, her past administrative experiences were influential and shaped her current teaching: "I use everything. All that I have...so that I use every single experience I've had in some way and apply it here."

Deana, like Mark and Sue, perceives her "real world" experiences including working in the corporate world and teaching at other colleges and universities, have also shaped her teaching. Prior to coming to DeVry, Deana held positions as a paralegal, as a factory worker in a form-making factory, and as a secretary. After earning an additional bachelor's degree in Computer Science, she began working as a computer programmer in the corporate realm. While working at private corporation, Deana earned her master's degree in Information Systems, and then also began teaching for her first time in the Computer Information Systems program at two institutions of higher education in Chicago.

Deana's "real-world" experience, combined with her first teaching experiences within higher education have shaped her teaching approaches and philosophies today at DeVry/Chicago.

Like the previous three participants, Janet has had significant work experiences

outside and within higher education, prior to coming to the Chicago campus of DeVry University. While working on her master's degree, Janet served as a teacher's assistant at a college in New Jersey, and after earning her degree, she worked in a financial institution in Canada as well as held an administrative position within the Canadian Embassy. She and her family then moved to Nigeria, where she continued her work in the financial field and eventually began working for UNICEF.

Janet then had an opportunity to move back to Canada, where she immediately took a position in the Computer Information Systems program as a full-time faculty member. These experiences in the United States, Canada, and Nigeria, Janet perceives, helped shape the philosophies and teaching methods Janet incorporates in her classes today at the Chicago campus of DeVry University.

Peter, like the other participants, was influenced by his past work experiences as well. For example, immediately following his graduation from high school, Peter worked for the Tandy Corporation as an electronics bench technician. Here, he was responsible for diagnosing and repairing consumer electronic items. He notes he was obligated to repair "pretty much anything" in this position, and he recalls that "I could have been working on an expensive stereo receiver in the morning and a garage door opener in the afternoon." Peter left this position after he decided to enroll in college. Another significant work experience Peter had was right after his college graduation, when he was hired by Motorola as a design engineer. In this position, Peter worked in the Special Products group of Base Station Engineering.

Peter perceives that each of these positions "added greatly to my expertise," and he feels these work experiences lend a "large measure of credibility as a teacher. Real-life experiences is

something that is very difficult to incorporate into a curriculum. It also gives the instructor the ability to say 'I was where you are now'."

As the only participant in this study who originally wanted to become a teacher, Virginia attended Illinois State University, a teacher's college in central Illinois, for her bachelor's degree. Upon graduation, she took her first teaching position at a junior high school in Aurora, Illinois. When discussing this experience, Virginia relates stories about the policies and procedures that newly hired teachers were required to adhere to, which have shaped how she views her role as a leader of change at DeVry/Chicago today. She also mentioned the racially changing climate of her school and the city where she taught, and these experiences have shaped her current views of race relations. She also warmly discussed how she would take her students to Chicago on the train, as many of her students had never ridden a train previously; this experience indicates how, even today, she is nurturing and caring toward her students.

Virginia's time teaching in the public junior high school was a time in her life that she believes she will never forget. She recalls the relationships, of both faculty and students, she developed and mentioned this experience as being a great starting point for her DeVry teaching career.

Summary

Participants convey perceptions of how their career trajectories, or career paths, have lead them to become faculty at DeVry/Chicago. Participants emphasize their educational experiences and how these experiences have shaped their lives as teachers. They also highlight how field-based experiences, including administrative experiences within higher education, shaped how they view the DeVry University organization and its philosophies and policies. Other

participants held field-based positions entirely outside of the realm of education; these positions include working technology, particularly in the fields of electronics and computers for these participants. One participant listed his experience as a door-to-door vacuum cleaner salesman as the field-based position, which taught him the most in regards to educating his students. Participants expressed their ideas of how they became DeVry faculty, indicating how some participants expected to enter the field of teaching, while others did so unexpectedly, as they "fell into teaching."

Reflections on Teaching

Teacher Education: Assimilation and How DeVry/Chicago Faculty Learned to Teach

Another significant theme was the participants' perception of how they learned to teach. Participants learned to teach in one of two approaches: formal or informal. For those participants who learned to teach through a formal process, they learned by completing coursework and earning teacher certification. On the other hand, for those participants who learned to teach through an informal process, they learned through tutoring their peers in college, through on-the-job training at DeVry or other institutions of higher education, through classroom observation of other instructors, and through being mentored by more senior faculty who lent support both in and out of the classroom and provided aid with educational practices and approaches.

Mentoring and peer coaching allows faculty to become more effective in the classroom by having one instructor observe another's classroom behaviors, and then, in a post-observation meeting, the observing teacher can provide needed, yet helpful, constructive criticism (Darling-

Hammond, 2001). Support groups such as peer coaching allows for greater access to effective feedback on helping faculty improve instruction and student learning. By providing structures such as peer coaching, teachers can more successfully supply feedback, collaborate on instruction, determine innovative solutions to instructional and curricular problems, and create a sense of community among colleagues (Bambino, 2002).

Participants, who learned to teach through a formal approach, enrolled in and attended college to learn to become a teacher and then earned teacher certification.

Virginia, again, is the only participant in this study who, as a child, dreamed of becoming a teacher. With the exception of Scott, Virginia is the only participant in the study who has formal teacher training. As an undergraduate student at Illinois State University, Virginia studied education and methodology of teaching mathematics and Spanish. Upon completing her coursework, she was a student teacher in the Lab School at her university. Virginia indicated that, at her campus' lab school, students taught in the early childhood development programs as well as in special education. Virginia acknowledges that her student teaching was "really kind of a great experience...I really enjoyed that." Virginia's perception of her collegiate experience was exciting and challenging, and she perceives that she developed into an effective teacher during these critical years.

Scott, like Virginia, formally learned to teach by enrolling in and completing a master's degree in education at Loyola University, after having earned his bachelor's degree from DeVry/Chicago. He recalls having to take "about ten classes" relating to education and methods of teaching to earn his master's degree. In order to earn his master's degree and teacher certification, he student-taught at Rolling Meadows High School, a public school in the northwest suburbs of Chicago.

Scott also perceived that he learned to teach informally through experiences with his siblings, which began when he was a young boy. He recalls this situation: "My sister was in 7th or 8th grade, and she's about five or six years older than me. She always had difficulty with math, and she and I got along quite well when we were youngsters...but she had difficulties with her math. I'd sit down and help her with it." Scott recalls being in the 3rd or 4th grade at the time he began tutoring his sister and claims "I used to dig math a lot...probably why I was very good at chess." As an elementary student, Scott was bored with his math classes because "we were doing the fundamentals, and I was helping my sister do trigonometry."

Scott also remembers experiences as to how he learned to teach through his work in the laboratories as a student at DeVry/Chicago. He often would help his classmates, stating: "I enjoyed the mini-groups at DeVry. I understood the stuff, and if I was talking to the others, and they didn't understand it, I'd give them some pointers and stuff. The examples I'd give, something would just click, and they'd understand it."

Participants, who learned to teach through an informal process or approach, described significant experiences related to teaching others, including other students they may have tutored at their college or friends in college study groups. The participants perceived these experiences to be influential in their development as future teachers, and their perceptions of these experiences rated, in some instances, as their initial teacher training experience.

Beginning teachers often rely upon their subject matter knowledge, early learning experiences, and peer observation and interaction during college to construct their teaching beliefs. Differences among faculty illustrate the manner in which specific conceptions of the subject, views on teaching, and teaching contexts contribute to a distinctive pedagogical comprehension of the teacher's subject (Grossman, 1990).

Mark describes what he perceives to be his first experience teaching other students:

> At Western, the program was all of the English majors; we didn't teach classes. We worked in a tutoring center... where students who were having trouble in their English classes, their instructors would send those students to this tutoring center. We were all English majors. We'd tutor students; we'd take their papers and cut them put you know... tell them what was wrong... I think we did some good work in terms of preparing people to go back to their English classes and do better.

Mark perceives this first teaching experience as significant because, like his work at DeVry/Chicago, he is serving students and aiding them to be successful. As indicated earlier, Mark's perceptions of his students' success and self-worth also validates his success as an instructor as well as his self-worth. Mark considers the influence of his past teachers' philosophies and approaches:

> I had a lot of good teachers, I had a lot of bad teachers. I think...part of it comes from just...having to develop an attitude that education really is important...the sense of responsibility comes from it. But I think, if I, if I have a teaching philosophy okay, you look back on the courses you enjoy. And you think about the teachers that taught those courses. And I can't say that I emulate any of those teachers in terms of their approach. But what I do think, in terms of the courses that I enjoyed, they were the course where the teacher made it interesting in some way or another. And that usually meant that the teacher was interested himself or herself...so while I don't think I...emulate anybody's style I mean my style is my own style.

Even though Mark had both good and bad teachers in his educational past, his perceptions of developing and placing a value on education stems from his enjoyment of learning and fond memories of classes and positive instructors as a college student. Although Mark does not perceive that he emulates any single instructor's style, he does acknowledge that the teacher's

interest in the subject matter made learning exciting to the students, so learning and teaching connections could occur.

Sue, a junior faculty member who teaches speech and communications, perceives that she learned how to teach through working with and discussing educational philosophies and methods with instructors who she admired and believed were effective teachers. She feels that observation of other instructors is a valuable method for one to become a better instructor. She discusses her thoughts on the topic:

> I have not been trained to teach at all. I took some classes in higher ed, but I was never trained to teach. I think it's something I learned through observation. But that doesn't mean I'm not applying some of the skills...observing teachers as students. Not through observing other teachers; I should probably do that more. Except I don't get to school enough, I can't learn everything, which is pretty bad. [Colleague and colleague] are two teachers I should observe. I could learn from them...they're good, good um I could learn from them. But pedagogically? How much? It's probably in there. I don't know. Because I rely so much on that stuff. You know how sometimes, I don't know, it's just in my unconscious awareness. There's a concept. But um I think it's in my unconscious awareness, I think it's there. I just don't know how much I use it.

Sue is at the beginning stages of reflection on her teaching; her perceptions of learning through observing others are significant to her development as a teacher. She understands that although she was not genuinely trained to teach, she can learn to become a better instructor by observing more senior faculty who may know effective strategies and approaches.

Although Sue acknowledges she was never trained to be a teacher, she does believe that one can learn to be a teacher, primarily through observing other instructors, applying educational theories and best practices in the classroom, and trying out new ideas and methodologies.

> Because I think over time you can teach people how to be teachers if they haven't had any experience. But if you start teaching, what

> you do is just try stuff out and watch other people and you read the theories and you apply them immediately. Just like any profession. I think that's where that comes into play. So I think that's where, and some people have it, and some people don't. Some of it's talent; I'm not going to say it's nature. I think you can pick it up though... I think you can learn to be a teacher. I you can learn content, so why can't you learn to be a teacher?...you know, it's hard to say how much of it has been my observation. You know I've seen others do it, and now I think hey I should try this. I don't know where it comes from. My thinking is I don't know where it ends and where it begins.

Sue's perceptions of learning to teach in this passage are significant, as she attends to the process systematically. She believes that teachers, who may not have been trained to teach, can be taught to be effective teachers. However, her understanding of the learning process, including how one learns subject matter and how one can learn pedagogical methods, is vague and unclear; she does not articulate her thoughts on her learning to teach process well. She utilizes her experiences of observing other faculty in the classroom and emulates what she believes are quality teaching practices, but at the same time, she questions her process and understanding. As previously discussed, Sue takes cues and suggestions from senior faculty in order to elevate her teaching; this transmittal of culture is often present in interviews with junior faculty participants. These perceptions of learning to teach, therefore, have shaped how Sue has learned to teach.

Janet, like Sue, attends to the learning to teach process systematically as she learned to teach primarily through observing other instructors and then trying out different approaches of teaching. Like Sue, Janet, as a junior faculty member, embraces suggestions and cues from senior faculty through observation and discussion of teaching styles. Again, the notion of a transmittal of culture from senior faculty to junior faculty is shown.

