UNIVERSITY WEBSITE MARKETING DISCOURSE
AND THE HISPANIC AUDIENCE

A Thesis presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School
University of Missouri

In Partial Fulfillment
Of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

by
Chrissy Sarcone

Dr. María Len-Ríos, Thesis Supervisor

MAY 2014

APPROVAL PAGE

The undersigned, appointed by the dean of the Graduate School, have examined the thesis entitled

UNIVERSITY WEBSITE MARKETING DISCOURSE AND THE HISPANIC AUDIENCE

presented by Chrissy Sarcone,

a candidate for the degree of Master of Arts,

and hereby certify that, in their opinion, it is worthy of acceptance.

Associate Professor María Len-Ríos

Professor Margaret Duffy

Associate Professor Cynthia Frisby

Professor Flore Zephir

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to give a special thanks to Dr. María Len-Ríos for all her guidance, support and encouragement as my thesis chair. I know that I am a smarter, better scholar and journalist because she pushed me to think more critically than I ever have before about serious racial and social issues in education that are sometimes difficult to discuss, particularly as someone who does not experience struggle and discrimination as others do. Her positive approach and constant optimism helped me persevere through the toughest parts of completing my master's degree. After completing my thesis, I now even more understand how privileged I am and am very grateful for my experience in my master's program at the University of Missouri School of Journalism. I also would like to thank Dr. Margaret Duffy, Dr. Cyndi Frisby and Dr. Flore Zephir for being a part of my committee and for asking the “hard” questions to improve and sharpen my research. I am happy to have had all my committee members be a part of my thesis and appreciate their time and dedication they have given to me. To Flore especially, thank you for giving me the opportunity to teach Spanish and to discover a new passion and love of being in the classroom and helping others.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgments.....	ii
Abstract.....	iv
CHAPTER 1: Introduction.....	1
CHAPTER 2: Literature Review.....	4
Critical race theory	
Marketing higher education	
Marketing to Hispanics	
CHAPTER 3: Method.....	20
Critical discourse analysis	
Coding	
Sample	
Chapter 4: Results.....	30
RQ1	
RQ2	
Chapter 5: Discussion.....	62
Overview/Implications	
Limitations	
Future Research	
References.....	70
Appendix.....	83
Textual coding rubric	
Visual coding rubric	
Figure 2	
Figure 3	

ABSTRACT

This research analyzes the discursive and rhetorical strategies used by universities to market themselves through their institutional websites. The research compares three Hispanic Serving Institutions (HSIs) with three non-Hispanic Serving Institutions (non-HSIs) located in similar geographic areas. Critical race theory (CRT) is the guiding framework for the critical discourse analysis (CDA) using Fairclough's CDA approach. The research shows discursive similarities among the HSIs and among the HSIs and non-HSIs with power, privilege and social class found in the housing, location, getting involved, commuter student and visual discourses. Other discursive similarities among the HSIs and among the HSIs and non-HSIs with race, culture and diversity occur in the multicultural programming, location and getting involved discourses. Differences in discursive strategies with regard to race, culture and diversity are strongly seen in the value system, visual and religious discourse of particular schools.

Key words: Hispanics, higher education marketing, critical race theory (CRT), discourse, critical discourse analysis (CDA)

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

U.S. Hispanics' higher education attainment has a history of high dropout rates and low completion rates. Cabrera and La Nasa (2002) surveyed a 25-year history of U.S. Hispanics ages 18 to 24 in higher education from 1975 to 2000. Their research shows that while Hispanics averaged nearly a 34% rate of college participation between 1975 and 1977, the completion rates among Hispanics ages 25 to 29 in those same years decreased from 8.8% to 6.7%, respectively (U.S. Census, 2013). Hispanics in the late 1980s substantially increased their college participation rates above 10% in 1988 and 1989 (U.S. Census, 2013). U.S. Census data from 1990 to 2010 showed that Hispanic college student completion rates have slowly, yet inconsistently, increased. Cabrera and La Nasa have identified reasons for lower completion rates among Hispanics:

They are more prone to have parents with no collegiate experiences, their parents participate less in their school activities, they are slightly more likely to have been raised by single parent families, they have older siblings who dropout from high school, and they are more likely to have a history of low academic performance prior to high school enrollment. These factors contribute to the gaps in each of the steps towards college. (p. 1)

In other words, Hispanics are more likely to be first-generation college students. Despite the obstacles that come with less familial support and experience, Hispanic students are increasingly enrolling in four-year universities. Fifty-six percent of Hispanic college students enroll in a four-year university (Fry & Taylor, 2013). A 2011 Pew Hispanic study showed that Hispanics are the largest minority enrolled in four-year

colleges. The number of Hispanics on four-year university campuses exceeded 2 million and reached a record 16.5% share of all college enrollments in 2011 (Fry & Lopez, 2012). According to Fry (2011), the higher high school completion rate among Hispanics, up almost 4% from 2010, helps explain the increasing number of Hispanic four-year university enrollments. Second and third-generation Hispanics will be the future focal group of prospective Hispanic college students because currently, the majority of U.S. Hispanic children are second or third generation residents (Kurtzleben, 2010).

Significance of the Study

This study examines the discursive strategies that four-year universities, three Hispanic Serving Institutions (HSIs), and three non-Hispanic Serving Institutions (non-HSIs), use to market to prospective students through their institutional websites. The goal is to examine how institutions textually and visually conceptualize Hispanic college students, their identities and needs, and whether the discourse engages or excludes these students. The study explores the similarities/differences in the discursive strategies among the HSIs and compares these strategies to the discursive strategies of the non-HSIs. As Hispanic high school students enroll at four-year institutions in higher numbers, it is likely to parallel the national population trends of continued Hispanic growth. Significantly, in order to recruit these students, college and university admissions offices will need to speak to the experiences and needs of these students. Some CDA studies have examined college and university representation in viewbooks and on websites. However, this research found no studies of how institutions of higher education represent themselves and engage with prospective Hispanic college students. None of the research

with CRT in education has applied it with CDA to higher education institutions' website marketing discourse.

In order to do this, I will first explain critical race theory (CRT) as the theoretical framework for this analysis. Next, I will contextualize the analysis in the literature of marketing higher education and marketing in general to the Hispanic audience. Then, I will detail the method for my analysis and address how the research questions are answered using critical discourse analysis (CDA). Lastly, the data from this study are included along with a discussion of the findings, the study's limitations and ideas for future research.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Critical Race Theory

Critical race theory (CRT) is a movement in which its scholars and activists study the relationship among race, racism and power. The roots of CRT can be traced to the mid-1970s when writers Derrick Bell and Alan Freeman, as well as other academics, lawyers and activists across the country realized that the advances made during the civil rights era of the 1960s had stalled (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001). CRT grew out of the movement called critical legal studies where legal scholars interpret legal doctrine to expose how legal ideology has helped create, support and legitimate America's present class structure (Ladson-Billings, 1998). A notable legal CRT scholar, Kimberlé Crenshaw, has worked on race and gender as they pertain to civil rights, African Americans, and feminism and the law.

Bell, one of the most influential scholars in CRT, sought to contribute to intellectual discussions about race in America, as well as achieve increased racial justice through political activism (Tate, 1997). Bell (1980) articulated the interest-convergence principle, defined as people of color in American society only making political, economic or other gains because these gains in some way serve the interests of white European Americans. Bell offered as an example the *Brown v. Board* civil rights case that helped improve America's image abroad during the Cold War.

CRT is founded on the idea that racism is normal and common to everyday life in U.S. society (Ladson-Billings, 1998). Racism creates the concept of the other to form an illusion of unity between nonstigmatized groups, particularly Whites, whose identity and

interests are defined in opposition to the other (Crenshaw, 1995). Most CRT scholars would agree that the system of white-over-color ascendancy serves important purposes, both psychic and material (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001). A crucial third part of CRT is the social construction thesis that states that race and races are products of social thought (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001). Race categories are invented, manipulated and retired by society, and CRT examines how certain physical traits that group people into a certain racial category overshadow other more humanizing traits such as personality, intelligence and moral behavior (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001). The narrative, or storytelling, by a marginalized group, plays an important role in CRT because it allows one to reflect on their experiences and lets the marginalized person speak out publicly without having their story subverted by the dominant ideology or story constructed by Whites (Fernández, 2002).

CRT in education research challenges universities' claims of objectivity, meritocracy, color-blindness and equal opportunity by examining how "race-neutral" laws and institutional structures, practices and policies bring about racial or ethnic inequality in educational achievement and success (Solorzano, Villalpondo & Oseguera, 2005). Tate (1997) surveys how educational research and legal structures contribute to existing belief systems and to legitimating social frameworks and policies that cause educational inequities for people of color. According to Tate, some of the earliest educational research, which related to representations of people of color, dealt with the intellectual assessment and achievement of African Americans and other ethnic minority students. This inferiority paradigm is built around the belief that people of color are both genetically and biologically inferior to Whites, and the assumed inferiority of African

Americans, Native Americans, Latinos and other ethnic minorities has a long history in United States legal discourse (Tate, 1997).

Latino/a critical race theory (LatCrit) extends critical race theory into discussions about the racialized subordination that encompasses Latino/a experiences (Yosso, 2005). LatCrit scholars call attention to immigration policy, bilingual schooling, language rights, internal colonialism, sanctuary for Latin American refugees and census categories for Hispanics (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001). This study will examine how higher education institutions include or exclude Hispanics in their prospective student discourse.