She acknowledges that her first semester teaching was not her best, and from that time forward, she has reflected on her teaching and has attempted to present classroom information in

better ways so that she may connect with her students. Janet details her first teaching experience at DeVry and her perceptions of how she learned to teach:

> I think it started at DeVry and then watching the level we teach, um my first term I would say was the poorest that I did, but from that term, even though I had very good evaluations, I felt that I could have done a better job...um I think you know, it's just a question of saying to yourself, there's a whole lot more I can give to my students, that I didn't. Like every single day, by the end of the day, I reflect on what I covered in class. Could I have presented the material in a better way? Could I have presented the material in an even easier way to understand? Then having to say "Ok, tomorrow we're going to have to go back over it again". Because if you present it thoroughly enough the first time and in as much detail, in a very, very explanatory way to the students, then you won't have to go over it again. So these are the kinds of things I reflect on, and I feel ok the next time I present this material. I'm going to do "xyz" to improve it, and I make sure that when I am prepping, I get to that point to where I'm fixing "xyz". Then I do...every term I'm refining; I'm refining everything. Like Database is especially one. I have taught this class from the very first day I started teaching at DeVry/Chicago. Every single term I get to teach that class. So um there is no term that I have not done things differently from another term...constantly refining. Pulling in new things and that makes it very, very interesting for the students and they can relate to the real world, what's going on...

Janet's perception of how she learned to teach, by observing other effective instructors, specifically senior faculty, and then investigating the value of their approaches to teaching by using the strategies in her own classroom, is significant. Her process of learning to teach is systematic which includes on-going assessment of her teaching, reflection of her teaching, and then constant refinement and modification of her strategies and approaches in the classroom. Janet understands that, upon reflection of her teaching methods, she can fine tune her teaching to better serve her students.

Peter perceives his "teacher training" began as an undergraduate student at Southern Illinois University. As mentioned previously, Peter had related work experiences, which he believes were influential in his understanding of his subject—electronics. He notes that "having previously had fairly extensive experience with electronics…I had a leg up on pretty much everyone in my class, who had not experience whatsoever." Due to this experience, Peter acknowledges, study groups and tutoring sessions were organized, allowing him to teach his classmates the highly complex material. Peter claims that "that was my teacher training," and he feels that his "proteges" encouraged him as "having potential as a teacher." He feels he "never would have thought that I would have the credentials to teach, but then…the opportunity just presented itself. DeVry was looking for someone with at least a B.S.E.E. and two or more years of industrial experience to teach electronic communications. The job seemed to have my name on it."

Summary

All participants in this study shared their experience and their perception of how they assimilated to the DeVry culture and how they learned to teach; each narrative was interesting and unique. Virginia and Scott learned to teach through formal teacher training, completing college coursework to earn a degree in education. The other five participants, on the other hand, learned to teach through informal approaches, which included peer tutoring during collegiate years, on-the-job training at DeVry or other institutions of higher education, classroom observation of other instructors, and by being mentored by senior faculty. Each participant shared an instance or period in their lives where they perceive they had, formally or informally, learned to teach.

The Good and Bad: DeVry/Chicago Faculty Perceptions of Effective and Ineffective Teaching and Learning Experiences

Faculty and administrators in higher education, and particularly at for-profit institutions, have called for more focused attention on creating positive, productive learning experiences for their students, and in doing so, the notion of "best practice" in teaching has flourished. Although the general principles for "best practice" teaching vary, the essential notion underlying these principles is the philosophy of creating successful learning experiences.

"Best practice" teaching applies sound instructional strategies based on one's subject matter, and "best practice" teaching methods should create relevant and memorable learning experiences. "Best practices" are also those which encourage frequent student-faculty contact, is collaborative in nature, assures active learning experiences, and communicates high expectations for students (LeBlanc, 1998; Chickering & Gamson, 1991).

Participants' perceptions of effective and ineffective teaching practices were categorized by two specific modes: teacher-directed and student-directed practices. Faculty attempt to maximize learning by employing methodologies, which they believe best accomplishes student achievement based on their personalities, skills, and talents. Certain modes of instruction better portray these particular effective instructor traits and attributes; these include characteristics associated with teacher-directed modes and student-centered modes (Timpson & Bedel-Simso, 1996).

For faculty in the study who are guided by the teacher-directed mode, an "operationalized" or administrative approach is taken. Faculty are physically in control of their classroom, exhibiting a sense of discipline and knowing. Here, faculty also provide a separation between themselves and their students, wanting to keep a distance in the teacher/student relationship.

For those instructors who are driven by the student-directed mode, a parental or nurturing approach is employed. In this manner, faculty are responsive to students, affording care and honesty. Faculty who teach in this mode are performance-based, creating a learning experience that is lively, engaging, and active. These instructors also tend to get closer with their students, creating a connection or bond within the teacher/student relationship.

Participants' perceptions were often based on experiences with past instructors and how they approached their teaching. Although strictly lecturing to students is not viewed as a "best practice" teaching method by educators, Mark, a senior faculty English participant, details an experience he had as an undergraduate student with a history instructor who primarily lectured:

> my life long love of history evolved probably from her class...she probably knew that she was well liked and well respected because
> I'd heard about her before I even signed up for her class...
> it was uh, I forget it, I don't think it was ancient history, I think it was more medieval to 1900's or something...
> she was a lecturer. She started talking when the bell rang, and she didn't finish until the bell rang again...so it was a furious note taking experience...no discussion, there would be uh, you know, if people wanted to ask a question, she would respond to the question...and since I lecture myself, and this may have been an influence...but since I lecture myself at least in some of the classes I teach...I hope I'm half as good a lecturer as she was. She always kept my interest...one of the reasons she was such a great lecturer was because she made history more less personal... she put in a little personal touches. It was a kick.

Although lecturing is not considered a traditional "best practice" among educators, Mark's perception of a positive learning experience in his early adult years shaped how he teaches today. Through lively and personal lecture, Mark's teaching experience has been quite effective in the classroom.

Moreover, Mark identifies what he perceives to be features and experiences of effective teaching. These perceptions also have been shaped by his learning experiences, as well as through his experiences working on the administrator at DeVry/Chicago.

> I want an instructor to be enthusiastic. I want them to be in control, I want, I mean...I mean the instructor runs the class, not the students...in my class, I walk in, I'm the expert. Now it's true, I might have people who are working professionals who write progress reports, who write feasibilities, that's happened, okay. But on the whole, they don't know as much as I know. And if I find somebody who does have some expertise in that area, I can use that to you know help the rest of the students understand it. So yeah, when you get out of here, this isn't the last writing you're going to have to do. You get on the job, you're going to have to write!

Mark's notion of effective teaching includes the idea of being in control, focused, and enthusiastic in the classroom; he believes in "the teacher is the expert" mentality. He also notes that expertise in one's subject area is significant for effective teaching and learning. Mark perceives that effective instructors also combine two significant attributes when teaching their students—knowledge of subject matter and the ability to competently deliver the information to the students. He describes his thoughts regarding effective instructors:

> Certainly they ought to have some knowledge of their subject... the one thing I want in an instructor besides knowledge and the ability to deliver it. I want an instructor who will put out for the students...most of our people do that....lots of times you see them doing extra sessions and that kind of thing. I think we have a

> wonderful group of teachers here! But I would rather have somebody who has the knowledge, has the communication skills, and is willing to put out....

Mark believes a teacher should be knowledgeable about subject matter, should be able to communicate with students and be able to effectively relay information about one's subject, and should "put out" by working hard for students

Sue believes an effective instructor is one who makes class fun, utilizes different approaches and strategies in the classroom, and creates great learning experiences for his students. Sue also acknowledges that effective teachers are direct in their style and approach, are tough when it comes to disciplinary matters, and are willing to challenge students to succeed. She perceived that the most valuable instructors she had as a student made learning "fun," and she indicated she was drawn to teachers that treated her well and helped her when she needed assistance.

Sue also fondly recalled her drama instructor she had as an undergraduate student stating, he "gave me confidence to try new things...he tried to help me do the right things in my major...he was really fun...I really learned as much outside of the classroom as I learned inside the classroom." Effective teachers, in Sue's mind, are those who are tough and challenging, yet are caring and create fun learning experiences. Her recollection of this instructor emphasizes Sue's notion that an effective teacher is one whose instruction affects students even beyond the classroom walls.

Additionally, Sue feels the most effective instructors are those who are flexible in their approaches within the classroom, and she believes she attempts to use a variety of methodologies

or best practices to meet the learning needs of her students. She comments on her active, entertaining style of teaching:

> But I use all of my experiences, and teaching is mostly organization. It's mostly administration of students, and then you're giving a speech every day. And that's pretty much what you're doing. And sometimes you're entertaining and sometimes you're not. Today I was entertaining; maybe I won't be Thursday night. But your grade books are on computer, so there's all of your computer experience. I'm doing my first e-college course this term. I like the flexibility even in terms of what you can even do in the classroom environment. I like to be able to I mean, like today, I used the board, I used overheads, and we had a video. I'm more happy if I could even include one other instructional element and give them a chance to learn. I mean I move around so I'm I like that. And I like developing the relationships with the students. I really enjoy that. I'd like to hear about, I like to see them and hear them apply theories and their knowledge and their experiences, and what can also happen in Interpersonal Communication is to have people say it's just your experience but in truth there are all these theories and you can apply your experiences, and once they start clicking on that, that's when I love it.

Sue's perceptions of how she teaches includes the ability to be able to teach in a variety of modes—visual, auditory, and kinethestic student learning styles dictate how she approaches each class session. Sue acknowledges that, as a teacher, she values being able to use different teaching styles in the classroom because she knows that her students' chance of success is improved. Her teaching style is entertaining and active, which allows for a personal connection with her students. Sue also realizes that organization in her teaching methods, as well as allowing her students to find their voices and develop an authority as "knowers," play an important role in her success.

Moreover, Sue perceives the most important attribute of an effective instructor is being able to make a connection with the student. She details her thoughts:

> You know it's just an idea but maybe this how you interact with others. And your understanding, it's how, you have this knowledge, and that's when you have this understanding, and this perspective and I think, I don't care what you do, it's about understanding. And when they click on that, they get it. I appreciate that.

Again, like Mark, Sue believes the teacher should be the expert when it comes to subject matter; however, she also feels that an instructor should employ whatever method of teaching is necessary to generate student understanding.

Finally, Sue perceives good teaching to be physically exhausting:

> I didn't' realize how physically grueling it is until I was pregnant....it was hard; I had to sit on a stool. I couldn't make it through class. And um it was because you don't really know, and I wear sensible shoes, and so all these things you got to make yourself comfortable up there. And it's taxing, and it's got to be if you're doing it right. In my opinion, if you're doing it right, you're exhausted...

In Sue's mind, quality teaching is often grueling, and requires intensity and high energy if one is to teach well.

Sue also believes in viewing her teaching as she viewed other instructors' teaching when she served in administrative roles:

> there's good and quality teaching in different ways; it can be operationalized. If we take a look at the DeVry model, good teaching is hitting all your course objectives, showing up to class on time, being organized, returning assignments in a timely fashion, all of the things that when I was an administrator I was looking for in my teachers. And I believe in those too; I do believe in showing up on time, organized. I don't believe in like using all the same texts you know; I don't care if they buy the book or not I just want them to read. They can share books for all I care...

But quality teaching? See a lot of it is task oriented for me....

Through Sue's past experiences as an administrator, she believes teaching should be operationalized and task-oriented. She holds herself accountable as a teacher in the same manner as she held instructors, who worked for her when she was in administration.

From her perspective as a faculty member, however, teaching is not always about being "operationalized" or standardized; often times, effective teaching means providing a first-rate performance in the classroom:

> but on the other hand it's a lot of performance, how you are in the classroom, I think that's important. And we've talked about this; I don't like to see the teacher standing behind the podium, and I don't like to see the teacher parked on a desk. But I think it's important for the teacher to be engaged with the students, and not just to have the students be engaged with the teacher. I think it needs to be reciprocal, and yeah, I think that's what makes a good teacher.

Although effective teaching in higher education requires planning and expertise, great teaching employs excitement, energy and awareness of students' learning needs. An energetic delivery of information helps to inspire students to think, learn, and develop new skills and concepts. In this sense, classroom performances parallel stage performances; both require preparation, interaction, and presentation skills, which bring life and spirit to subject matter. Entertaining instruction and honed delivery skills challenge students to think creatively and aid them in learning better how to learn (Timpson, Burgoyne, Jones, & Jones, 1997). Sue believes the teacher should be fully engaged and active within the classroom. Teachers, in Sue's faculty-driven view, should include performance skills in order to effectively connect with students.