Ladson-Billings and Tate (1995) argued for a critical race theoretical perspective to look at problems of racism in schooling. They discussed how multicultural education has been conceptualized as a reform movement to provide students from diverse racial, ethnic and other social class groups with an equitable educational experience and offer all students multicultural courses in the education curriculum. The concept of multiculturalism outside the classroom in the university context, according to Ladson-Billings and Tate, is the attempt to bring students and faculty of diverse backgrounds to a school environment. Chang (2002) discussed how diversity discourse must go beyond promoting campus diversity through affirmative action practices in college admissions and focus on the total commitment of college governing bodies to advancing student learning and further democratizing institutions. Arrona et al. (2006) surveyed higher education institutions after the 2003 landmark affirmative action cases of *Grutter v. Bollinger* and *Gratz v. Bollinger* using CRT, arguing that meaningful affirmative action must be expanded beyond admissions policies to ameliorate hostile racial campus climates, as well as increase subsequent preparation for college access.

CRT has specifically been applied to Hispanics and education. Dehyle and Villenas (1999) used CRT and ethnographic studies to explore Latino schooling and family education. The stories of the Latino youth and parents emphasized how “raced” children received low teacher expectations and were placed in low-level classes with a more tedious curriculum. Despite the messages of schools that parent involvement was strongly encouraged, Latino parents were still somewhat ostracized from the school environment. Dehyle and Villenas concluded that schools do not operate apart from social hierarchies and institutionalized racism and that Latinos must not only make themselves learn the U.S. school system but also enact change where school officials accommodate and understand their culture and language.

Sólorzano, Villalpondo and Oseguera (2005) examined the educational inequities of Latino undergraduate students in the U.S. with a CRT framework. They demonstrated how many researchers have suggested that culturally sensitive academic advising, increased financial aid opportunities, orientation programs for social and academic enrichment, access to learning centers and the alignment of diversity programs with the university’s mission are ways universities and colleges can accommodate and retain Latino students. However, Latinos still remain underrepresented on four-year university campuses due to issues such as academic tracking (institutions assigning students to courses of study based on past achievement, ability and academic interests). Also, contributing to underrepresentation of Latinos is ineffective counseling and standardized admissions exams. These types of “race-neutral” practices are what, according to the researchers, create racial stratification in higher education. They argue that higher

education must adopt more explicit race-conscious practices to enhance success of Latino college students.

Marketing Higher Education

Researchers have examined the adoption of a market-based approach to admission and recruitment practices in higher education. In the late 1970s to early 1980s, prospective students began to see themselves as consumers of academic programs (Saichaie, 2011). Because students enrolled less often in the 1990s and politicians allocated less state and federal funding for public higher education institutions, Anctil (2008) said many higher education institutions had to find their “niche” in the marketplace to compete. This was also a result of public universities having to also compete with for-profit schools. With less government funding and more regulation, public universities were forced to find alternative revenue-generating streams. One way to increase revenue is to attract fee-paying students, who are often privileged and more affluent, in what Askehave (2007) refers to as the “marketization of higher education.” Marketing is essential to modern-day business and is characterized by “serving the customer’s needs through the production of appropriate commodities” (Morgan, 1992, p. 136). Kwong (2000) defines the marketing of higher education as “the adoption of free market practices in running schools” (p. 89).

Due to the competitive nature of the higher education market today, colleges and universities have needed to develop their brands and to produce a clear mission that reflects their organizational identity (Anctil, 2008). Branding has become a key component to college and university marketing plans, and most schools try to create a favorable identity. Colleges and universities use slogans, or short phrases brands typically

use to encapsulate the essence of their products. Slogans are meant to promote memorable brand impressions and generate awareness, such as the University of Texas' slogan "What starts here changes the world." A mission statement defines the aims and values of colleges and universities but also can be used as a marketing tool to attract students who identify with the values expressed in the mission statement.

Some critics have used the term "commercialized admissions" to describe colleges' and universities' use of marketing strategies that mirror the private sector. Certain critics argue that colleges and universities put more effort into positioning their institutions and less effort into seeking personal contact with prospective students to ensure their satisfaction with their college education experience (Ancil, 2008). This is evident in Leyland's (2011) study that examined the marketing strategies on the University of Manchester's international student web pages. The marketing discourse showed higher education institutions shifting from an institution that "enlightens young minds to a business seeking to make capital gain" (p. 207). International students were considered an economic resource to the institution, with the dynamic of the university as enabler and the international student as beneficiary. Molesworth, Nixon and Scullion (2009) argued that the current higher education discourse "promotes a mode of existence where students seek to 'have a degree' rather than 'be learners'" (p. 278), preparing the student for a mission of confirmation rather than transformation. For Hispanics and other racial minorities historically underrepresented in higher education, education as a service rather than a merit-based process could mislead their perceptions about the necessary work to earn an education and jobs after graduation.

Fairclough (1993) examined the shifting authority relations and shifts in self-

identity within British higher education institutions by analyzing the discourse in advertisements, academic curriculum vitae, program materials for academic conferences and prospectuses (i.e., documents describing the chief features of an educational program) using CDA. Fairclough's study found the decline of stable institutional identities, the construction of more entrepreneurial institutional identities, a decline in the authority of the institution over its applicants, potential students and potential staff, and the reconstruction of professional identities of academics on a more self-promotional basis. Prospectuses had differing levels of implicit and explicit discourse with their main purpose being to "sell the university and its courses to potential applicants in the context of a competitive market" (p. 156). In other words, universities have a product sell.

Similarly, Askehave (2007) did a textual and visual analysis of international student prospectuses at universities in Scotland, Japan, Australia and Finland. The study analyzed the roles and relationships of the universities and the prospective students to show how the prospectuses used a discourse that deemed the university as a provider of innovative goods and services for its customers. Askehave also concluded institutions' prospectuses depicted them as service-minded, customer-driven organizations promoting the university as an experience. Askehave failed to find discourse describing a university that sets standards, takes action or requests something in return, such as student initiative or commitment to academics.

Hartley and Morpew (2008) content analyzed themes in 48 viewbooks from U.S. four-year colleges and universities. They found several institutions highlighted institutional context and features, academics and faculty, co-curricular opportunities, admissions and financial aid, value of education and the purpose of higher education. The

authors concluded that the viewbooks sell college as a product, rarely connecting the experience as “something more cerebral, spiritual or educational” (p. 688). If Hispanics and other historically underrepresented racial minorities in higher education view college as a product, it could mean guaranteed access to the “good life” and an improved socioeconomic status, without their realization of the hard work and often struggle for success in and after school.

Websites and university image.

The Internet offers “immediate” marketing opportunities for colleges and universities as a complement to the traditional college viewbook. Because the Internet allows anyone to publish content and ratings about higher education institutions, impression management has become essential for institutions of higher education, which they achieve through the adoption of advertising and marketing techniques (Saichaie, 2011).

Higher education institutions widely use websites as a marketing tool. According to Kittle and Ciba (1999), mostly every postsecondary institution had a functional website by 1997 (as cited in Saichaie, 2011). Websites are a multimedia platform, as they allow for promotional discourse in both visual and textual form.

Few critical discourse studies have analyzed college and university representation on institutional websites. Chipur (2006) examined the discourse on 10 Romanian public and private universities websites in light of Romania’s entry into the E.U., which brought institutional change. Chipur found discourses of promotion, transition (transformation from Communism to democracy), autonomy, flexibility, competition and innovation. University discourse was used as an instrument for attaining competitive advantages, as a

creator of added value and as the means to construct and promote institutional image and identity. Saichaie (2011) analyzed written, oral and visual texts on college and university websites, finding promotional discourses and discourses to legitimize the institution. Institutions created uncertainty in the financial aid sections of their websites, and discourse was tightly structured to control institutional images.

University websites and prospective Hispanic students.

Studies have shown that using online techniques is important for reaching Hispanics. Scarborough Research summed this up as follows:

Marketers today recognize that the Internet is an efficient way to target young people, but the youth factor is accentuated among Hispanics, so the Internet becomes even more of an important component of a Hispanic marketing strategy.

(p. 13)

While 93% of Hispanics ages 18 to 29 said they go online occasionally (Gonzalez-Barrera, Lopez, Pattern, 2013), only 7% report they infrequently go online or do not have Internet access. Hispanics with a higher socio-economic status are more likely to go online versus those who are of lower SES (Gonzalez-Barrera, Lopez, Pattern, 2013).

Research shows that the knowledge and ability to get financial aid are important for Hispanics' enrollment in four-year colleges and universities. Perna (2004) examined Latino students and parents' college selection process, and concluded that information that is particularly high on their priority list is understanding of college costs and financial aid. However, the Tomás Rivera Policy Institute's 2004 survey of Hispanic parents of 18 to 24 year olds and young Hispanics ages 18 to 24 found that Latino parents were less likely (49%) to be able to name one or more sources of financial aid compared

with all parents (81%). This pattern held true when examining Latino young adults to all young adults who would enter the university (Perna, 2004). Because information on websites is typically only in English, it may prevent Spanish-dominant Hispanic parents from getting college information and may cause them to be uninformed or rely on their children for the information. Other factors that play an important role in Hispanics' college selection are the close location of the school to family, family, social support networks and opportunity (Carolan-Silva, 2013; Pérez, 2010).

Prospective Hispanic students and higher education.

Scholars have also identified enrollment barriers faced by Hispanic students to four-year colleges and ways they can be overcome. A 2009 Pew Hispanic study found that a lack of financial resources, the reluctance to borrow money for school, family obligations, and the “lukewarm” support of parents and teachers were factors that contributed to the lower levels of Hispanic higher education attainment (Alonso-Zaldivar & Thompson, 2010). To overcome these barriers, family involvement in discussions of future educational goals (Milan & Turcios-Cotto, 2012), as well as maintaining strong family and community ties (Sólorzano, Villalpondo & Oseguera, 2005), are crucial for helping Hispanic students succeed in college.

Scholars' recommendations for selling higher education have argued for viewing the prospective student as a collaborative partner (Bay & Daniel, 2001, as cited in Anctil, 2008). Galotti and Kozberg (1996) said students' college decisions have implications for career and family choices (as cited in Anctil, 2008), and the importance of parent involvement in college selection and experience makes marketing directed at both students and parents necessary (Anctil, 2008).