Later in the interview, Sue, again, looks through an administrative lens to describe effective teaching:

> Administratively you want the teacher to cover all the objectives and um be fair and all that, you do. I think that should be there too. I'm not going to say, some students think a good teacher should be friendly, I don't think that's necessary...one of the best teachers here is not friendly, wonderful instructors, almost standoffish. I don't think you have to friendly.
> I think that can be a detriment to teachers. I come across as being very friendly; I have strict rules about certain things because it's not fair to students if there's all this other stuff. You need rules. And if you know what the rules are, you know how to operate within those guidelines, whether you're a child, an employee, a student, whatever. So I have rules in the classroom; I think clear expectations and clear guidelines are a benefit. Instead of this hazy stuff. So you know, it's necessary to say "no" sometimes.

In this excerpt, Sue's perceptions of effective teaching are illustrated. She understands that quality instruction can mean many things to many educators. As a past administrator, Sue realizes the need for DeVry faculty to adhere to teaching guidelines and policies, to utilize DeVry's course terminal objectives, to being fair with students, to be organized with daily activities, and to watch boundaries in the teacher/student relationship—not getting too close to students, yet not distancing oneself too much either.

As a faculty member, Sue knows that teachers must be fully engaged and active with their students in order to be most effective and to make a connection with the students and their needs. She understands good teaching means providing students with a superior, high energy performance, which, often times, leaves the instructor physically exhausted.

Deana also has perceptions, based on her learning and teaching experiences, of what characteristics are shared by effective teachers. Deana believes teachers who take the time to work with students and who show care for their students are effective.

Deana recalls warmly one of her elementary teachers: "she was a good teacher. I remember her...even though she was a little hard boned, she really cared...we learned...and it's that caring act...that caring act... even if it meant being a little strict and disciplining...she really wanted us to learn." In high school, Deana fondly recalls her chemistry and physics instructor as exhibiting traits and characteristics of effective teachers: "he was very funny...you know we did the experiment where you stand on the third floor and drop the egg...and it was just the fun things he had us do...you know it was very funny...he kept class fun...it was different...because I think it was a new concept." To Deana, instructors who are entertaining and fun in the classroom—who perform to an audience—create effective learning environments.

Janet, like the other participants, identifies her perceptions of attributes of effective teaching. Janet acknowledges as well that, often times, an effective teacher must serve the student as an additional parent. She explains:

> I just enjoy being in the classroom with the students. I love it so much when I see the green light in their eyes. When it clicks for them, and you see that face. Oh, that makes my day. I think that as a teacher, one has to be very, very compassionate. As a teacher, you have to be a parent to these people. Some of them might be older than you are, but you still find yourself parenting them in some way...you're nurturing them. I don't know if it's like that at DuPage, but a lot of our students here, maybe given the diversity, a lot of them come from homes where they have a lot of issues and a lot of problems. And I see it every term because they bring their problems into the classroom, and it affects them academically. And so, as an instructor, you have to be able to pull them away from the issues at that time and allow them to focus on the instruction so that at least, you know, with everything else that's happening. You still know that at the time, and you are able to move on. So you don't want the whole term to be wasted because they have these issues that they're bringing into class. So as an instructor, you need to be compassionate. You should be able to read the students without them telling. Because, often times, students won't tell you anything...so you have to retell to them,

> "Ok, you weren't in class. Why weren't you in class?" You e-mail them, give them a phone call or something like that...those types of things you have to do to be able to do that with your students.

In sum, Janet perceives the most effective teachers are those who show interest in their students through caring and nurturing; attending to their needs and issues, she parents them. She is compassionate and understands her students have lives outside of DeVry with real problems and real issues, yet her discourse exhibits a tension of being responsive to their personal lives. Unlike Sue's administrative voice, Janet's voice is one of understanding that her students' emotional needs and issues must often be dealt with prior to moving deeper into the course curriculum. Finally, she acknowledges that students who are cared for and nurtured by their teachers are often appreciative of their instructor's assistance and guidance.

Scott perceives the characteristics of the most effective teachers are those who "know their material...the effectiveness is also maintaining currency." Effective teachers in Scott's view are up-to-date and substantive. He believes teachers should also be able to identify their strengths and weaknesses in the classroom and should reflect on how to constantly improve as a teacher; they should constantly self-assess and refine their teaching methods. He thinks being honest and open with students is also another key trait of an effective teacher: "Don't try to 'BS' the students. If you don't know the answer, get back to them. Uh, don't tell them 'I have to look it up"...get back to them. Provide them feedback. We talk about it all the time in education that you have to evaluate your performance...you have to close with feedback...and if there's a weakness, what are you going to do to overcome that weakness?" Scott displays a responsiveness to his students and provides continual feedback for them.

Scott, additionally, feels that an effective teacher is one who takes on leadership in the educational community: "Taking a leadership role with respect to DeVry. Not just here at

campus, but with respect to DeVry corporate, system-wide." Scott notes that he has taken on leadership roles in the past by having written curriculum guides, working on system-wide electronics projects, and initiating engineering projects. Service to the university and a role in the "big picture" of the institution as a system are of value to Scott and his work.

Participants often recalled their teaching and learning experiences and identified instructors and their philosophies and approaches that were effective; however, in other instances, the participants described instructors who were ineffective in the classroom. The latter remained etched in the participants' minds, and throughout the interviews, the participants detailed their perceptions as to how they wanted to provide better teaching to their students than their ineffective instructor had provided them.

Most participants illustrated four main components when describing ineffective teachers: those who lack discipline in the classroom, display a lack of passion for their subject, demonstrate "boring" modes of classroom delivery, and are demeaning or condescending to students.

For example, Mark, a senior English faculty participant in the study, recalls that he had some "horrendous teachers" in his past. His perception of those ineffective instructors and the traits they exhibited were those who did not maintaining discipline in the classroom, were often boring in their delivery methods, kept class uninteresting due to a lack of passion for the subject or topic being discussed, and those teachers who were demeaning or condescending to their students.

Mark remembers one of his least effective learning experiences during his collegiate years as being "boring" and "wanting to fall asleep" in class due to the awful style of teaching. Additionally, Mark had an instructor whose lectures were ineffective because of the fact that the

teacher talked in low tones and students could not even hear the instructor. This teacher also never answered students' questions, and the students "felt that they weren't learning things that they felt they should be learning." Mark perceived that there was a lack of purpose in the classroom; he acknowledged the instructor had "tons of knowledge," but he also perceived that she hated her students. The students, in turn, felt the teacher's hatred toward them, and the learning process was inhibited from that point forward. Ultimately, Mark's perception of how he has learned to teach stems "as much from the bad teachers as from the good ones."

Sue also has perceptions of characteristics of both effective and ineffective teachers. One teacher, whom she recalls during college, often yelled at his students, was boring in class, and was "kind of tempermental" according to Sue. In college, she perceived ineffective teachers to be those who gave too much work and allowed too little time to complete the assignments. She believes that in these situations, students feel "spread too thin," and this often results in negative perceptions of the instructor. Sue summarizes her perceptions of ineffective teachers:

I'm put off by a teacher who stands in front of the room

> who reads even if it is their own publication. I m put off by any teacher who wants to speak to impress rather than to convey understanding. So I um you know we have classes with teachers who like to use this language, and it tunes me out, and I've talked to others and we have sat and read dictionaries trying to figure out what the teacher was saying... Talk about the bad teachers. I don't want my students to go home and look up words in the dictionary because trying to figure out what the heck I was saying in class. I don't like teachers to swear in class; I think that's, we're intelligent human beings... we can come with better language than that. I think it's disrespectful. I don't like it when teachers turn their back and scribble on the board or talk to a Power point or read a PowerPoint to students; I just don't care for any of that. Or teachers who sit down. You should be interacting with the students, and so I guess that's what I use. So yes there's lots of positive influences in there, but I... this is what I like, and this is want I don't like.

Sue's discourse in this excerpt depicts ineffective instructors who are boring in the classroom and who wield their power in a demeaning and condescending manner. She dislikes instructors who are disrespectful toward students by using curse words and who do not interact with students or who use less than adequate delivery methods. Sue's perception of ineffective teachers has shaped the approaches she employs in her classes today; the negative characteristics of ineffective teachers in her past have created perceptions of what she does not want to emulate a teacher.

Likewise, Deana, a junior faculty member teaching Computer Information Systems, recalls her experiences and perception of ineffective teaching. She remembers a high school teacher and her poor qualities: "I think I remember my English teacher but she was kind of…I would say kind of mean…I think she was just bad overall. She was just very mean." In Deana's college experience, ineffective teachers were those who were "kind of impersonal…kind of dry…very, very dry." She recalls that these instructors did not provide their students with a "fun learning experience" and often had a difficult time connecting the subject to the students.

Peter, a senior electronics faculty participant in the study, recalls having had both effective and ineffective teachers during his learning experiences, but Peter's perception is that he takes the experiences from both and applies them to his classroom and his teaching: "I've learned a lot sometimes from bad instructors. You know, I've caught myself walking out of lectures…I'd walk out of there and go 'God, I hope I don't do that to my students…God, somebody strike me dead if I ever do something like that to my students.' So you can learn as much from the really lousy instructors as you can from the good ones."

Summary

In most instances through the course of the data collection process, the participants relayed details and descriptions of what they perceived to be the traits and characteristics of effective teachers. These instructors are categorized in two manners: teacher-directed and student-directed. For those instructors who are teacher-directed, they employ modes of teaching that can be seen as administrative or "operationalized." These include such attributes as being on time, organized, disciplined, controlled, and creating a distance or separation in the teacher/student relationship. For those instructors who are student-directed, they utilize modes of teaching that are viewed as nurturing or responsive to students. Student-directed faculty use active and engaged methods of teaching and present dazzling teaching performances to pique students' interest in the subject. They also act as parents toward their students, providing care for students' personal issues and needs while developing a closer teacher/student relationship than those who are teacher-directed.

In other instances, however, the participants examined the alternate view—the traits and characteristics of ineffective teachers. These teachers exhibit difficulty in maintaining classroom control and discipline, display a lack of passion for their subject matter, use boring delivery methods, and are demeaning and condescending to students. Throughout the interviews, the participants recalled these details with the intent of reducing or eliminating those traits or characteristics in their own teaching repertoire.

"Planting of a Seed": How Methods Translate into Philosophy for DeVry/Chicago Faculty

Participants shared how various teaching methods translated into their philosophical approaches to their teaching. Two overriding educational philosophies emerged in the study—a "sink or swim" philosophy and a "hand-holding" philosophy. Although each participant may use different methodologies, each participant's teaching methods translates into one of these two philosophies.

Mark describes his philosophy on education, which was established through an assignment he was asked to complete during his doctoral studies:

> As part of my teaching philosophy I wrote about the fact that uh, wrote about this teacher and the fact that the interest that he instilled here evolved later on into picking up that book and reading it. And I, I tried to indicate that real education sometimes is just the planting of a seed...which has some uh, flowering later on. Who knows how much, how far you know?

Mark compares teaching to planting seeds, establishing foundations for later learning, and then expecting a "flowering," or blossoming, of the student as he or she applies the learning to educational and real-world instances.

> I like teaching the adults and I think uh...I'm uh...I just don't know, at my advanced age now, I don't know if the younger students could deal with me now as well as the more mature students in the night school.

In this excerpt, as Mark believes he is changing as an instructor as he gets older, he comments on the responsiveness of his students, and in turn, their receptiveness to his teaching methods. He is

uncertain as to whether his approaches and philosophies need to adapt to the type of students he sees at DeVry. His discourse identifies his ambiguity toward his students as he matures as an instructor.

Mark also discusses the teaching practices that he perceives to work best for the students in his writing class at DeVry/Chicago:

> I lecture and that's pretty much what I do, and I, and I don't want to say that I uh, that I shut off classroom discussion. I'm always open to questions. and I always invite questions. But, to be honest, in...in a professional writing course, the way that I teach it anyway, there's not a whole lot of room for opinions, you know? There are right ways to do things. A progress report is a certain kind of report, and you have to know it's made up and what the parts are and how it's made up and that kind of thing. And the best way to get that is for me to tell you and then to show you a couple of examples and then send you out to see if you get anything like that...so if I was teaching a literature course, for example, I think that I would teach it differently...it would be a discussion class. There's certain body of information they have to know so they have it at their disposal so they have it when they're sitting down trying to write this particular assignment....that's my approach. I have to give them this information.

Mark's perceptions of what subject he is teaching dictates how he will attempt to get his points across to his students. Mark is uses the teacher-directed approach within his courses, and he believes that certain subjects can be taught differently based on the nature of the content; some courses require more lecture from the instructor whereas other courses, like literature, may require more classroom discussion. Differentiated instruction is a philosophy Mark values and employs.

Mark also details his philosophy on challenging the student in his class to not only reach his expectations of them, but to also exceed these expectations. He discusses his philosophy:

> My attitude is in general if I want to ease up, I can always ease up...but if I start easy, I can't toughen up...it's much easier to get easier than to...loosen it right away...once, once, once you've uh gotten rid of the deadwood...once the ones that are still with you have gotten used to you a little bit...then you can relax your standards slightly. I never relax them all the way... No one rises to low expectations. So that's part of my attitude. My attitude is, you set the expectations up here (raises his hand above his head), and you challenge your students to reach them. And I think, okay, if I set the expectation up here (again raises his hand above his head), it's quite possible the students might only get this far (raises his hand to his chest)...but, if I set the expectation here (raises his hand to his chest again), they wouldn't even get that far okay? The furthest they would go is here...so I think that as an educator, you set the expectations way up there, challenge your best students to go for that. And in the process drag as many of the other ones along there as you possibly can. All right, the risk, of course...is that you lose some of them along the way. And sometimes you lose them because they aren't capable, and more often you lose them, I think, because they give up hope...all right, and that's sad, and so I try to keep encouraging them, and while I grade strictly and that kind of thing, I do have a...a variety of extra credit things that can happen along the way, although they don't always know about them ahead of time. So that, even somebody that's struggling can score points along the way and get over the hurdle. And the idea is that along the way, as they struggle, they'll get further than they would have otherwise...and that's the idea. It doesn't always happen, but I think it happens more often than not. So that's the first part....no one rises to low expectations.

Although Mark uses a phrase like "dead wood" as a connotation for students who may not meet expectations, he discusses his perceptions of how he challenges other students to meet and exceed expectations in his classroom. As shown previously, Mark's discourse includes views of some students as being "likeable" and others as struggling; he comments that those who leave the DeVry system often cause classroom disturbances, hindering those who truly wish to learn. Even though Mark sets his student expectations at a high level, he realizes his philosophy is risky; if he sets his expectations too high, he will lose students. Mark recognizes the danger in

his "sink or swim" philosophy as he states: "in the process [you] drag as many of the other ones along there as you possibly can...the risk of course is that you lose some of them along the way."

He perceives that his encouraging nature and enthusiasm in the classroom are also attributes, which allow students to be successful throughout his courses. Furthermore, Mark continues to discuss his philosophies on effective teaching:

> The second part is, of course education ought to be fun in some way. Uh...I think my students would tell you that the work is not fun, but I try to make the classes fun, as much as possible. And one of the things I do, and I don't know if the students like it or not, but uh I'm a connoisseur of cartoons. Okay, and a lot of times I find cartoons in the paper that relate to education stuff. And so I'll clip them out and, like I have cartoons on my midterm and final exams...I think they're pretty neat cartoons...and I try to do that just to lighten the load a little bit, and lighten the attitude.

In his view, Mark utilizes humor in the classroom to make students more at ease; he perceives that a fun learning experience will be a successful learning experience for his students. Finally, Mark details the last portion of his philosophy on effective teaching:

> The third part of my attitude when I was, when I was back in admissions and my son was a student here, one night he was at home playing video games on his computer, computer games, and I knew he had a midterm the next day, and I, you know, as a concerned parent, I said "What the hell are you doing?...you know I uh...you should be studying for your midterm!" And my son just looked at me and said, "Dad, don't worry, it's a blow-off course!"...and I tell my students this, because I tell them this story, and I say, I made up my mind at that time that no student would ever describe my class as a blow-off class. There's got to be some meat there. Umm...so those are the three cornerstones of my attitude, or philosophy okay? Uh...challenge them to reach higher than they thought they could, try and make it fun, and no blow off.

Mark's "sink or swim" philosophy of teaching concludes by his ability to challenge students to greater heights; he believes he induces students to achieve by being knowledgeable in his subject

area, by creating a fun and joyful learning environment, and through making his course meaningful and worthwhile to his students.

Janet's philosophy and approach to effective teaching is to simply make herself available to her students as much as possible. Janet perceives that, like Deana, she has "real world" experience to offer her students, and she makes the most of her time at DeVry/Chicago, by meeting with students, discussing the day's lesson, and making certain her students have understood the material. She discusses her approach:

> During my office hours, if I don't have students who have scheduled appointments, I just go downstairs to the lab to see who's there that needs help, and I work with them. Then, students who do Senior projects. I don't teach Senior projects, but then because I teach databases. And, often times, I've had the students in classes, they come back, and they ask questions... I pretty much work with students throughout the different programs: EET, CET. Yeah, they all come and I just help them. Whatever I can do to help a student...I tell them, you know. Well, the fact that the term ended, my class with you has ended, that doesn't mean that I can't help you...if you have questions, feel free. I present the concept and, um, I show them the code. How you do it. Why we do it. This way and different things. And then, we do like a little worksheet of the same concept. So now, they are doing it, and I say, "Ok, now there's going to be a lab on it. There's going to be a homework assignment on it." But we do the hands on in class and they can see exactly how it works. Ok, after that, ok, here is an in-class assignment. Go ahead and do it now that you've done your hands on...they do it again, so that's a third time. And then there's a lab associated with it, and after they do the lab, then they take a quiz on it...so, reinforcing it, over and over again...it makes a lot of difference.

Janet's perception of how she nurtures her students both in and out of the classroom is critical in how her philosophies have shaped the type of teacher she is today. Her philosophy toward her students—a "hold my hand" philosophy—contrasts sharply to Mike's "sink or swim" philosophy. Janet's ability to be flexible and open to change accentuates her students'

understanding of her highly technical and rapidly changing field. Her philosophy is similar to a parent; she is nurturing, maternal, and reaches out to her students to keep them involved and active.

Janet also relates her philosophy as to how and why she assesses their learning. She also describes her philosophy on grading and assessment in her classroom:

> I relate the labs. The labs are similar to what we would've done as an in-class assignment. Hands on in-class assignment. Sometimes I will grade those in-class assignments. And other times I would need to, you know, just go over it. And I make sure everybody has it done right. And then the lab would be quite similar to that. So that in terms of grading, they have already seen it before; they've done this. And I work with them, getting the lab done. They are able to do it very easily. Now, my policy, typically, is I don't accept anything late. And I tell them that from day one. It's in the syllabus. We go over that. I don't, I am not, uh, a fan of make-ups. I just tell them, "No make ups". You get so many different graded items all term long that, you know, one missed assignment or one missed quiz will not make that much of a difference. Now, having said that though, I let them know upfront, day one if there are any circumstances that would prevent you from coming in to take a quiz or to submit an assignment, you call me ahead of time, send me an e-mail to say I'm not coming to class because of "x,y, or z". Leave me a number. I'll call you; we'll make an arrangement. If it's quiz, you can come in. I'll make arrangements for you to take it. But if you just blow it off, you don't do anything...the students, they know my methodology. So they know that if there is anything that comes up, they call me. Or if they're going out of town, they let me know. And I say, you know, send me a reminder, and I'll remember it. If anything... if we do anything and you're absent, you're just going to be exempted from that. Or if I feel it is something that you really must have to do, then I'll give you an opportunity to do a make-up. So they know up front.

As an instructor, Janet perceives that she is fair and equitable in her assessment of her students' learning. She remains disciplined in her approach, yet she also is open to making arrangements with students if they meet with her to discuss their situation. This approach, as she perceives, typifies her caring and nurturing manner as a teacher.

Janet, moreover, discusses her attitudes and philosophy toward her students in general:

> I treat my students um I treat them with respect; I do treat them the same. The thing that's really worked for me is that I do not treat my students as a body of students. I treat them as individuals who have names to them. So I treat them more on a personal level. I work with them at that level so when I go into a class, they're just not a body. So you know, we have that one-on-one relationship, and I think because of that, a lot students when they have issues, personal issues, they come to me, and they talk to me about issues. And then you know, I direct them; I tell them, "this is where you need to go with this." If I didn't have that relationship with them, they wouldn't come to me...and this is both male and female. I have that type of relationship with both genders.

This excerpt illustrates Janet's perception of her teaching philosophies and approaches. As a caring and nurturing teacher, Janet takes the time to treat her students on a more personal level, getting to know and developing one-on-one relationships with each student so that she can better serve them. Janet perceives her relationships with her students as being a part of the larger picture; if she can aid them in their drive toward to success, she, in turn, validates her self-worth as a teacher.

When discussing the approaches and methods he uses in his electronics classes, Peter relates advice he was once given by his dean: "My dean once said that a successful teacher at DeVry needs to be one-third Gabe Kotter, from 'Welcome Back, Kotter' the 70s TV series, one-third Professor Kingsfield, and one-third Eddie Murphy." Peter's reference indicates finding a balance in one's teaching style between a caring and nurturing approach like Gabe Kotter's, a more serious, business-like approach like Professor Kingsfield's, and a humorous stance like the comedian, Eddie Murphy. In his teaching, Peter strives to strike a balance between the "sink or swim" and "hold my hand" philosophies.

Peter perceives that within his electronics curriculum, the courses he teaches "have content that has a half-life of around six months." Therefore, Peter understands that his most significant approach in teaching his students is to allow students the "opportunity to research cutting edge hardware and technology at the beginning of the term and repeat the assignment at the end of the term. They see for themselves that technologies and equipment that was cutting edge is mere ho-hum four months later."

Peter's main approach toward his students, however, is to promote quality teaching and learning experiences in the classroom. He insists his students learn what industry expects they should know upon graduation and wants them to leave as graduates who will be successful upon entering the workplace.

Deana, a junior faculty who teaches in the CIS program at DeVry/Chicago, perceives that she has become a better teacher over the years because she has used her "real world" experience in the computer industry to bring about greater learning for her students. She details her perceptions:

> I think um if I had to say one thing it would be the struggle that I had to go through because of the knowledge that I didn't have. Ok and which was one of the reasons why once I started teaching. I knew that I wanted to teach in this field—information systems. Not because of my masters but because I wanted to actually teach what I knew and also teaching to teach students that this is something that they don't teach you in school, my real world experience, and this is what you need to know because when you walk out that door, even though you have that degree, they're going to expect you to do certain things. And you can't say "well they didn't teach me that". They should have taught you that you know.

In Deana's view, she has brought more from her "real-world" experience to her classroom than actual teaching experience; her experiences in the computer field demonstrate viable work-

related knowledge and understanding for her students. Deana believes a quality education must include "real world" experiences and applications, and her perception of what students in her classroom need to know in order to be successful in industry can be gained from what she has experienced throughout her years of working in the computer field.

As a senior electronics faculty member, Scott's main approach to the DeVry University student is simple—treat the students as adults. He believes respect goes a long way in the classroom and details these nurturing points:

> I say, 'you guys are all adults.' You know, they're not in high school. I tell them, you have to accept responsibility of being an adult. In my class, you're an adult; you're responsible. These are choices each individual makes. You treat them as people. You treat them as adults. I'll tell you, it's invigorating to be with students. They're my students, my kids. You've got to maintain your professionalism because otherwise, students see that. I think overall, because I treat students fairly, warmly, that increases my effectiveness in the classroom. They respect. Uh, I respect them, and I think that's a round robin here.

Scott's perception of his student learners is that they are his "kids;" as a caring instructor, he takes ownership in treating his "children" as adults. Like a nurturing father, Scott treats his kids "fairly, warmly" and attempts to treat his students with respect. In Scott's mind though, respect must be mutual, or a "round robin." Scott also feels that professionalism as an instructor is just as important as treating students with respect.

Finally, Virginia explains her nurturing, caring approach when working with her students at DeVry/Chicago:

> The content is extremely important, and yes, there should be a flow, but my worry is not what they do in my class, but what they're going to do in the next class. I tell my students, whether I teach business or whether I teach career development, whether

> I teach any of the subjects I taught here, including math, I say to them, if you learn two things—1) don't be afraid to ask, and 2) that you know more than you think you know. If you know that, then I don't worry about you in the next class.

Virginia, who is the senior faculty member in this study, understands the bigger picture in the DeVry system. She believes that students should try to do well in her mathematics class, but the larger issue, in her mind, is that students learn to learn; her educational philosophy is future-oriented—a "flowering." Virginia perceives that if her students can learn how to learn, then they have a greater chance of success in future courses as well as in future career positions. In doing so, she keeps her students close to her, forming a bond between teacher and student.