Higher education institutions' establishment of a personal connection and trust with prospective Hispanics, as well as culturally-relevant college advising and recruitment strategies in high schools and colleges, are important initiatives for increasing Hispanic higher education participation. Raúl Lorenzo, vice president of operations for Hispanic marketing agency Bauza & Associates and former higher education admissions counselor, helps colleges and universities recruit and retain Hispanic students. With regard to recruiting Hispanic students, Lorenzo states:

Institutions need to think differently about recruiting Hispanics. They need to speak to the heart as well as the intellect. It is a much more personal way of communicating than traditional marketing. It is important to make an emotional connection between the college and prospective students as well as their parents.

(Gilroy, 2010, p. 32)

Although higher education institutions aim to attract all types of revenue generating students, there is a need for understanding how schools market and recruit not to just the generic student but to the diverse makeup of students in the prospective student pool.

Marketing to the Hispanic Audience

Since few studies have specifically examined the marketing of higher education to prospective Hispanic college students, this literature review includes a discussion of marketing and advertising to Hispanics in the private sector. Some of the techniques used by marketers and advertisers in the private sector can be applied to higher education institutions' marketing strategies to attract the prospective Hispanic college student. Hispanic is the term most widely used in the advertising/marketing industry because it

describes people of Hispanic/Latino identity as sharing a common Spanish language and is a common Census category.

For the purpose of this study, Hispanic will refer to those who are of Cuban, Mexican, Puerto Rican, South or Central American, or other Spanish culture or origin (excluding Portuguese-speaking individuals) (U.S. Census, 2010) who were either born in a Spanish-speaking country or whose parents were born in a Spanish-speaking country, and currently resides in the United States and speaks Spanish, English or a combination of both. This definition includes the sharing of common cultural traits and values, as well as those that are unique to a particular country or region. I chose this definition because speaking Spanish is shared among Hispanics, and they also have in common cultural beliefs and values, yet are also distinct according to their country of origin.

Advertising scholars have conducted studies to determine how Hispanic consumers respond to the use of English, Spanish or both, as well as ethnic cues in advertising. Koslow, Shamdasani and Touchstone (1994) used accommodation theory to explain the effects of Spanish language use in print advertising. The findings suggested that using a bilingual approach is most effective for targeting Hispanic consumers because bilingual messages reflect sensitivity and recognition of culture, as well as acknowledgment of Hispanics' attempts to acculturate. However, the sample for this study comprised mostly bilingual participants, which makes the researchers' conclusion more directed to that group versus those who speak only Spanish or English. Blair and Noriega (2008), using a social cognition framework, hypothesized that native-language advertisements would be more effective for bilinguals and produce more positive brand attitudes and higher purchase intentions. The study's respondents indicated more

contextually language-congruent thoughts when their native language was used, with a positive interaction between language and consumption context.

Scholars have also researched how acculturation levels affect advertising effectiveness and purchase intentions. Palumbo and Teich (2005) state that Hispanics are “retaining their Latino identity and learning new attitudes and behaviors from the mainstream United States population” (p. 160), which is most clearly seen within the U.S. Hispanic adolescent population. Li and Tsai’s (2012) study on the influence of acculturation on advertising effectiveness confirmed that Hispanic consumers’ attitudes toward targeted ads and their purchase intentions are influenced by their acculturation levels. In terms of online website content and acculturation levels, Baack, Baack, Pereira and Singh (2008) explored how acculturation affects U.S. Hispanics’ preferences for culturally customized websites (a “website that is culturally and linguistically customized to a specific role” (p. 226)) and concluded that weakly acculturated Hispanics have a higher preference for culturally-relevant content in comparison to strongly acculturated Hispanics. Marketing professionals also advocate the need to make communication culturally relevant.

Armando Azarloza, president of The Axis Agency, a leading multicultural marketing agency, shared insight into how brands must engage the Hispanic consumer:

In fact, Latinos are more likely to turn away from brands that are only interested in selling to them, rather than empowering their cultural relevancy. Hispanics are more inclined to build trustworthy relationships with people and companies that take the time to understand who we are and what we represent morally, ethically and culturally. (Llopis, 2012, p. 2)

While Hispanic marketing strategies can be seen as serving the needs and desires of Hispanic audiences and have been shown effective, these practices have the potential to be considered what scholars call “othering.” Said (1977) defined othering as the process of creating and maintaining a dichotomy between oneself and the other, an “us” and a “them.” Discourses of similarity and difference are produced to create the concept of the other. “Others” are not just subordinated or marginalized groups, yet most research has centered on discourses of othering as constructed by majority populations.

The idea of othering emphasizes the importance of segmentation and acculturation levels for advertisers and marketers seeking to reach Hispanics. Some Hispanics might react unfavorably to targeted, cultural advertising because they don’t want to be seen differently from other consumers, whereas other Hispanics are persuaded and engaged by it. Through the lens of CRT, marketers who other the Hispanic market with racial/ethnic advertising use Hispanics’ race and culture for their own interests and profit, as well as those of their clients.

Even with the knowledge of U.S. Hispanics’ diversity of experiences, advertisers and marketers do lump Hispanics together and sometimes produce offensive stereotypes. Rodriguez (1997) examined the historical construction of Hispanic consumers by interviewing and collecting documents from 17 marketers/audience researchers from various U.S. Latino media firms, national Spanish-language television networks, bilingual and English-language magazines and newspapers, and Spanish radio stations. She found that the dominant discursive concept of Hispanics in the marketplace was of a Hispanic audience that was non-White, Spanish speaking and poor. The authors of the marketing discourse, in contrast, were mostly college-educated Latinos, which

significantly differed from the majority of the Latino population—half do not have a high school diploma and live in households where the median household income is three quarters that of the general U.S. population (Rodriguez, 1997). A more educated group with a higher SES creates this representation of Latinos.

In interviews with 16 Hispanic ad agencies and from the content of national ads created for Univision and Telemundo, Dávila (2001) found the common goal of addressing all Hispanics as a unified and culturally specific market, “out-of-many, one people,” which she referred to as *Latinidad*. Hispanic marketing is guided by the premise that Hispanics’ cultural differences create the need for culture and language-specific marketing, not otherwise reached by marketers through other means (Dávila, 2002). As marketers construct a culturally defined Hispanic audience as a homogeneous niche market, “the development of essentialist and authenticating discourses of U.S. *latinidad* constrain its intrinsic heterogeneity and compel its presentation as a bounded and hence easily targetable population” (Dávila, 2000). Because the profitability of the Hispanic market is based on the premise of putative homogeneity, marketers are unlikely to challenge the dominant characterization of Hispanic consumers.

Hispanics’ cultural and acculturation differences exercise influence on how they respond to ethnic advertising. Many U.S. Hispanics are bilingual, and, as a result, desire culturally relevant content in Spanish and English. There are also those who primarily speak Spanish, such as some parents of Hispanic prospective college students. The diversity in relation to class and race among U.S. Latinos presents a challenge to achieve a cohesive discourse like those achieved by other minorities (Avila-Saavedra, 2011).

Due to the highly competitive nature of the higher education market, colleges and universities put substantial resources toward attracting the best, and in many cases, the most diverse students. In order to be ethically and politically correct and, institutions must offer inclusive higher education marketing discourse for all of society's racial groups. The next section details the method of critical discourse analysis (CDA) and how it will answer the following two research questions:

RQ1: What are the similarities/differences in the discursive strategies used among HSIs (Hispanic Serving Institutions) to attract Hispanic college students?

RQ2: How do the discursive strategies used by HSIs compare to the discursive strategies used by non-HSIs?

The next section includes a description of the method, the coding mechanisms and the sample.

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

Critical Discourse Analysis

To show how the theoretical framework of critical race theory and how the research questions were studied, a discussion of critical discourse analysis as a theory and method is included here. CDA was the appropriate method for this study's exploratory research. Researchers use CDA as a means to describe, analyze and interpret textual and visual representations at local, institutional and societal levels.

According to Jorgensen and Phillips (2002), discourse is the way "language is structured according to different patterns that people's utterances follow when they take part in different domains of social life" (p. 1). They also define discourse as "a particular way of talking about and understanding the world" (p. 1). Therefore, discourse analysis is a social constructionist approach to studying language and culture. Language is used to create representations of reality, and it is the "machine" that constitutes the social world (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002). In the CDA tradition, language is never seen as neutral because it is caught up in political, social, racial, economic, religious and cultural formations (Hui et al., 2005). A discursive strategy is defined as a conscious plan employing persuasiveness that is used to achieve a particular goal, whether that goal is social, political, psychological or linguistic in nature. Discursive practices are the means through which producers create texts and audiences interpret them.

CDA has evolved as both a theory and a method to examine the relationship of power, language and society (Gee, 2005; Rogers, 2004). Hui, Malancharuvil-Berkes, Mosley, Garro and Rogers (2005) simply defined CDA as the study of "how language, as

a cultural tool, mediates relationships of power and privilege in social interactions, institutions and bodies of knowledge” (p. 367). Power is central to the CDA framework and is most often perceived as a “systemic and constitutive element of society” (Meyer & Wodak, 2009, p. 9). Power is exercised through discourse because discourses “institutionalize and regulate ways of talking, thinking and acting” (Meyer & Wodak, 2009, p. 35).

Fairclough and Wodak (1997) point out that the “critical” portion of CDA is uncovering the hidden meanings and connections and linking them to the greater local, institutional and societal matters. According to Fairclough (1992), intertextuality “points to how texts transform prior texts and restructure existing conventions to generate new ones.” Intertextual analysis draws upon “orders of discourse—the particular configurations of conventionalized practices (genres, discourses, narratives, etc.)” and serves to mediate the connection between language and social contexts (Fairclough, 1992).