Summary

Each participant in this study commented on their perceptions of the various approaches and methods they use to connect their subject matter with their students. Participants primarily employ a "sink or swim" or "hold my hand" educational philosophy; others attempt to find a balance between the two philosophies. Although each participant may have noted different strategies or methodologies which may work best for them, each participant translates their methods to particular educational philosophies.

Conclusion

Participants shared similarities of how they view and interpret their institution and its mission in the first section of Chapter Four. Participants also identified the diverse nature of the student population at DeVry/Chicago, students' specific learning needs, and which approaches and teaching methods work best to connect with the students at their campus. More specifically,

DeVry faculty recognize their students to be desperate and struggling individuals, who lack outside support systems which could aid in their academic and personal success. Additionally, faculty view their students as being culturally diverse, exhibiting a variety of modes which indicate how they socialize, behave, and make meaning of their environment. DeVry faculty also perceive their students to be academically unprepared when they enter the classroom; however, faculty indicate their students approach education with high motivation levels and are willing to commit to learning as they realize education is the key to their future success.

In the second section of Chapter Four, themes have emerged which demonstrate how the participants' life stories. Parental expectations and career trajectories shaped the participants' lives. The participants discussed perceptions of how parental expectations influenced them to enter the field of education and later to become teachers. Participants also conveyed perceptions of how their career trajectories, or career paths, have led them to become faculty at DeVry/Chicago. Participants highlighted their educational experiences and how these experiences shaped their lives as teachers, and how field-based experiences, including administrative experiences within higher education, shaped how they view the DeVry University organization and its philosophies and policies today. Other participants held field-based positions completely outside the realm of education. These positions include working in the electronics or computer fields; one participant sold vacuum cleaners door-to-door. Participants also expressed their notions of how they became DeVry faculty; some participants expected to enter the field, while others did so unexpectedly, as they "fell into teaching."

Participants reflected upon teaching and their "teacher education" in Chapter Four's third section. Participants perceived their "teacher education" to have transpired through one of two approaches: a formal approach or an informal approach. Participants, who learned to teach

through a formal approach, enrolled in and attended college to learn to become a teacher and then earned teacher certification; participants, who learned to teach through an informal approach, detailed significant experiences related to teaching others, including other college students, friends, or siblings they may have tutored during their formative years. Participants perceived these experiences to be influential in their development as future teachers, and these experiences often served as their initial teacher training.

Participants' reflections on teaching also revealed their perceptions of effective and ineffective attributes of teachers and their methods and modes of delivery. Participants also reflected upon how these attributes translate into the educational philosophies they have adopted with their teaching at DeVry/Chicago.

The purpose and general nature of this study was to examine how participants, seven faculty members at DeVry/Chicago, perceive the institution, culture, and mission where they teach and how they viewed DeVry learners and their specific needs. This study examined how participants perceive how they were influenced to become teachers and how their career trajectory led them into the field of education. Participants reflected on teaching as well, including their perceptions of how they learned to teach, how they view effective teaching, and how these effective teaching ideas translate into their educational philosophy.

Chapter Five

Summary, Implications, and Conclusions

> What you learn is not from textbooks. It's what you learn from others and how you put to work what you have...it doesn't make any difference if you get a degree, if you don't put it to use... I don't care how you use it. Use it. Cover up the crack in your wall but use it in some way... what I've learned is how to learn...how to go find the information.
>
> --Virginia, DeVry/Chicago

Within the changing landscape of higher education, for-profit institutions, like DeVry University, fill a special need, particularly for non-traditional students. But more specifically, what is the niche DeVry University fills and why does it matter? Because the curricula at DeVry University focuses on distinct subject matter, particularly technological-based subject matter, employers feel students are ready to be placed within their organization immediately upon graduation. Graduates of for-profit institutions typically have learned field-based concepts and theories, and with a thorough knowledge base within their specific program of study, are effectively prepared to enter business and industry. Additionally, with hands-on experience, along with valuable internships and externships, for-profit graduates are equipped and able to begin their planned career.

For-profit institutions fill this particular need within higher education as they provide the tools necessary to aid their students in learning a vocation and preparing for future careers.

The next significant question, then, is why does it matter that for-profit institutions fill a niche within higher education? As the landscape of higher education continues to change and evolve, it matters because for-profit institutions, and DeVry University specifically, offers an education to those who may otherwise not have been granted an opportunity. DeVry University affords these students the opportunity to become productive members of society who have a real chance at employment success. If they flourish professionally, the likelihood of them attributing that success to their education increases, which translates into a deep appreciation for education and encouragement for future generations to educate themselves as well. This "border group," armed with a DeVry education, will now have a voice, an opportunity to help bridge the gap between the "haves" and the "have-nots".

The purpose of this study was to examine conditions relating to teacher preparation and practice and how they influence teacher effectiveness at for-profit institutions of higher education. The specific case selected, the Chicago campus of DeVry University, was used, therefore, to focus on the perceptions and experiences of faculty at this campus. This study has implications for all for-profit university faculty and administrators, who serve undergraduate, career-oriented students.

Within Chapter Five, I reflect on the findings with regard to my original research questions relating to the experience of faculty members who teach at for-profit institutions of higher education, how they develop their approaches and philosophies of teaching, and how institutional structures, policies, and culture shape their understanding of their role as faculty.

Additionally, I consider how DeVry/Chicago faculty construct an identity as faculty and what are their processes of development as teachers.

The answers to my original research questions emerged within the findings of this narrative case study, which encompasses three interrelated themes: 1) Who are we?: The institution, its mission, and its students, their learning needs, and their differences within differences; 2) Life stories: Decisions to teach, parental expectations, and career trajectories; and 3) Reflections on teaching: Teacher education, perceptions of effective and ineffective teaching, and how methods translate into philosophy.

Summary of Findings and Implications

Who are We?

The Institution and Its Mission

Throughout the first section of Chapter Four, participants share similarities of how they view and interpret their institution and its mission. The senior and junior faculty participants today see DeVry University as an institution of higher education that has two faces; these differences are most notable as generational differences in understanding the culture and mission of DeVry University and its students' needs.

For senior faculty, who have taught at DeVry for more than fifteen years and who have seen DeVry, which was developed primarily for repairing radios and televisions and which was run like a business, change and evolve into an institution which fosters student learning for career-oriented learners, their perceptions of their role as faculty is to provide students with knowledge and understanding of how to be successful in their careers. Senior faculty's

experience at DeVry, throughout the course of many years, has shaped these perceptions, and prompts them to continue to use experience to provide students with the appropriate lessons necessary for future success.

For junior faculty, who are still attempting to find their way in the DeVry culture by teaching the rigid terminal course objectives as established by DeVry's administration, their understanding of the mission of DeVry is different than the senior faculty. Although they perceive using the terminal course objectives as a means to foster student learning, their notion of educating their students is different; they feel as if they may fail, or they may not "fit the mold" of DeVry faculty, if they do not apply DeVry's methodologies and strategies to their teaching. Their experience, just as significant in their minds yet not nearly as sweeping due to their lack of service at DeVry, has shaped these perceptions. Their experiences, as suggested by those who have taught for several years longer than they have, is to "not recreate the wheel" and attempt to fit into DeVry's culture as best as possible. Junior faculty perceive that there is "no compromise" in this situation and feel they must conform to this culture in order to be successful faculty members. The experiences of new faculty are accentuated by pressure, stress, and uncertainty (Austin, 2002).

One implication for for-profit institutions is that the socialization process for new faculty will need to change in order for new faculty to develop positive conceptions about their careers in academics and their role as faculty (Austin, 2002). For new Ph.D. graduates entering faculty positions throughout higher education, the implication is that they will need to quickly and effectively adjust to the culture of the institution, even more so if they wish to teach at for-profit institution.

Because there is often insufficient understanding of faculty roles, Ph.D. students who are considering entering the teaching realm frequently struggle with the faculty workload (Austin, 2002). The socialization process, therefore, needs to change by ensuring that all newly hired faculty fully understand the culture, mission, and policies of the institution prior to accepting a faculty position at a for-profit institution. Likewise, Ph.D. granting institutions must to a better job of illustrating and clarifying teaching and learning environments for their student population.

Senior faculty understand their role at DeVry better than junior faculty. Due to their lengthy tenure at DeVry, they acknowledge the inherited culture that comes with teaching at DeVry and perceive the institution's mission to be more than simply preparing students for a career. Senior faculty understand that their role is not simply to address and fulfill obligations according to terminal course objectives; they know that they must provide their students with the knowledge and confidence to become learners, those who must adapt and learn how to learn. Senior faculty understand their role as faculty as those who must create a love of learning for their students, which the students then can utilize throughout their lives in many capacities.

The faculty participants who commented on the culture of DeVry University share similar yet different experiences of their roles as faculty. Although they do perceive DeVry to be a non-traditional institution of higher education, which places a premium on instruction and does not include research as a priority for their faculty, the understanding of their roles is different.

For junior faculty, a transmittal of culture has developed; junior faculty take cues and suggestions from senior faculty members, providing strategies and methods for "fitting in" to the DeVry culture and shaping views of how an instructor can become successful in this particular culture.

Another significant change that is seen in the changing landscape of higher education in America is the influx of adjunct faculty. Since one participant in the study is an adjunct instructor at DeVry University, it must also be noted that there are implications for institutions of higher education who depend upon hiring part-time faculty. Often, for for-profits, success or failure depends on the school's ability to attract high caliber adjunct faculty, especially in competitive urban markets (Halfond, 2000).

There are direct implications for for-profit institutions as faculty are drawn from industry, bringing managerial and professional experience to the classroom, not necessarily refined teaching skills. In many instances, the institution must create faculty professional development activities, including training and orientation seminars, in order to allow the faculty member to begin to adapt to the institution's culture. For-profit institutions, who hire and train the new professoriate, must manage the mix of full-time and part-time instructors effectively so that availability and circumstances do not dictate the composition of the adjunct faculty.

Another important theme that emerged was that senior faculty perceive that teaching their students how to learn is the most critical element; for junior faculty, their perception of becoming a successful faculty member at DeVry is through teaching only the terminal course objectives and fitting into the DeVry culture. The problem communicated here, however, is one of confusion and contradiction based on participants' discourse. An identity crisis has occurred within the DeVry culture for faculty—what exactly is DeVry and how do we fit into the culture itself?

This confusion causes tension and internal conflict for faculty, even for those who have been employed within the system for several years. Faculty discourse, then, becomes reactive

and often defensive, as those outside of the DeVry system may question how DeVry faculty conduct their instruction and contest their lack of research.

If the DeVry faculty member is in conflict though, then why do they remain at DeVry and continue to teach? Perhaps they stay because of the challenge DeVry and its students present. Teaching the DeVry student, who has quite specific learning needs, forces faculty stay focused, educated, and teaching to the best of their abilities. Perhaps faculty have a desire to give a marginalized group, like the DeVry student, a voice, an opportunity. Perhaps faculty continue to teach at DeVry because of the great sense of job satisfaction they feel due to the sacrifices their students make as they are so desperate to get an education. The answer to this question varies, as participants continue to understand the mission and their place within DeVry University.

These faculty perceptions have been shaped by years of service at DeVry, and through a greater understanding of the bigger picture of DeVry University's mission, faculty at DeVry may one day be relieved of this internal struggle.

The For-Profit Student, Their Learning Needs, and Their Differences within Differences

Also within the first section of Chapter Four, participants identify the diverse nature of the student population at DeVry/Chicago, students' specific learning needs, and which approaches and teaching methods work best to connect with the students at their campus. DeVry faculty, more specifically, see their students as desperate and struggling individuals, who lack outside support systems which could aid in their academic and personal success. In addition, faculty view their students as being culturally diverse, exhibiting a variety of modes which indicate how they socialize, behave, and make meaning of their environment. DeVry faculty

also perceive their students to be academically unprepared when they enter the classroom; however, faculty indicate their students approach education with high motivation levels and are willing to commit to learning as they realize education is the key to their future success.

The faculty who participated in this study perceive that the DeVry student has sincere differences based on students' experiences and specific learning needs, which are seen by DeVry's faculty on a daily basis.

DeVry's students, according to faculty, are likeable, diligent, and diverse. Their struggles through life have placed them "on the fringe" in most circumstances, and these experiences often bring about feelings of empathy and hopefulness for future successes from their instructors.

On the other hand, DeVry students' successes are often perceived by faculty as the faculty member's own success. When a student is successful, faculty view this success as having effectively taught; the student's success is validated by the instructor. Conversely, teaching is the reward for the instructor. Education, therefore, is viewed as a gift—for both the student and teacher.