Written and oral texts are the primary units of textual analysis for the CDA research method and can be gathered from interviews, conversations, policy and written documents, audio/video recordings and other social artifacts such as websites (Saichaie, 2011). McKee (2003) stated that a text is something we make meaning from and has implications for thinking about meaning production. Although language is only present in the written and spoken word, visual analysis has emerged from textual analysis and plays an important role in the theoretical understanding of how meaning is produced through images (Larsen, 1991).

CDA has three common critiques: political and social ideologies are read into the data, there is an imbalance between social theory and linguistic theory in the method and CDA is often separated from social contexts (Hui et al., 2005). Researchers must be conscious of their own background knowledge in the subject area that they bring with them as they perform CDA (Saichaie, 2011).

Advertising as a form of cultural communication has received much scholarly interest from mass communication researchers, semioticians, linguists and discourse analysts. Discourse analysis not only involves textual analysis, but according to van Dijk (1991) it “accounts for the relations between structures of a text and talk, on the one hand, and of their cognitive, social, cultural or historical ‘contexts,’ on the other hand” (p. 111). Several content analytical approaches in critical media studies have revealed biased, stereotypical, sexist or racist images in texts, illustrations and photos (van Dijk, 1997). Through critical discourse analyses of higher education marketing discourse on institutional websites, I examined how power, social class, privilege and race play a role in prospective student recruitment in relation to Hispanics.

Fairclough’s CDA Approach

Fairclough’s critical discourse analysis framework was used to answer the research questions of this study. According to Fairclough’s dialectical-relational approach to CDA, social relations, social identities, cultural values, consciousness and semiosis are dialectically related elements of social practice (Meyer & Wodak, 2009). The approach permits analysts to focus on the signifiers in the text, the linguistic and visual selections, their juxtapositioning, sequencing, layout, etc. (Janks, 2005). Fairclough’s framework has three dimensions, each with a specific type of analysis: textual, process and societal.

In textual analysis, the researcher analyzes the texts and describes the properties of the textual and visual elements (Saichaie, 2011). This description process allows the researcher to count occurrences and look for patterns (Janks, 2005). Once the researcher has established the foundation of description and understands the design of the text, the next step of analysis involves interpretation. Process analysis involves the interpretation of the relationship between the data and its producers. The relationships in the messages aid the researcher in identifying what discourse practices speak to larger societal structures (Saichaie, 2011). Lastly, the third dimension of analysis is societal analysis, which involves explaining discourses present in the data within their greater cultural, historical and social contexts. See Figure 1 below.

Figure 1: Fairclough's CDA method. This figure illustrates Fairclough's three-level CDA method.

Source: Saichaie, K. (2011). *Representation on college and university websites: an approach using critical discourse analysis* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Iowa, Iowa City). Retrieved April 27, 2013, from <http://ir.uiowa.edu/etd/1071/>

Textual Analysis

Because Fairclough's DRA to CDA draws upon the theory of systemic functional linguistics pioneered by Halliday, this study employed selected categories from a rubric

developed by Janks (2005) to use as the coding mechanism for the process part of Fairclough's three-dimensional CDA model. Janks' lexical and grammatical rubric of analysis is based on Fairclough's (1995) CDA model and was derived from Halliday's (1985) Systemic Functional Grammar that views grammar as a theory of meaning in context. According to Halliday (1985), "A discourse analysis that is not based on grammar, is not an analysis at all, but simply a running commentary on a text" (p. 17). Systemic functional linguistics not only looks at what is in texts, but has a powerful use in that it can indicate what is absent from texts (Fairclough, 1992).

The rubric has high utility because it lists the linguistic features the researcher looks for when conducting CDA, as well as explains coded terms. The linguistic features of the rubric enable researchers to work with ideational, interpersonal and textual meanings of the text. The ideational meaning is how language expresses the speaker's experience of the external world and his or her own consciousness (Halliday, 1978). The interpersonal meaning is the expression of relations among participants in the situation, and the textual function refers to language as a message in the communication process (Halliday, 1978). Halliday (1985) calls these metafunctions, the manifestations of the linguistic system with the main purpose being to understand the environment and act on others in it. Janks' rubric is included as Appendix A.

Visual Analysis

In addition to textual analysis, I also conducted visual analysis using selected categories from Kress and van Leeuwen's (2006) rubric. Visuals, such as those on university websites, also communicate and provide representations along with the written communication. Barthes (1964/1977) wrote that "the viewer of the image receives at one

and the same time the perceptual message and the cultural message” (p. 36). This implies that visuals have a denotative, perceptual meaning, as well as a connotative, deeper-level meaning. The field of social semiotics originated from systemic functional linguistics and claims that all visual texts perform actions, or semiotic work (Jewitt & Oyama, 2001). Social semiotics involves the systematic deconstruction of visuals to critically analyze their meanings. According to Kress and van Leeuwen (2006), the producers of mass images and visual grammars possess the power to create as well as break rules of visual representation. The goal of critical visual analysis is to renegotiate the inherent meanings in those constructs instead of seeing them as binding and natural (Iedema, 2001). Kress and van Leeuwen’s rubric is included as Appendix B.

Sample and Rationale

The sample for this study included six four-year universities, three of which are HSIs. As defined by the Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities, an HSI is a college, university or system/district where total Hispanic enrollment constitutes at least minimum of 25% of the total enrollment. Total enrollment includes full-time and part-time students at the undergraduate or graduate level (including professional schools) of the institution, or both (i.e. headcount of for-credit students). The reason for choosing three HSIs is that these institutions have a high concentration of Hispanic students and recruit with this pool of applicants in mind. Non-HSIs are institutions that are not part of the Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities and whose campus populations of Hispanic students do not meet or exceed 25%.

The six schools were chosen from the three states with the highest Hispanic populations: Texas, California and Florida. More than half (55%) of the U.S. Hispanic

population resides in these states (Brown & Hugo Lopez, 2013). Of youth ages 16 to 25, Hispanics comprise 42% of those in California, 40% of those in Texas and 24% of those in Florida (Pew Hispanic, 2013). The selected HSIs were the University of Texas at San Antonio (UTSA), Florida International University (FIU) and California State University, Fullerton (CSUF). These schools have steady economic resources in terms of the faculty size, programs offered and endowments. The selected non-HSIs were the University of Texas at Austin (UT), the University of Miami and the University of California-Los Angeles (UCLA). See tables 1 and 2 below.

Table 1

HSI Enrollment

<u>HSIs</u>	Total Enrollment	Number of Hispanic Students	Percent of Total Enrollment
University of Texas at San Antonio	28,623	13,329	46.6
Florida International University	50,000	30,500	61
CSU, Fullerton	38,325	13,413	35

Table 2

Non-HSI Enrollment

<u>Non-HSIs</u>	Total Enrollment	Number of Hispanic Students	Percent of Total Enrollment
University of Texas at Austin	52,059	9,920	19.1
University of Miami	16,935	3,947	23.3
University of California-Los Angeles (UCLA)	42,163	6,348	15.1

This study analyzed the “Campus Life” content area of all six selected university websites. Olive (2009) studied the factors influencing first-generation Hispanic college students’ desire for higher education. She found that a comfortable academic environment, the opportunity for self-discovery and the support of valued individuals enhanced students’ aspiration. Universities that create campus climates that value and validate Hispanic culture, and academic programs that promote collaboration have also shown to help first-generation Hispanic college students succeed in college and attract them to attend an institution (Cortez, 2011). “Campus Life” website pages are particular marketing/advertising tools that present the above elements to prospective students. The goal of studying these six websites was to compare the discursive strategies of the HSIs to each other, as well as to three non-HSIs in the same geographic area. Visual analysis was limited to the visuals on the “Campus Life” landing pages.

Data Collection Process

The web pages analyzed were printed out and coded by computer, using selected categories from Janks’ (2005) linguistic rubric and Kress and van Leeuwen’s (2006) visual analysis rubric. A second copy of each website was kept in the original HTML format as to preserve the natural, online setting of the websites’ discourse. I coded the video on the web pages using Janks’ (2005) rubric for the oral communication and Kress and van Leeuwens’ (2006) rubric for the visuals. Electronic files were kept with notes, coding sheets, PDFs of the pages and website links to ensure organization and information clear for interpretation.

To answer RQ1, I took descriptive notes on the text and visuals and the patterns/differences among the three HSIs. I used parts of Janks’ (2005) rubric for the

process level analysis of Fairclough's CDA model and to code the written textual components of the HSIs' "Campus Life" website content area. I used parts of Kress and van Leeuwen's (2006) rubric to code for the process level and the visual components of the HSIs' "Campus Life" landing pages. The same process was used to answer RQ2. I used the description and patterns, as well as the relationship between the data and its producers, to analyze the discourses in their historical, societal and cultural contexts.

The Researcher's Role

In qualitative research, it is necessary to acknowledge the researcher's role as the main instrument for gathering, analyzing and interpreting the data studied. It is important for the researcher to acknowledge their personal views and biases. As a student of communication, journalism, and Spanish, I have had two internships where I have worked on Hispanic marketing strategies and events. I have been taught ideas, strategies and tactics of public relations and marketing professionals for how to engage and reach the Hispanic audience for their companies. As a master's student, I highly value education and wanted to expand my range of practical and critical thinking skills by attending the University of Missouri School of Journalism to pursue advertising and public relations. I also teach Spanish 1100 as a graduate instructor and have experienced education both from a teacher's and a student's perspective. I believe there is a transformative essence to education, that it is not just a means to an end—getting a good job. Higher education institutions are where people grow intellectually, physically, and, perhaps, spiritually, as I have personally experienced. I have also witnessed this through teaching and interacting with my students.

The next section contains the study's results and analyses of the themes that emerged from the six schools' "Campus Life" discourse.

CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

This section contains the study results from the critical discourse analyses of the six university websites. First, I contrast the institutional definitions on what particular aspects of the university constitute “Campus Life.” This is followed by critical discourse analyses using Fairclough’s CDA model to describe, interpret and explain the discourses within their textual, process and societal categories. I organize the analyses according to the research questions and how the “Campus Life” discourse relates to power, privilege, and social class, as well as race, culture and diversity to show similarities/differences among the HSIs and between the HSIs and non-HSIs. Discourses examined in-depth are those related to the location of the institution; housing; getting involved/student clubs and organizations; multicultural programming; religion; and value systems. Visual analyses of the “Campus Life” landing page visuals are also included.

Definitions of Campus Life

As I expected, the six universities chosen for this study define and display campus life differently in their “Campus Life” sections. “Campus Life” is shown to the prospective student most commonly as themes regarding housing, dining, getting involved and recreation. All the schools similarly understood the concept of “Campus Life” in terms of physiological processes (living and eating) and students’ active engagement in campus activities and recreational interests. Interestingly, CSUF classifies its “Campus Life” discourse as information for “Current Students” rather than “Future Students.” CSUF is also the school with perhaps the most unorthodox listing of its components of “Campus Life,” as many subsections express essentially the same idea

and can be combined under a more encompassing term, such as combining “Clubs and Organizations,” “Greek Life,” and “Volunteer Services Center” under “Get Involved.” See Figures 2 and 3 in the Appendix for the institutions’ organization of “Campus Life” discourse.

Of the six schools, UCLA, UT, FIU and UTSA all include some sort of prefacing discourse to introduce and set the tone for their “Campus Life” section. UCLA describes its campus as the “foreground of the future” and “perpetually in motion” and uses promotional discourse about its active students and world-renowned faculty to underscore its campus as a leading force. UT promotes its history and “campus treasures” that its 50,000 students explore on “nearly 350 acres just blocks from downtown Austin.” FIU, as does UTSA, describes campus life as outside of academia, that “life is more than just going to class.” UTSA juxtaposes the classroom and campus life, contrasting the “confines of the classroom” to its “boisterous and rowdy campus life.” This separation of classroom and campus reinforces institutions’ belief that students have a life outside of studies and that higher education is not purely an academic, but also a social, experience.

Religion, value systems, the library, varsity athletics and location are found in the “Campus Life” discourse but not consistently across all six schools. Miami is the only school to explicitly discuss religion, as is FIU with its library. UCLA is the only school to prominently showcase its value system for its campus life. UT and FIU prioritize discourses on varsity athletic teams. Location is a theme that runs through UCLA’s and FIU’s “Campus Life” discourse.

The presence of multicultural programming on campus does not appear to be a necessary “Campus Life” discursive strategy for FIU, UCLA, UT and CSUF, as none of

these schools employ extensive strategic textual or visual discourse for this topic. UTSA is the only HSI to include a link to its multicultural programming (Student Center for Community Engagement and Inclusion) on its “Campus Life” landing page. Miami dedicates the most discourse to its multicultural programming in terms of textual and visual discourse, yet it is categorized under its “Getting Involved” section as a separate menu tab from “Campus Life.”

Some of the “Campus Life” landing page links, particularly in the discourse of CSUF and UTSA, show an attention to the race and social class of their prospective students. CSUF’s “Resources for AB540 Students” link is information for undocumented students, a term that has evolved in media and political discourse to describe a Hispanic person without legal documentation. UTSA’s inclusion of links for student computing services and its child development center potentially speak about its target audience as those from a lower socioeconomic background without funds to purchase a personal computer, as well as students who are non-traditional with families.

Visuals are also a point of difference among the six schools, with CSUF not including visuals as part of its marketing discourse. All of the other schools use visuals to some extent to portray campus life, and FIU even uses video.

The following sections discuss the research questions and how the discourses of the HSIs and non-HSIs speak to larger societal and cultural contexts involving power, privilege, social class, race/ethnicity, culture and diversity.

RQ1

Power/privilege/social class.

“Campus Life” discourse on housing provided fruitful investigation for examining power relations, privilege and social class. The HSIs all use the discursive strategy of describing on-campus housing as convenient, safe and close to campus. FIU uses relational discourse to describe campus housing as the student’s home away from home. Active verbs, such as enjoy, and calls to action to relax or catch up on studying are found in the “Housing” discourse to portray the campus housing situations as something prospective students should enjoy and is something worthy of which to take advantage. Other active verbs, including provides and offers, signify promotional and offertory language. These schools all focus primarily on the traditional incoming freshman student with their “Housing” discourse and heavily promote their on-campus living accommodations, such as residence halls. The majority of the actors seen in the housing visuals, apart from visuals of the housing facilities, are typical, college-age students.

FIU expresses that living on campus is “getting the full college experience.” This discourse makes the college experience a product the student can buy, particularly students with a higher SES, which can exclude students of a lower SES. CSUF emphasizes that on-campus living enhances personal growth and academic success. The schools also stress that campus living helps students develop peer relationships. Living on campus is presented as more than just the physiological processes of living and sleeping but as a way to belong to the university community. Through the institutions’ campus living experiences, the students have the power to better themselves. The discourse promotes individual development, disregarding any benefits or disadvantages it creates for one’s family by having the student on campus.

The focus on traditional, freshmen students who live on campus ignores the audience of commuter and non-traditional students who might be interested in attending the institutions. The push for and highly promotional nature of on-campus living and the portrayal of students as powerful consumers who enjoy the amenities create the ideal student as one who is privileged and able to afford this luxury. This discourse potentially unintentionally excludes prospective students for whom the ability of living on campus cannot be realized due to their lower SES. Seen from another perspective, the college experience is only for those who can afford to live on campus. Because Hispanic students most often come from low-income families and also strongly value family ties due to the nature of Hispanic culture, the inability to live on campus and afford housing is often a reality. According to the National Conference of State Legislatures (2012) about 50 percent of Hispanic students are the first in their families to go to college and one third continue to live at home during their college years.

To describe the college experience as an on-campus experience can further create the social and racial stratification in the prospective student pool. Prospective students from low-income families may feel excluded from the four-year college experience and seek alternative options, such as community colleges or online classes. It also can possibly cause prospective students to take out a loan to try and pay for something that they cannot afford in order to conform to the institutions' ideal image of their students.

Among the HSIs, there are different textual and visual approaches to their "Housing" discourse that relate to the social class of prospective students. Most of FIU's housing visuals show colorful buildings with palm trees, and its "Live FIU" video features aerial views of both campuses at dusk with spoken discourse describing the

campus as energetic, stunning and breathtaking, thus portraying an exotic campus scene. CSUF does not use visuals on its “Housing” landing page but clicking further into the housing facilities page are visuals of standard-looking accommodations. UTSA reflects CSUF’s visual representation of campus housing.

The competitive market and corporatization of higher education leads schools to continue to innovate and build up their resources, such as state-of-the-art recreation facilities or housing options, to better differentiate themselves and their educational “product,” which ultimately can increase overall tuition price. Presentations, such as FIU’s, of campus housing that include visuals or textual descriptions of resort/vacation-style accommodations speaks to a more affluent audience, whereas Hispanic students, like students of other racial backgrounds, who come from low-income families, might possibly not respond well to this discourse because it is not as comfortable and may seem out of their reach.

Besides “Housing” discourse, privilege plays a role in discourse on institutional location. All of the three HSIs are located in cities with considerably large populations, yet FIU is the only school to include marketing discourse in its “Campus Life” section about its geographic location and the activities in Miami. The most salient visual associated with the “Miami” discourse is the beach. The less prominent visuals of Little Havana, Miami Beach and the Design Strict all show standard city streets, not necessarily reflecting the textual description of Miami as an “eclectic” city with elegance, culture and charm. But FIU’s “Explore Miami” video more clearly exemplifies the life of Miami with an emphasis on images of recreation, such as the nightlife and the beach. The action verbs explore, go and find exemplify that the student has the power to explore Miami and

choose what they want to do. This discourse on recreation speaks to the institution's belief that students should have a life outside of academia. The college life it is portraying reflects a life that the privileged can enjoy in comparison to those from a lower socioeconomic background. Hispanics are the institution's largest group of prospective students, however its portrayal of college life is targeted to a more affluent class of prospective students.

Additionally, FIU creates the logical argument that because of its location, access to jobs is an easy thing to come by for FIU students. This discourse masks the reality of individual initiative, work and sometimes struggle to develop oneself to successfully take advantage of the cities' resources. This discourse could potentially overpromise to students based on the assumption that because one pays for an education, they will have professional success and advantages over other students. Power, opportunity and success in society are in the hands of those who have a college education. The discourse promotes the "good life" view of education and does not address the hard reality of finding jobs and being successful after graduation for some students, especially those who do not pursue the most lucrative fields of study. This discursive strategy is possibly detrimental for students who are unfamiliar with higher education due to limited familial experiences with it and who, because of their race or class, could face workforce discrimination.

Student involvement in campus activities is a theme that runs throughout the HSIs' "Campus Life" discourse. Visuals show students engaged in activity to promote an active campus life scene. Students are powerful agents on campus able to customize their out-of-class experience, as the active verbs participate, join, and attend portray the student as the active campus citizen. But the discourse also depicts the institutions with

power to offer students involvement opportunities, as well as cultivate skills in students. Active verbs, most commonly offers, provides, helps, empowers, strives, seeks or serves, show the institutions as the suppliers of engagement opportunities and exerting power and influence on their students' professional, leadership and social development. The institutions have some degree of societal power because they determine what skills are important for students in life beyond the university.

There are differing degrees of self-development versus group-development with a heavier concentration on self-betterment as motivation for students to get involved on campus. CSUF proclaims that there is something for everyone on campus because of all the different offerings and backgrounds of its students. Other reasons the schools give to persuade students to get involved are that involvement translates into leadership skills (UTSA and CSUF), increases one's marketability in the professional world (CSUF), is essential to learning and experiencing college (CSUF) and it benefits the school (UTSA and CSUF). FIU mentions how student involvement helps one become part of the university community. Education is seen as more of a private good rather than something public to be shared and used to strengthen communities. Group-development does not involve the community or one's family but the university community. In this view, students are productive resources for institutions to liven the campus life scene and make it attractive to prospective students.

Lastly, privilege and social class intersect some of the ways FIU mentions to get involved on campus. FIU has a "Be Active" video and textual discourse that promote recreation and its varsity athletics. The alternative it presents is to immerse oneself in arts and culture with museums or music concerts. The recreation center and varsity athletics

typically cost money because of their popularity, whereas the arts and culture often offer free admission. Students from an affluent background are more able to afford the rec center fee and sports tickets, whereas students from less affluent backgrounds might be excluded from participating and have to take advantage of free events. The discourse creates a dichotomy with sports and the rec center for the privileged and the arts and culture for the underprivileged.

Despite the HSIs' missions and identities centering around Hispanic students, their "Campus Life" discourse sometimes ill-serves this group of prospective students with how marketing discourses, particularly in housing, location, and campus involvement discourses, disregards the experiences and struggle Hispanics have had in higher education attainment and matriculation. At times, the discourses exercise quality control and avoid weakening the university experience to maintain institutional image, however the schools' must achieve a balance to cater to the needs of racially diverse, underrepresented and underprivileged students and fulfill its mission of providing access.

Race/culture/diversity.

FIU uses Miami and its offerings to sell its college experience to prospective students. FIU promotes its optimal location in terms of the recreational, cultural and professional opportunities. There are subtle discursive cues to Hispanic culture that FIU uses in its promotional discourse, as it mentions the Cuban Little Havana and its Calle Ocho as places of interest. Relational verbs relate Miami to its host of international people and that "it's home to people from all over the world." FIU puts a Hispanic student with a noticeable Hispanic accent as the narrator of its "Explore Miami" video, and several students and people shown in the video appear to be Hispanic. The institution

promotes discovery of the South Florida lifestyle, as exemplified with “The culture and charm of Calle Ocho awaits you just around the corner.” Culture is seen as a valuable asset to the institution for attracting prospective students, not necessarily something the institution or student should value because of its unique qualities or learning opportunities. Prospective students might be willing to go to a school where students look like them and live in a city where people share their Hispanic identity. Hispanic culture, though, is reduced to recreation and is a marketable resource for schools and not something for students to respect, contemplate or learn about. The discourse exploits Hispanic culture to attract students to further the interests and mission of those in power in higher education administration, who are most often White and male.

UTSA’s marketing approach to student involvement on campus might prove advantageous with Hispanics because of the value it places on diversity. Rather than mention any particular organizations, UTSA describes student involvement as diversity, access and collaboration. This discourse might speak to prospective Hispanic students because it involves students who are racially diverse, as well as those who have been historically marginalized on college campuses. The collective focus in Hispanic culture might also make collaboration in campus groups attractive to Hispanics. These values might persuade Hispanics because they communicate acceptance, equal opportunity and collectivity. Other repetitions of the idea of community and support, such as “work together,” “exchange ideas,” “inclusive,” “friendship,” and “mentorship,” communicate to students that the school supports teamwork and diversity.

The more generic mention of cultural groups or lack of mentioning any particular Hispanic groups might show a lack of priority for recruiting these students or providing

them with outlets of cultural expression. CSUF vaguely references its campus organizations as “social, cultural, political, religious and community service organizations, to name a few.” FIU specifically discusses its student union, Greek life and student media and makes a general reference to its student clubs on campus. Because prospective students are not likely to click through many pages to find information, the upfront presentation of cultural or Hispanic clubs and organizations might be beneficial to recruit Hispanic students. Studies have highlighted that involvement in minority-based organizations facilitates the adjustment to college for these students in ways other organizations do not (Barajas & Pierce, 2001; Conchas, 2001; Nagasawa & Wong, 1999). As many Hispanic youth are bilingual and value their Hispanic identity while also wanting to acculturate into U.S. society, schools who do present “Campus Life” marketing discourse about cultural groups or multicultural programming on campus could attract greater numbers of Hispanics.

An interesting site of investigation was multicultural programming. UTSA is the only HSI to provide a link to its multicultural programming information under “Student Services” on its “Campus Life” landing page. CSUF organizes its multicultural programming discourse under a separate tab titled “Student Support” that exists on the same menu bar as its “Campus Life” section. FIU’s multicultural programming information is harder to find, as there is no link provided on the “Campus Life” landing page that explicitly describes this discourse. To find it, one has to click three times beyond its “Campus Life” landing page.

The goals of the multicultural programs among the three HSIs have certain similarities and differences. All three HSIs promote service, social justice, active

citizenship, access to higher education and retention efforts, learning about diverse cultures and people, and cultural competency. FIU and CSUF also talk about leadership development. The main subjects are multicultural students, who the schools conceive to be racially or ethnically marked, or identified by race or ethnicity in comparison to the dominant White group, as well as those in the LGBTQ community.

Although cultural/ethnic campus groups and multicultural programming can be created with genuine intentions, Baker (2008) and Goldsmith (2004) argue that minority-based organizations or multicultural programming can possibly worsen campus race relations because of the lack of interracial interaction. CRT scholars argue that racially grouping diverse students for support or identification reaffirms the existence of racism, maintains the status quo and is seen as a coping strategy for racism rather than a solution because multicultural programs are not integrated into the heart of the institution (García, 1999). The HSIs multicultural programming discourse focuses on supporting multicultural students and enriching the campus community with cultural groups, events and programming but does not mention confronting campus racism/discrimination and engaging in dialogue with other racial groups about issues related to privilege and social class.

But one could argue that the lack of cultural/ethnic campus groups or multicultural programming is a form of racism because of its “color-blind” practice. Color-blind practices ignore the racial struggle and issues of power and privilege that race, as a socially constructed concept by the dominant majority, has conferred on those racially marked. Cultural/ethnic campus groups and multicultural programming are important for the support, retention and matriculation of multicultural students, yet they

are difficult to conceive without marginalizing these students, limiting them to their racial and social identities, and continuing to manage, not correct, racism in higher education.

The institutions discuss how multiculturalism, culture and diversity enhance the university experience for the larger campus community. Higher education institutions see those who “possess” diversity because of their racial or ethnic markedness as productive resources with market value. Diversity has emerged as a marketable quality for higher education institutions on the belief that a college’s diversity profile helps attract desirable applicants (Urciuoli, 2010). The emphasis placed on cultural competency and preparing students to be leaders in a global society are skills that universities and colleges can cultivate in students, particularly White students, because of how race and ethnicity have historically been socially constructed to create marked difference from the normative supremacy of Whiteness. A central tenet of CRT is the notion of race as property (Iverson, 2007). Another critical element in CRT is “interest convergence,” where White people “will tolerate and advance the interests of people of color only when they promote the self-interests of Whites” (Lopez, 2003, p. 84). The use of racially marked students as market capital to achieve competitive advantages and make higher education institutions attractive to prospective students serves the interests of the predominantly White governing bodies in higher education.

In higher education diversity discourses, culture most often stands in for race (Urciuoli, 2009). Culture and diversity in multicultural programming discourse are framed as resources that can be displayed, celebrated and performed in the form of cultural celebrations like Hispanic Heritage Month or in some of the multicultural groups’ missions. In this way, multicultural students are portrayed as having culture that

provides symbolic capital for the schools, their culture being authenticated by their racial markedness (Urciuoli, 2009). Diversity celebrations that involve nationally recognized events, such as heritage months or holidays, are familiar for those in the majority and do not pose challenges to their dominant status with issues dealing with racism, power, privilege and class. Multicultural programming does create a sense of shared culture and learning, which can help multicultural students succeed in college by having support networks. But it also others multicultural students and exploits them to “culture” other students and make institutions more attractive to prospective students because multicultural programming is a way to conceptualize the existence of diversity on campus.

Active verbs, such as supports, helps and welcomes all act to create an environment or space of acceptance for multicultural students on the university campus, such as UTSA’s promise that its Student Center for Community Engagement and Inclusion “will be a safe space.” The multicultural programs or offices of these institutions are also sometimes described as “advocating” for multicultural students. Because of racial, ethnic, gender or sexual orientation differences, there is the assumption that offering students group membership caters to those differences, creates events or groups particular to one’s racial or cultural identity, and focuses on their academic and leadership development. What is absent in the discourse is the multicultural student’s own merit to succeed academically and be a leader without the institution’s help, which is also sometimes present in the “Getting Involved” prospective student discourse. The discourse projects a stereotypical image of the multicultural student who because of their race and social disadvantage will automatically struggle in college.

The assumption that multicultural programs are necessary to provide support, resources and advocacy for multicultural students acknowledges racism and reinforces difference. Since institutions see multicultural students as requiring support and advocacy, the discourse depicts these students as socially risky because of their difference. While the schools' intentions to help multicultural students stay in school and matriculate are an attempt at genuine concern, the discourse of disadvantage constitutes these students and works to constrain them to their social and racial identities. The theme of social justice runs throughout some of this discourse, yet it never coincides with diversity as a process of organizational change or as the moral thing for higher education institutions to do to ameliorate racial and social stratification in higher education. As CRT scholar Ladson-Billings (1998) said:

Rather than engage in provocative thinking about the inherent contradictions between goals of equity and fair treatment and the individual lived realities of discrimination and harassment, universities celebrate diversity concomitantly with developing strategies to help people of color feel safe.

But as discussed before, the absence of multicultural programming and the employment of "color-blind" practices is a form of ignorance that does not address how race, as well as class, structures relations, privilege and power in the campus life atmosphere.

Institutional support for multicultural students, as well as a commitment and plan for diversity on campus that do not solely benefit the institution or its non-multicultural students, need more attention from the scholarly community and higher education administrators to determine the best strategies for achieving a truly inclusive campus life scene.