Another intriguing question though is: Why are certain students attracted to for-profit institutions of higher education, like DeVry University, in the first place? The primary reason is that along with the high percentage rate of job placement that for-profits offer, students understand that they can graduate—in a relatively short period of time—with the necessary skills to begin a job upon graduation. The goal for most for-profit students is a good job that pays well, which well then somehow change one or more aspects of their current lifestyle. Another reason is that many students are attracted to the current student population at for-profits; these students

do not feel as marginalized because many of the present students are, or have been, in similar situations.

Because these students struggle and overcome incredible obstacles, faculty gain a greater sense of job satisfaction when teaching those who may not personally or professionally challenge them or strive for success as passionately as their DeVry students. As participants suggested, most of these students are sacrificing a great deal to get to come and desperately want to get an education. Faculty derive a great sense of self-satisfaction in aiding those who struggle and providing them with the tools to attain their goals, giving them a sense of personal success with a realistic hope for financial security as well. DeVry faculty, then, have a hand in bringing this group of individuals from the margins of our society. DeVry faculty are both individually and collectively involved in helping to not only begin their students'educational journey, but more importantly, to perpetuate the cycle of learning.

Life Stories: Decisions to Teach

In the second section of Chapter Four, themes have emerged which demonstrate how the participants' stories have shaped their lives. Parental expectations and career trajectories are two key themes, which form the participants' life stories.

Parental Expectations

The participants discuss perceptions of how parental expectations influenced them to enter the field of education and later to become teachers. For five of the seven participants in this study, education was perceived to be valued and was greatly stressed in their family; these five participants were influenced to continue their education by their parents throughout their lives. For those five participants who indicated their parents held strong educational influences and

high expectations for furthering their education, the participants also want to pass down their encouragement and influence on to their own children's education; a "passing of the torch" of education is evident among these participants. For the remaining two participants, education was not perceived as a priority in their childhood, but through finding a passion for their subject and through diligence and hard work, they were able to succeed in education to become faculty members at DeVry University.

In general, the seven participants in the study showed interest in extracurricular activities and organizations throughout their childhood and into college. Although two participants, Peter and Scott, did not actually participate in extracurricular activities nor did they have parental educational influences, their passion for their subject was shown at an early age. Participants who had strong parental encouragement were active and engaged; on the other hand, those participants who had little influence or encouragement were less engaged.

Each participant, however, did identify at least one individual—a parent, teacher, coach, organization sponsor, or other family member—who took interest in their lives and educational endeavors and made a difference. Each participant described one individual who exhibited a sense of caring or nurturing toward him/her or made the classroom experiences interesting or fun for him/her. These experiences are what shaped them to become the educators they are today DeVry/Chicago.

Current for-profit students somehow procured a passion for something—education, subject matter knowledge, career advancement, job security. This passion and desire were instilled in them and brought them to DeVry. Faculty, some brought to education for the same reasons as their students and others brought due to enormous support and high educational expectations from family, are motivated to keep those students in school, educate them, teach

them how to learn and provide them with the tools of success. One thing is static here though; faculty value education so deeply that they take their appreciation for it and extend it to others in their world community. Once students are enrolled at DeVry, faculty members, in a sense, become parents or caregivers, passing down their knowledge and encouraging their charges to equally appreciate education. This exchange may, in turn, cause the students to do the same in their households and their communities, as participants have noted. DeVry's faculty, then, are changing the face of education one person at a time, one generation at a time.

As all of these faculty concurred, support from an outside source was crucial to their academic achievement. Even those faculty whose families supported their educational endeavors needed others outside of family to encourage them to continue. The same applies to the DeVry learner; imparting knowledge is simply not enough as a great deal of outside influences—poverty, work obligations and environments, and lack of familial support—distract him/her from pursuing education. There is an enormous need for support outside of their home environments and encouragement to stay motivated. These seven instructors, understanding their students' needs, take on that additional responsibility, and that is yet another reason their students' successes become theirs as well.

Career Trajectories

Participants also convey perceptions of how their career trajectories, or career paths, which have lead them to become faculty at DeVry/Chicago. Participants highlight their educational experiences and how these experiences shaped their lives as teachers, and how field-based experiences, including administrative experiences within higher education, shaped how they view the DeVry University organization and its philosophies and policies today. Other participants held field-based positions completely outside the realm of education, including

positions within the electronics or computer fields; one participant even identifies his position as a salesman, selling vacuum cleaners door-to-door, as his most significant work-related experience. Participants also express their notions of how they became DeVry faculty; some participants expected to enter the field, while others did so unexpectedly, as they "fell into teaching."

The career trajectories of the participants were influenced by a variety of work-related experiences, or work-related experiences within institutions of higher education but outside the teaching realm. Many faculty at for-profit institutions are differently prepared. Many full-time and part-time faculty have tremendous business and industry experience, which allows students to gain real-world insight through cases and examples. In this study, six of the seven participants have had business and industry experience prior to beginning their teaching career at DeVry/Chicago.

Many for-profit faculty, primarily full-time members, have strong backgrounds and experience working as administrators and/or teaching in higher education as well as in other levels of education, including grade school and high schools (Ruch, 2001). These notions hold true in this study, as five of the seven participants have either worked as an administrator or have taught at other institutions of higher educationTwo participants, however, have experience teaching at the junior high and high school levels. Many of these professors have degrees in education, where pedagogy and classroom management courses serve as their basis to enter the world of education (Ruch, 2001); in this study, two participants have education degrees, and three other participants have completed courses for advanced degrees in education.

With great diversity in their training in terms of educational background and prior work experiences, these faculty were exposed to various types of people in different settings. Armed

with this knowledge from outside of the academic arena, they enter DeVry open to diverse populations with a greater ability to adjust to their students' specific learning and educational needs.

The differences or diversity in their preparation lends directly to DeVry's culture. They have a responsibility to appeal to their students' different learning styles in relationship to the students' outside environment. DeVry faculty often become salespeople, selling the DeVry education as a commodity that their students cannot live without.

The expectation, then, is that faculty, as well as students, take an active, rather than passive, role, creating an empowered and motivated learning environment. Because this education is providing students with an opportunity to attain a higher standard of life, expectations for student preparation and participation is high. Students are expected to take equal responsibility in their education. That is one of the reasons their success is so rewarding for the participants in this study. Students overcome countless obstacles to use the tools provided by faculty to attain personal and professional goals.

Reflections on Teaching

Teacher Education

Participants reflect on teaching and their "teacher education" within the third section of Chapter Four. Participants perceive their "teacher education" to have transpired through one of two approaches: a formal approach or an informal approach. Participants, who learned to teach through a formal approach, enrolled in and attended college to learn to become a teacher and then earned teacher certification. On the other hand, participants, who learned to teach through an informal approach, described significant experiences related to teaching others, including other students they may have tutored in college study groups. These participants perceive these

experiences to be influential in their development as future teachers, and these experiences often served as their initial teacher training.

Each participant in this study shared their experience and their perception of how they learned to teach; each narrative was interesting and unique. Two participants learned to teach through formal teacher training, completing college coursework to earn a degree in education. The other five participants, on the other hand, learned to teach through informal approaches, which included peer tutoring during collegiate years, on-the-job training at DeVry or other institutions of higher education, classroom observation of other instructors, and by being mentored by senior faculty. Each participant shared an instance or period in their lives where they perceive they had, formally or informally, learned to teach.

Formally or informally trained, what seems to be the common thread is the fact that each participant learned, in some way, to deal with people from all walks of life, in general. What is key here is the fact that they entered a specific climate and have adapted their individual teaching style to that particular environment. Through experimentation, discussion, and conformity, they have found a level of success, which works for them.

Their ideas for effective teaching, while not all the same, boil down to the DeVry learner and meeting his/her needs, fulfilling the mission of DeVry, and how their individual styles blend into an institutional philosophy of education—"to teach and foster student learning through high quality, career oriented undergraduate and graduate programs in technology, business, and management" (DeVry University Catalog, 2005).

DeVry faculty members are not at DeVry to research; they perceive they are at DeVry to impart knowledge and to inspire students to use that knowledge to become successful both personally and professionally. If they can accomplish that, they, in turn, feel they are successful.

Perceptions of Effective and Ineffective Teaching

Participants' reflections on teaching also reveal their perceptions of effective and ineffective attributes of teachers and their methods and modes of delivery. Participants often recalled their teaching and learning experiences and identified instructors and their philosophies and approaches that were effective; however, in other instances, the participants described instructors who were ineffective in the classroom. The latter remained etched in the participants' minds, and throughout the interviews, the participants detailed their perceptions as to how they wanted to provide better teaching to their students than their ineffective instructor had provided them.

In most instances through the course of the data collection process, the participants relayed details and descriptions of what they perceived to be the traits and characteristics of effective teachers. These instructors are categorized in two manners: teacher-directed and student-directed. For those instructors who are teacher-directed, they employ modes of teaching that can be seen as administrative or "operationalized." These include such attributes as being on time, organized, disciplined, controlled, and creating a distance or separation in the teacher/student relationship. For those instructors who are student-directed, they utilize modes of teaching that are viewed as nurturing or responsive to students. Student-directed faculty use active and engaged methods of teaching and present dazzling teaching performances to pique students' interest in the subject. They also act as parents toward their students, providing care for students' personal issues and needs while developing a closer teacher/student relationship than those who are teacher-directed.

Most participants illustrated four main components when describing ineffective teachers: those who lack discipline in the classroom, display a lack of passion for their subject, demonstrate "boring" modes of classroom delivery, and are demeaning or condescending to students. Throughout the interviews, the participants recalled these details with the intent of reducing or eliminating those traits or characteristics in their own teaching repertoire.

Faculty professional development is the key implication here for for-profit institutions. The primary goal of education is to nurture discovery and growth in both students and teachers; if educators are not committed to this aim, then their role is deprived of moral justification. Because educational institutions are comprised of barriers, which oftentimes are obstacles to obtaining the primary goal of education, teachers often are inadequately prepared as practitioners. Until the preparation of teachers is directly met through continuing to become learners themselves, then the primary goal of education will remain to be reached (Sarason, 2003). Participants distinctively identified the importance of why participating in professional development—through formal or informal activities—is valued among faculty at DeVry/Chicago and is critical for their continuing education and life-long learning endeavors.

Eimers, Braxton, and Bayer (2001) understand the necessity of quality professional and field-based experience for faculty. Throughout their research, nearly every article or report they reviewed suggested that all higher education faculty "should strive to enhance their skills as a college teacher" (p. 576). It is essential for faculty to gain valuable professional or field-based experiences as "the ability to analyze the teaching situation, to monitor one's own effectiveness, and to adapt one's methods to a particular class and a particular teaching situation are elements in continuing development as a faculty member" (p. 576).

Professional development opportunities for full-time faculty, as well as for adjunct instructors, is an invaluable service at for-profit institutions. Presenting faculty with worthwhile professional development opportunities allows them to gain useful and pragmatic learning experiences (Petrisko, 1999). Practical professional development activities "ensure that all faculty are as prepared as possible to deliver high-quality instruction to their student" (Petrisko, 1999, p. 81).

Participants in the study also discussed the necessity to exhibit passion in their classrooms when it comes to teaching their subject. Exhibiting passion about one's subject is critical in regards to the primary aim of education, for "if teaching becomes neither terribly interesting nor exciting to many teachers, can one expect them to make learning interesting or exciting?" (Sarason, 1996). Each participant commented on their perception of the necessity of displaying passion about their subjects within the classroom, and each participant perceived that the stronger the passion one exhibits, the greater the success of their students. More often than not, formal and informal professional development activities can re-ignite the passion for one's subject.

Faculty in the study also briefly hinted at another problem often encountered by faculty as they further their professional experience—teacher burnout. Teacher burnout involves a change in behavior and attitude, typically in response to a frustrating, demanding, or unrewarding work experience. In general, burnout refers to "negative changes in work-related attitudes and behaviors in response to job stress" (Sarason, 1996, p. 203). Implications for situations such as teacher burnout can be easily identified, and can be easily solved, too—potentially. By providing faculty with sufficient time to participate in professional development activities and increasing budgets to fund these experiences, for-profit institutions, along with all

institutions of higher education, can begin to eliminate the problem of teacher burnout. Participants in the study perceived this to be a critical need for DeVry/Chicago faculty. Allowing faculty to participate in professional development activities means better prepared faculty, and in turn, creates stronger opportunities for improved teaching and learning in the classroom.