Value systems in the “Campus Life” discourse give a glimpse as to what institutions perceive as important. UTSA is the only HSI to include a value system in its “Campus Life” discourse. Clicking on the third “Campus Life” moving visual that navigates to the “Student Activities” page, the institution provides a link to the value system. UTSA communicates positive student behavior, that diverse ideas are beneficial to all students and education (civility), that moral principles are important to a fair and honest process for students (ethics), that diverse backgrounds and experiences are beneficial to UTSA and the San Antonio community (diversity) and collaboration is key for students’ educational success (collaboration). Repetition of “We value” emphasizes the importance of the institution’s implementation of values in order to shape and exercise control over students and the campus climate. UTSA extends its discourse to include the greater San Antonio community and how the values can be used to impact it.

The institution views diverse students as valuable and important to their campus life. The discourse speaks to tolerance and fairness on campus for those who are diverse, perhaps because of how historically, racially diverse students have been marginalized on or from college campuses. The focus on community and the collective “we” identity repeated throughout the discourse speaks to Hispanic culture and its collectivity/family orientation. Less emphasis is given to individual development and more to community betterment with the institutional values. It is likely that the school reaches out to Hispanic-based organizations as part of its volunteer work due to the large concentrations of Hispanics in San Antonio. This discourse on community development and collaborating with community partners and families could appeal to prospective Hispanic

students because the institution reflects their values, which could communicate support, likeness and belonging on campus.

The actors in the HSIs' visual discourse speak to their target audiences and realities as Hispanic Serving Institutions. Incorporation of visuals is a strategy of UTSA and FIU but not CSUF. FIU has 25 visuals (not counting videos), and UTSA has 9. UTSA utilizes moving visuals with captions that headline its "Campus Life" pages. Visuals in the form of video are unique to FIU. The actors in the sample schools' "Campus Life" page visuals are students who appear to be the normal college-going age of 18 to 22 years old. UTSA's visuals feature both Hispanic and White students, which are its two largest racial groups at 46.6% and 29.2% of the student body, respectively. FIU has the most visible Hispanic students included in its "Campus Life" visuals, as 61% of its student body is Hispanic.

The salience of more Hispanic students found in the HSIs' visuals speaks to their identities and missions of serving minority students. Hispanic college students represented in the "Campus Life" discourse transmits an image of the ideal prospective student with whom Hispanic students can identify. However, the non-traditional Hispanic students, as well as other non-traditional students, are absent from the discourse, which might discourage those students from applying because they do not fit the desired student mold. With White students being the second-highest concentration of actors in their visuals, that presentation strategy speaks to the HSIs' inability to completely rely on targeting Hispanic students. HSIs only need 25% of their student bodies to be Hispanic. The HSIs must attract prospective students who can fully afford the price of tuition, which in most cases, are White, more affluent students. This reinforces the racial and

social stratification of higher education and inequality with regard to access. The interests of the racial majority throughout all of higher education must be served by HSIs in order for the interests of the minority to become a reality.

UTSA's and FIU's visuals emphasize recreation. Most students are engaged in activity, pictured in personal distance with others or are smiling to communicate satisfaction and happiness with their experience. The "Campus Life" visuals do not reflect the rigor of academia. FIU, who textually and verbally in its videos does describe its library, professional opportunities and research, relies on images of leisure to persuade prospective students. These visuals further perpetuate college as a product and as living the "good life" with little to no initiative or hassle on behalf of the student. This can be problematic for students who do not have college insights from their parents and are unfamiliar with the work that higher education demands.

Culture and diversity as marketable resources for institutions to attract students and to produce multicultural campuses, specifically found in the HSIs' location, multicultural programming and student clubs/organizations discourses, use diverse students and populations for their culture. Institutions should view diversity as empowering diverse students to be leaders not only for their own gains—but also to advance and better the communities from which the students originate—with their knowledge gained, their success and positive higher education experiences can then serve as examples to encourage other Hispanic students to pursue something that people of less privileged backgrounds, as well as racial minorities, sometimes think is out of reach.

RQ2

Power/privilege/social class.

In comparison to the HSIs, the non-HSIs all include “Housing” discourse in their “Campus Life” sections. Similarly, the non-HSIs also persuade prospective students to live on campus with convenience, safety and proximity factors. UT, as does FIU, describes campus housing as the student’s home away from home. UCLA’s target audience is incoming freshmen, as shown in its discourse that “94% of Freshmen Live On Campus.” UCLA’s descriptive language about its “palm-tree terraces, cafes, vibrant vistas and recreation centers” engages students of a higher SES for whom the cost to enjoy campus amenities is not an issue. UCLA’s statement that “Living Here Is An Essential Part Of the UCLA Experience” excludes students who cannot live on campus and makes it sound as though the college experience is not for them, but for the Whiter, more affluent students, who still have the most societal power today.

On the contrary, UT constructs its housing discourse for a broader audience. The subjects found in UT’s housing discourse are also commuter students, married students and students with families. UT includes information for the commuter student who might have a family or decide to live off campus, such as links to the Austin Chamber of Commerce website, UT’s off-campus affiliates, its childcare center and others in the community, and local schools. With this discourse, UT brings attention to the class and most likely the race of its prospective students because its ideal student is not always the on-campus, privileged student. From the discourse, the college experience is also for commuter students, graduate students, married students and students with families (possibly including the non-traditional student). UT uses UTSA’s and CSUF’s approach by showing normal-looking residence halls in its visuals, which perhaps also shows the school’s acknowledgment of its varied audience.

Miami, although its visuals and text depict on-campus housing, includes a link to off-campus housing resources for students choosing to commute, as well as information on Miami neighborhoods, roommate search assistance and an off-campus housing/roommate fair. Miami, like UT, acknowledges that not every student is privileged to live on campus. But what is interesting is that information on Miami neighborhoods seems to target out-of-state students, possibly out-of-state Hispanic students, not those in Miami who would live at home and commute. And although Miami brings commuter students into the discussion, its visual promotion of on-campus housing with descriptions of the campus lake, patio areas for relaxation, Miami sunsets, and the dorms' "serene, natural courtyards" turns campus living into an exotic resort that resonates with affluent students and possibly alienates others who cannot enjoy on-campus living privileges.

In addition to FIU, UCLA is the only other school in the sample to devote considerable discourse to its location and its available recreational, cultural and professional opportunities. UCLA's "LA Lifestyle" describes itself as located at the "heart of one of the most dynamic cities in the world," and illustrates that there is fluidity between the campus and the city by saying that UCLA is "a crossroads of ideas, cultures and limitless experiences and opportunities." UCLA primarily constructs its discourse about Los Angeles with relational verbs to equate the experience of UCLA with the experience of Los Angeles. UCLA articulates that students "can experience Asia, Latin America and everywhere in between in a single afternoon." Latin America, as mentioned above, is a term that binds Hispanics by their common Spanish language.

Repetition of the words “opportunity” and “limitless” are words that could speak to Hispanic students, specifically those who desire an education to improve their socioeconomic status. UCLA uses subtle ethnic cues for the Hispanic audience with its mention of Latin America and culture, which depict a city where Hispanic students would fit in because of the presence of Hispanic culture. It is possible that UCLA’s mention of culture speaks to its values about culture as a positive experience for students. However, in similar fashion to FIU, this discourse also promotes “cultural tourism” that helps UCLA sell itself to prospective students. The two visuals do not portray students engaged in professional settings or being exposed to cultural situations but show them among the city’s aesthetics and recreation. The culture of importance, which FIU also exemplifies in its textual and visual discourse, is geographic. And with UCLA’s geographic culture comes a lifestyle for the privileged to take advantage of sightseeing, the “last set at the Coachella music festival,” and the “iconic neighborhoods” of Bel Air, Brentwood and Beverly Hills.

The discourse puts UCLA in the service role to its students because it promises them “every resource and opportunity to take advantage of all L.A. has to offer,” which puts no pressure or initiative on the student to be successful in this environment. Like FIU, UCLA portrays education as a guaranteed service rather than something the student has to earn, which can give students, particularly those with limited understandings of college, the wrong perception. Also, those who have an education do not always have societal power or the best lives, and success requires more than just a degree but also merit and resourcefulness.

Involvement on campus and being an active student is a theme that runs throughout all of the non-HSIs' "Campus Life" discourse. In comparison to CSUF, UCLA and UT proclaim that there is something for everyone on campus because of the different offerings and backgrounds of its students, as exemplified with UCLA's discourse that "for every interest, there is an outlet at UCLA." UCLA emphasizes leadership skills (as do UTSA and FIU) as incentives for students to get involved, as well as how student involvement benefits the school (as do UTSA and CSUF). UT focuses involvement around increasing one's marketability (as does CSUF) and out-of-classroom learning as necessary to the college experience (as do Miami and CSUF). As in the HSIs' involvement discourse, students are powerful actors who impact campus, as UCLA ascribes identities to its students, describing them as volunteers, intramural basketball players, Greek life members, writers, deejays and leaders in student government. But the institutions are also given societal power to inculcate skills in students through involvement opportunities, in example from Miami's student activities staff: "In collaboration with the University community, the office strives to further students' personal and professional development through involvement while celebrating their uniqueness."

UT, who has nationally recognized athletics, brings privilege to the forefront when it mentions its Division I sports programs, just as FIU does in its "Campus Life" discourse. Calls to action to "Bleed Orange" echo the discourse that "cheering on the Horns is part of the Texas experience," an experience that typically is for the privileged, especially with how Texas has turned its athletics into a multi-million dollar enterprise.

Marketing discourse about commuter student involvement in campus life, which only Miami displays among the HSIs and non-HSIs, is important in relation to Hispanic students. Information on commuter student involvement suggests that Miami understands that not all of its students come from affluent backgrounds and can afford living on campus. This discourse takes into regard class, which is inevitably linked to race. Racial minority groups, such as Hispanics, as well as Whites, sometimes come from lower socioeconomic backgrounds. Miami's marketing discourse on commuter student involvement might appeal to less affluent students because it acknowledges a place in the campus experience for those off-campus.