Participating in faculty professional development—through either formal or informal activities—is critical. Based upon participants' discourse and the scholarly literature I examined throughout the study, I call for faculty to pursue formal or informal professional development activities to enhance their teaching in order to better meet students' needs and to rejuvenate one's passion for subject matter and teaching in general.

These faculty professional development activities, again, can exist in formal or informal frames. Formal activities, which can be pursued at any institution of higher education, include the following: seeking an advanced degree within one's specific subject area or within the education realm; participating in conferences, seminars, or workshops designed to enhance pedagogy; partaking in faculty-initiated observation seminars, which are developed to better understand student behavior and thinking (Sarason, 1986); and forming peer mentoring or peer coaching groups designed to allow veteran faculty to assist and support newer, younger faculty.

For DeVry/Chicago faculty specifically, I recommend participation in the following formal professional development activities: pursuing further teacher training through the faculty-driven TEC Plus course (Teaching Excellence Course Plus), a course designed in 2004 to aid faculty in improving pedagogical methods as well as to develop more effective online teaching strategies within DeVry's required supplemental online component, iOptimize; seeking further, more advanced teacher training, through DeVry's ETC (Excellence in Teaching Course) which

is offered online and includes specific recommendations for better understanding of teaching and learning styles; and partaking in the New Faculty Orientation Program (NFOP), which is offered to newly hired faculty as they make their transition into the unique culture of DeVry University.

Although there are several avenues for faculty professional development already in place for DeVry faculty, motivation for faculty to participate in these programs has been problematic. For newly hired faculty, participation in the NFOP and TEC Plus programs are required; both programs acclimate the new instructor to DeVry, its mission and culture, and policies and procedures that are necessary to begin teaching. For veteran faculty, however, there is no policy which dictates that faculty dedicate a particular amount of time to professional development; the policy simply indicates that faculty should remain current in their field. My recommendation, then, is that DeVry administration determines and requires a minimum number of hours of professional development for faculty. Minimally, I believe faculty should be required to participate in at least twelve hours of professional development per year. In conjunction with a policy of this nature, administration should allow faculty release time in order to fulfill this requirement. Using a required number of hours to propel faculty to pursue worthwhile professional development activities, then, could also motivate faculty to gain increased motivation to seek advanced forms of professional development.

Informal faculty professional development activities are another crucial element, which I recommend faculty at DeVry, or any institution of higher education, for that matter, pursue. These activities include the following: dialoguing informally with other faculty in order to remain current within one's field; reading scholarly literature which allows for greater enhancement of the changing nature of one's field or which directly relates to improved

pedagogy; and creating "brown bag lunches," an informal gathering of faculty around lunchtime, designed to discuss relevant educational or subject matter issues. Reading scholarly literature, although an entirely informal method of professional development, is significant. Educational practitioners must read literature in their fields "to *want* to know what others are thinking and writing because they feel they *need* to in order to have the sense that they are intellectually-

Professionally alive and enlarging their horizon" (Sarason, 1993, p. 130). Again, motivating faculty to participate in professional development activities is often troublesome for administration; however, faculty must become self-motivated in any many instances, and specifically toward informal professional development activities, in order to gain greater insight to one's field and the teaching and learning process.

Regardless of the formal or informal nature of the activity, strategies, which will improve one's teaching, are significant in the development process of all faculty; student input is also an equally effective tool. DeVry's culture, being student centered, allows for students to interject their recommendations to instructors through the use of student evaluations, or in DeVry terminology, SIFFs (Student Information Feedback Forms). In this way, students are able to communicate with the instructor which elements worked well while teaching or those that did not work as well. Unlike most of the participants in the study, who sat passively and lamented their ineffective instructors, DeVry's student population becomes actively involved in the teaching and learning process. Instructors become more adept at understanding their students' needs through constructive and legitimate comments. SIFFs work so well for all types of DeVry instructors because they gives those who are more teacher-directed a glimpse at how better to

pique student interest, and it provides the student-directed instructors a guide for particular "operational" needs that may not have been addressed.

Translating Methods into Educational Philosophy

Armed with this information as well as past experience both as student and instructor, participants translate that into the educational philosophies they have adopted with their teaching at DeVry/Chicago. Each participant in this study commented on their perceptions of the various approaches and methods they use to connect their subject matter with their students. Participants primarily employ a "sink or swim" or "hold my hand" educational philosophy; others attempt to find a balance between the two philosophies. Although each participant may have noted different strategies or methodologies, which may work best for them, each participant translates their methods to particular educational philosophies. As teaching and fostering student learning is the principle mission of DeVry University, much like other for-profit institutions, participants shape their educational philosophies to effectively tie into DeVry's culture.

DeVry/Chicago's faculty are a microcosm of America because they, too, are a "melting pot." Teachers, from diverse backgrounds, come together to create their own unique culture and educational climate. DeVry, as a for-profit institution, and its students set limits on their approaches, but like America itself, conforming does not mean losing total individuality. Rather, these instructors each bring something special and unique to DeVry, and through faculty professional development, they work tirelessly to perfect their personal educational philosophies in an attempt to blend it seamlessly with DeVry institutional philosophies.

Recommendations for Further Study

The findings of my study and the acceptance of the themes which emerged open countless possibilities for further study. First, six of the seven participants were born and raised within the United States; one participant, Janet, was born and raised in the United Kingdom. Could participants with varying nativity have made an impact on the themes of the teaching experience at DeVry/Chicago? Perhaps participants from other countries could be interviewed for further study.

Similarly, did race effect the results of my study? Five of the seven participants were white, while the other two participants were black. Could African-Americans from other regions of the United States and who may approach teaching and meeting students' needs differently produce varying results? Is there a difference in how blacks born and raised in the United States compared with blacks born and raised in other countries in regard to their experience teaching within higher education? For that matter, how do whites from other regions of the United States experience teaching within higher education? Is there a difference in how whites born and raised in the United States compared to whites born and raised in other countries in regard to their teaching experience? These are just a few of the questions relating to race that could studied further.

In regards to gender, four participants were women; three participants were men. During the course of the interview process, gender issues arose. I contend it would be interesting to explore these issues in greater depth. To what degree were the teaching and learning experiences different for men and for women?

Another intriguing aspect of the study to consider would be to examine differences among teachers who were raised in urban environments compared to those who were raised in suburban or even rural environments. Within my study, there were noticeable differences among the participants in this regard. Could the environment where a teacher was raised and educated influence one's teaching and learning experiences?

Furthermore, does the age of the participant impact my study's findings? Four participants in the study were deemed to be Senior Faculty Participants, while three were considered to be Junior Faculty Participants. While these labels were selected primarily due to years served teaching at DeVry University, are there generational differences among participants? If so, and I assert there are, could these generational differences alter the findings? I believe further study is needed in this regard.

Another aspect for further study would be to examine differences experienced by faculty based on their discipline. Do technically based faculty, for example, experience teaching differently than non-technical faculty? Are there separate differences even among technical instructors? For example, do electronics faculty experience teaching differently than computer teachers, as the world of computers evolves alarmingly fast, almost daily? At any institution of higher education where technical degrees are offered, these questions may be worth examining.

Lastly, are there differences among participants and their varying methods or approaches to teaching? As shown in Chapter Four, participants in my study exhibited a "sink or swim" or "hold my hand" philosophy in regards to teaching DeVry/Chicago students. To what degree were teaching and learning experiences different for those who employ the "sink or swim" methods of teaching and for those who utilize the "hold my hand" approaches to teaching? Does

a less personal, stricter approach to students compared to a more personal, friendly approach to students create a different teaching and learning experience for faculty?

Differences among such factors as race, country of origin, gender, or environment may shape the study differently based on faculty members' belief systems, values, and assumptions. Embedded in the complexity of a study's determining factors, the findings of the study may be shaped differently. For example, questions for a future study relating to the issue of an instructor's nativity may note differences how parental influences and expectations shaped the education of the instructor or how the faculty member translates methods into educational philosophy may shape the findings differently. Employing different questions in a study based on different elements could potentially shape the researcher's findings considerably.

Whatever the direction for further inquiry into this topic, the results of my study, at the very least, provide the "tip of the iceberg" for the exploration of a domain heretofore neglected and still in need of investigation. My study provided a voice for for-profit faculty to be heard and a model that can be studied and applied at all institutions of higher education.

Conclusion

Although each participant in this study was raised in different regions of the United States and Europe and each of the seven participants discussed his/her influences and career trajectories as they pertain to their role as faculty at DeVry/Chicago, it was often as if I had spoken with seven people who came from one neighborhood despite their differences. Whether it was how they perceived their institution and its mission, how they viewed their students and their students' specific needs and issues, or how they explained how they learned to teach and who they are as teachers at DeVry/Chicago today, each participant willingly expounded on each

topic. Their explanations and themes that emerged were inextricably interrelated. One could not exist without the other, and each was necessary for their endurance at the institution.

For example, participants' reflections on their teaching, their students, and their institution translated into how their teaching approaches and methods were refined. Refinement of their teaching approaches and methods, as well as educational philosophies, led to positive changes in self or in curricular needs. Further change as a reaction to needs led to subsequent research into teaching and education in general, including formal and informal faculty development activities and mentoring, classroom observation, and peer coaching.

As I looked back over the themes within this study, I realized the significance of how the participants' discourse created this interrelationship. I also realized the importance of my study and how it pertains to the success and effectiveness of faculty at DeVry University. Though other studies exist relating to the purpose and mission of for-profit institutions of higher education, none were quite like my study. My initial need to discover the experiences of faculty who teach at for-profit institutions of higher education and how they develop their approaches and philosophies of teaching and learning, along with how institutional structures, policies, and culture shape their understanding of their roles as faculty, was now satisfied because of my investigation and my findings. By telling their stories, I became convinced the participants of the study collectively achieved one voice by sharing their experiences; at the same time though, that one voice consisted of seven different and complex perceptions.

As I reread transcripts from my interviews and listened to this newly emerging voice, another intriguing aspect of the study became evident to me. The emerging themes were interrelated and interconnected. An examination of this interrelationship and interconnectedness also revealed the development process that was common to the participants.

The participants in this study shared various similarities and differences in their teaching experience at DeVry/Chicago. It is my challenge to the participants of the study and faculty within for-profit and traditional colleges and universities today to celebrate these experiences and learn from the participants. I challenge every institution of higher education to listen to the voices of their faculty and provide support programs and professional development opportunities, which recognize their background and experiences and enable them to become better teachers. If these challenges are met, then the experiences of the participants in this study will not go in vain. Rather, they can be applied to future faculty members as they endeavor to learn to teach because as George Bernard Shaw once wrote, "to me, the sole hope of human salvation lies in teaching."

References

Arnold, G.C.S. (1995). Teacher dialogues: A constructivist model of staff development. *Journal of Staff Development*, 16(4), 34-38.

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

Bambino, D. (2002). Critical friends. *Educational Leadership*, 59 (6), 32-35.

Beem, K. (2002). The adjunct experience. *The School Administrator*. 63(2), 6-12.

Blumentyr, G. (2000). How for-profit institutions chase community-college students. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. 47(12), A30-A31.

Blustain, H, Goldstein, P, & Lozier, G. (1998). Assessing the new competitive landscape. *Cause/Effect*. 21(3), 19-27.

Borich, G.D. (2000). *Effective teaching methods*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Brandt, R. (1997). On using knowledge: A conversation with Bob Sylwester. *Educational Leadership*, 54(6), 16-19.

Broad, M.C. "Presidents and Teacher Education: Solving the Puzzle." *The Presidency*. Winter 2000, 14-23.

Broder, J.M., & Dorfman, J.H. (1994). Determinants of teaching quality: What's important to students. *Research in higher education,* 35 (2), 235-251.

Brody, W.R. (1998). The university in the twenty-first century: Adapting to stay relevant. *Continuing Higher Education Review*, 62, 28-39.

Buck, J., & Frank, M. (2001). Preparing future faculty: a faculty-in-training pilot program. *Teaching English in the two-year college*, 241-258.

Chaffee, E.E., and Tierney, W.G. (1986). *Collegiate culture and leadership strategies*. New York: Macmillan.

Charmaz, K. (2002). *Grounded theory: Objectivist and constructivist models.* In N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln (eds.) *Handbook of qualitative research.* Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Chase, S.E. (2003). *Learning to listen: Narrative principles in a qualitative research methods course.* In R. Josselson, A. Lieblich, and D.P. McAdams (eds.) *Up close and personal: The teaching and learning of narrative research.* Washington, DC: APA.

Chickering, A.W., and Gamson, Z.F. (1991). Applying the seven practices for good practice in undergraduate education. *New directions for teaching and learning.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Clough, P. (2002). *Narratives and fictions in educational research.* Philadelphia: Open University.

Cohen, P. (1995). Understanding the brain: Educators seek to apply brain research. *Education Update,* 37(7), 1, 4-5.

Collis, D. (2001). When industries change: The future of higher education. *Continuing Higher Education Review.* 65, 7-22.

Creswell, J. (1997). *Qualitative inquiry and research design.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1996). Focusing on teacher quality. *Education Update*, 38(7), 1-8.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1997). *The right to learn: A blueprint for creating schools that work.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2002). Defining 'highly qualified teachers': What does 'scientifically-based research' actually tell us? *Educational Researcher*, 31 (9), 13-25.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2003). Keeping good teachers: Why it matters, what leaders can do. *Educational Leadership*, 60 (8), 6-13.

Delpit, L. (2002). *The skin that we speak: Thoughts on language and culture in the classroom.* Eds. Lisa Delpit and Joanne Kilgour Dowdy. New York: The New Press.

Delpit, L. (2001). *Education in a multicultural society: Our future's greatest challenge.* Exploring socio-cultural themes in education: Readings in social foundation. Ed. Joan H. Strouse. Coloumbus, OH: Merrill Prentice-Hall.

Delpit, L. (1995). *Other people's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom.* New York: The New Press.

Denzin, N.K., and Lincoln, Y.S. (2002). *Handbook of qualitative design.* Second edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Denzin, N.K., and Lincoln, Y.S. (1994). *Handbook of qualitative design.* London: Sage.

DeVry Institute of Technology-DuPage . (Fall 2001). *Student satisfaction inventory: Campus Report.* Iowa City, IA: USA Group Noel-Levitz, Inc.

DeVry University (2003). *DeVry University catalog 2003-2004.* Oakbrook Terrace, IL: DeVry University.

DeVry University (2004). *DeVry University catalog 2004-2005.* Oakbrook Terrace, IL: DeVry University.

Ediger, M. (1995). Selected major goals for staff development in schools. *Education*, 116 (2), 192-195.

Eimers, M.T., Braxton, J.M., and Bayer, A.E. (2001). Normative support for improving undergraduate education in teaching-oriented colleges.*Research in higher education*, 42 (5), 569-693.

Evertson, C.M., Hawley, W.D., and Zlotnik, M. (1985). Making a difference in educational quality through teacher education. *The Journal of Teacher Education*, 36(3), 2-12.

Feiman-Nemser, S. (2001). From design to practice: Designing a continuum to strengthen and sustain teaching. *Teachers College Record*, 103 (6), 1013-1055.

Finkelstein, M.J., Seal, R., and Schuster, J.H. (1998). *The new academic generation: A profession in transformation.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins UP.

Finkelstein, M.J., Seal, R., and Schuster, J.H. (1998). New entrants to the full-time faculty of higher education institutions. *Education statistics quarterly,* 1(4), 78-80.

Fogarty, R. (1995). *Best practices for the learner-centered classroom.* Palatine, IL: IRI/Skylight.

Giertz, B. (1996). Long term effects of a programme for teaching training. Professional Development in Higher Education, 7-12.

Giuliano, G. (2002). *Education: Reflecting our society?* Detroit: Gale Group.

Glaser, B.G., and Strauss, A.L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research.* Chicago: Aldine.

Glaser, W. (1993). *The quality school teacher: A companion volume to The Quality School.* New York: Harper-Collins.

Grossman, P.L., and Richert, A. E. (1996). Building capacity and commitment for leadership in preservice teacher education. *Journal of School Leaadership.* March 1996, 202-212.

Grossman, P.L. (1990). *The making of a teacher: Teacher knowledge and teacher education.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Gusky, T.R., and Huberman, M. (1995). *Professional development in education: New paradigms and protection.* New York: Teachers College.

Halfond, J.A. (2000). When adjunct faculty are in the majority: Focusing on those who make us what we are. *Continuing Higher Education Review.* 64, 47-55.

Hamp-Lyons, L., Hood, S., and MacLennan, C. (2001). Promoting quality teaching in the tertiary context. *Higher education review*, 34(1), 61-76.

Hargreaves, A., and Fullan, M.G. (1992). *Understanding teacher development.* New York: Teachers College.

Haun, P. (2001). *Engage them online: Active learning and enhanced communications for online learning environments.* Symposium conducted for Syllabus 2002, Santa Clara, California, July 27-31, 2002.

Hayes, W. (2001). DeVry University-DuPage campus. Personal interview, December 3, 2001.

Heinecke, W.F., and Stohl Drier, H. (1998). Research for better classroom practice and policy. *The Educational Forum*, 62, 273-280.

Heller, D.E. (2003). Not all institutions are alike. *The Chronicle of Higher Education.* 50(12), B7-B9.

Hiebert, J., Gallimore, R., and Stigler, J.W. (2002). A knowledge base for the teaching profession: What would it look like and how can we get one? *Educational Researcher.* 31 (5), 3-15.

Holt-Reynolds, D. (1999). Good readers, good teachers? Subject matter expertise as a challenge in learning to teach. *Harvard Educational Review*, 69(1), 29-50.

Ingersoll, R.M. (2001). The realities of out-of-field teaching. *Educational Leadership*, 58 (8), 42-45.

Jensen, E. (1998). *Teaching with the brain in mind.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Josselson, R., and Lieblich, A. (2003). *A framework for narrative research proposals in psychology.* In R. Josselson, A. Lieblich, and D.P. McAdams (eds.) *Up close and personal: The teaching and learning of narrative research*, Washington, DC: APA.

Kempner, K., and Tierney, W.G. (1996). *The social role of higher education: Comparative perspectives.* New York: Garland.

King, J.M. (1997). Brain function research: Guideposts for brain-compatible teaching and learning. *The Journal of General Education*, 46(4), 276-290.

Kirp, D.L. (2003). Education for profit. *The Public Interest.* 152, 101-112.

LeBlanc, R. (1998). Good teaching: The top ten requirements. *The Teaching Professor.* 12(6), pp. 1,7.

Levine, A. (2001). How the academic profession is changing. *The American academic profession.* Ed. Graubard, S.R. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

Liberman, A. (1994). Teacher development: Commitment and challenge. *Teacher development and the struggle for authenticity: Professional growth and restructuring in the context of change.* Eds. Grimmett, P.P., and Neufield, J. New York: Teachers College.

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

Lindenstein Walschok, M. (1998). The social integration of knowledge: Rethinking the work of continuing higher education. *Continuing Higher Education Review.* 62, 64-77.

Locke, L.F., Spirduso, W.W., and Silverman, S.J. (2000). *Proposals that Work.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lyons, N. and LaBoskey, V.K. (2002). *Narrative inquiry in practice: Advancing the knowledge of teaching.* New York: Teachers College.

Marlowe, B.A., and Page, M.L. (1998). *Creating and sustaining the constructivist classroom.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

McLaughlin, D., and Tierney, W.G. (1993). *Naming silenced lives: Personal narratives and processes of educational change.* New York: Routledge.

Meloy, J.M. (2002). *Writing the qualitative dissertation: Understanding by doing.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Merriam, S.B. (2002). *Qualitative research in practice: Examples for discussion and analysis*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Merriam, S.B. (2001). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Miles, M.B., and Huberman, A.M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Miles, M.B., and Huberman, A.M. (1984). *Qualitative data analysis: A sourcebook of new Methods*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Miller, W.R., and Miller, M.F. (1997). *A handbook for college teaching*. Sautee-Nacoocchee, GA: PineCrest.

Minor, L.C., Onwuegbuzie, A. J., Witcher, A.E., & James, T.L. (2002). Preservice teachers' educational beliefs and their preceptions of characteristics of effective teachers. *The journal of educational research*. 96(2), 116-127.

Moore, D.G. (2003). Toward a single definition of college. *The Chronicle of Higher Education.* 50(12), B7-B9.

Novak, M. (2001). The new older learner. *Continuing Higher Education Review*. 65, 98-105.

Oblinger, D.G., and Verville, A.L. (1998). *What business wants from higher education*. Phoenix: Oryx Press.

Offerman, M. (2002). Reflections on moving from the public to for-profit. *Continuing Higher Education Review.* 66, 70-90.

Ogren, C.A. (2003). Rethinking the "nontraditional student from a historical perspective: State normal schools in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. *The Journal of Higher Education.* 74(6), 640-661.

Orlich, D.C. (1989). *Staff development: Enhancing human potential.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Patton, M.Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Petrisko, M.E. (1999). Faculty development for part-time faculty in workforce development programs. *Continuing Higher Education Review*. 63, 80-87.

Piantanida, M., and Garman, N.B. (1999). *The qualitative dissertation: A guide for students and faculty*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Prieto, L.R. and Altmaier, E.M. (1994). The relationship of prior training and previous teaching experience to self-efficacy among graduate teaching assistants. *Research in higher education*, 35(4), 481-497.

Riessman, C. (1993). *Narrative analysis*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Ruch, R.S. (2001).*Higher ed, inc.: The rise of the for-profit university*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins UP.

Sarason, S.B. (2003). *The skeptical visionary: A Seymour Sarason reader.* Ed. Robert L. Fried. Philadelphia: Temple UP.

Sarason, S.B. (1996). *Revisiting the culture of the school and the problem of change*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Sarason, S.B. (1993). *You are thinking of teaching?: Opportunities, problems, realities*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sarason, S.B., Davidson, K.S., and Blatt, B. (1986). *The preparation of teachers: An unstudied problem in education*. Cambridge, MA: Brookline.

Scherer, M. (2001). Improving the quality of the teaching force: A conversation with David C. Berliner. *Educational Leadership*, 58 (8), 6-11.

Scheurman, G. (1997). Using principles of constructivism to promote a reflective judgment: A model lesson. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching*, 8(2), 62-86.

Schon, D. A. (1991). *The reflective turn: Case studies in and on educational practice.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Schuster, J.H. (1995). Whither the faculty: The changing academic labor market. *Educational record.* 76(4), 28-33.

Sears, James T., Marshall, J.D., and Otis-Wilborn, A. *When Best Doesn't Equal Good: Educational Reform and Teacher Recruitment*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1994.

Shapiro, A. (2000). *Leadership for constructivist schools*. Lanham, MD: The Scarecrow Press.

Sherin, M.G. (2000). Viewing teaching on videotape. *Educational Leadership*. 57 (8), 36-38.

Speer, T.L. (1996). A nation of students. *American Demographics.* 18(8), 32-45.

Sperling, J, and Tucker, R.W. (1997). *For-profit higher education: Developing a world-class workforce.* New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

Stake, R. E. (2001). *Case studies.* In N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln (eds). *Handbook of qualitative research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Stenberg, S., and Lee, A. (2002). Developing pedagogies: Learning the teaching of English. *College English*, 64 (3), 326-347.

Stodolsky, S.S., and Grossman, P.L. (1995). The impact of subject matter on curricular activity: An analysis of five academic subjects. *American Educational Research Journal.* 32(2), 227-241.

Strauss, A.L., and Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Strauss, A.L., and Corbin, J. (1994) *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Stronge, J.H., and Hindman, J.L. (2003). Hiring the best teachers. *Educational Leadership*, 60 (8), 48-52.

Tierney, W.G. (1991). *Culture and ideology in higher education: Advancing a critical agenda.* New York: Praeger.

Tierney, W.G. (1990). *Assessing academic climates and cultures.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Tierney, W.G. (1989). *Curricular landscapes, democratic vistas: Transformative leadership in higher education.* New York: Praeger.

Timpson, W.M., Burgoyne, S., Jones, C.S., and Jones, W. (1997). *Teaching and performing: Ideas for energizing your classes.* Madison, WI: Magna.

Timpson, W.M., and Bendel-Simso, P. (1996). *Concepts and choices for teaching: Meeting the challenges in higher education.* Madison, WI: Magna/

Tinto, V. (1993). *Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Wood, J.K. (1998). Getting real and getting smart : The teacher's voice in educational policy making—supporting the realities of classroom practice and improving student achievement. *Childhood Education*, 56 (3), 120-137.

Yin, R.K. (2003). *Applications of case study research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Yin, R.K. (1994). *Case study research: Design and methods.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Yow, V.R. (1994). *Recording oral history: A practical guide for social scientists.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.