However, Miami's commuter student discourse also "others" these students by grouping them together and advocating their needs. It reinforces the stereotype of commuter students as uninvolved, disinterested in campus life and as dependent on the university's help to assimilate, as seen in its discourse that says, "We hope that our programming and services will provide you with the chance to become a more informed and more active member of the UM community." The discourse only encourages commuter students to have relationships with on-campus students in case they need a place to stay the night. While Miami develops support networks aimed to help commuter students, the isolation of commuter students further emphasizes their difference in social class in contrast to on-campus students.

While some of the non-HSIs' discourse does take into consideration privilege and social class, other forms of marketing discourse play to the privileged and preserve White domination of higher education. If these schools are going to walk the walk and sincerely try to recruit students of different races or lower SES, the discourse must consistently

remain inclusive, which is challenging because historically and still today, the privileged are the drivers of higher education.

Race/culture/diversity.

References to culture and Hispanic culture are present in UCLA's discourse on campus clubs and recreation. The campus organizations are described as a "mosaic of culture and activity." Culture in terms of race and ethnicity is seen in a visual with two girls who appear to be Hispanic and are part of a group named "Grupo Folklórico de UCLA" (Folkloric Group of UCLA). But while prospective Hispanic students might identify with the two Hispanic girls, the rest of UCLA's "Campus Life" visuals do not include many Hispanic students, which causes an inconsistency for the school and this specific diverse identity it might be trying to ascribe to its students.

By clicking further to UCLA's and Miami's student organizations directories pages, they have campus clubs for Hispanics of different ethnicities. For example, Miami has student groups for Venezuelans, Colombians and Cubans, as does FIU for the latter two. UCLA has groups for both Chicano/a and Costa Rican students. Dávila's (2000; 2001; 2002) work on Hispanic identity and the myth of the homogeneous Hispanic market can apply to schools such as UCLA and Miami that offer student groups for different Hispanic ethnicities. These schools might make a connection with prospective Hispanic students because Hispanics could perceive ethnicity-specific labels as a respectful understanding of the heterogeneity in the often-perceived homogeneous Hispanic culture. But without the salient presentation of these groups in "Campus Life" discourse, it is unknown whether prospective students would click further to investigate student organizations directories that have hundreds of campus groups.

An interesting finding from this study is that Miami, a non-HSI, is the lone school to provide a visual, link and textual description for its multicultural programming, although it organizes it under its “Getting Involved” content under a separate tab next to its “Campus Life” discourse. UT’s multicultural programming information is accessed via a link to its Division of Diversity and Community Engagement embedded in the “Getting Involved” discourse, the second content area under its “Campus Life” section of the website. UCLA does not have multicultural programming as part of its “Campus Life” discourse but includes a “Diversity” link to its overall institutional diversity initiatives in a menu bar at the bottom of all “Campus Life” pages.

The salience Miami gives to its multicultural programming on its “Getting Involved” webpage could attract diverse students, such as Hispanic students, because it openly communicates the presence of support networks on campus. The other schools have multicultural programming, but it is not as accessible for the viewer. It is possible that Miami wants to strategically communicate not only the presence of this programming but also that it as an institution supports diversity on campus and wants to recruit prospective diverse students.

As non-HSIs, Miami and UT do have multicultural programs that include some of the same discourse as the HSIs. Miami’s multicultural programming goals are leadership and advocacy for underrepresented and ethnically diverse students with services concerning matriculation, retention and academic development (themes found in the discourse of the HSIs), in addition to its support role to maintain a multicultural campus that celebrates and supports diversity. Interestingly, the phrase “support role” relates to García’s (1999) critique that multicultural programs are less useful if they are not

integrated into the heart of the institution. Miami's multicultural programming takes the supporting role, rather than the leadership role. The word "maintain" is also interesting because it calls into question for whom a multicultural campus is maintained. It appears there are motivations beyond just supporting multicultural students, motivations to help the university attract students based on the diversity rationale, a term that has come out of affirmative action cases, that operates on the assumption that diversity makes institutions more attractive.

Diversity, as seen in the multicultural programming discourse of UTSA, UT, and Miami, is something that the institution values and celebrates. Relational discourse tries to inspire comfort and inclusion for the multicultural student on campus, such as UT's Multicultural Engagement Center as a "great place to access resources and for many others, it is a home away from home" or Miami's welcome message to multicultural students that says, "We are happy to have you join our University of Miami multicultural family." As mentioned before with the HSIs' multicultural programming, the discourse works to contain multicultural students together and constrain them to their racial and social identities. The multicultural programming discourse portrays the multicultural student as powerless and dependent on the school to survive higher education, which gives the institutions the power because they have a "product" that can remedy race and disadvantage.

Miami and UT similarly conceive the multicultural student. The majority of the student organizations found within their multicultural programming are racially marked by categorizations used in affirmative action practices. However, Miami also has groups labeled by their nationalities and gender, and UT's multicultural programming also

contains student groups for queer students, students of color and their allies, and a general equity and diversity group. Most of Miami's and UT's events and programming do not provide meaningful dialogue on how race and social class affect minority student and White student relations on campus. It seems as though the events and programming are for White students as much as they are for multicultural students in terms of fostering cultural competency and exposure to diversity that is said to benefit students in the professional world.

Religion and its role in Hispanic culture proved to be a noteworthy point of investigation in the study. Miami is the sole university to say anything about students' spiritual lives on its "Campus Life" pages. The other five universities all have a variety of religious groups listed in their student clubs and organizations directories, yet none give prominence to students' spiritual lives in their "Campus Life" marketing discourse. Miami is not religiously affiliated, but it is the only private university in the sample. Miami promotes the variety of religious centers on or near the campus to address students' spiritual needs. Catholic clergymen are visual actors, and their facial expressions communicate a welcoming arena for religious ideas. Those involved in the religious discourse are students, faculty, staff, clergy, lay workers and the institution. Relational discourse discusses the institution's support and social/emotional investment in its students' spiritual well being, as well as clergy and lay workers' involvement in the "day-to-day activities dealing with faith and life, heart and mind."

Many studies (Jeynes, 2003; Ellison and Muller, 2001; Regnerus, 2000; Sanders, 1998; Zern, 1989) have shown a correlation between religious involvement and academic success. Ellison and Muller (2001) found adolescents' religious involvement was

positively associated with academic effort, educational expectations and educational attainment. Specifically regarding Hispanic college students, Carter and Hurtado's (1997) study showed that religious involvement is strongly associated with a sense of belonging among Latino college students. Jeynes' (2003) study of Black and Hispanic 12th graders suggested that family structure and religiosity may possibly help explain the academic gap between Black and Hispanic students and Whites.

Miami's prominent religious discourse speaks to the distinction between public and private education. Religion in a private school is more often talked about and less likely explicitly addressed in a public institution. Miami uses the synonyms "dialogue" and "discussion" (used twice) to relay that religion is to be contemplated and conversed about on campus. While the other schools have religious organizations, their "Campus Life" marketing discourse does not communicate openness to religious pluralism and discussion. To find, for example, religion at UCLA, one has to click three times from the ucla.edu page and search religion on the UCLA student groups page, where religion is not a student group classification. The search terms "religious" or "religion" yield a religious conference, not religious groups/organizations.

It is possible that Miami's private identity is advantageous for recruiting Hispanic students because the majority of U.S. Hispanics are religious, with only 12 percent who consider themselves religiously unaffiliated (Public Religion Research Institute, 2013). The visual salience of Catholicism on Miami's "Campus Life" page is an interesting artifact because 53 percent of Hispanics identify as Catholic (Public Religion Research Institute, 2013). Miami's inclusion of religious discourse might speak about the

institution's value on its students' spirituality away from their family and the continued and encouraged practice of it in the collegiate community.

UCLA is the sole non-HSI to prominently and saliently place its campus value system as the second content area of its "Campus Life" discourse. UCLA's value discourse, like UTSA's, speaks to how its values can impact the community and the world, which might appeal to Hispanics' values on community. Overlexicalization brought on by repetition of the word "community" and phrases such as "the greater good," "impact the world," "campus-wide selflessness," and "volunteerism" constructs UCLA as an altruistic institution concerned with the public good. But promotional and legitimizing discourse that raises the profile of the institution (i.e. UCLA being the No. 2 campus in the nation for volunteerism and its 20 years dedicated to reducing waste and increasing efficiency) undermines the altruistic image to serve UCLA's interests of attracting prospective students and branding itself by the specific qualities it inculcates in its students.

UCLA lists integrity, excellence, accountability, respect and service as the "founding principles" of its True Bruin code, which differ from UTSA's campus life values. Active verbs portray the values system/UCLA as the powerful actors that "welcome" incoming students, "unite" the campus and "project" UCLA's image outward. Diversity, although it is not a "value" of UCLA's True Bruin code, is "celebrated" on campus and in the community. UCLA perceives diversity as praise worthy, yet what is also clear is the absence of diversity as a meaningful principle in UCLA's value system, which calls into question whether UCLA prioritizes diversity in its campus life initiatives. In this context, diversity is vague in definition and serves to explain that it

exists at UCLA, yet what purposes it serves or what form it comes in is ambiguous. As the powerful actor inculcating values in students, UCLA does not view diversity as an asset to shaping its students and campus life, unlike UTSA.

Visuals are a shared discursive strategy among HSIs and non-HSIs and reflect structural racialization. The visual count of the photos are as follows: UCLA (24), UT (15) and Miami (15). Similarly, UT, like UTSA, utilizes moving visuals with captions that headline their “Campus Life” pages. UCLA displays consistent organization with a large visual that headlines each of its content sections under “Campus Life,” as well as other visuals with the textual discourse that follows. Miami’s visuals proceed short textual descriptions of the different content areas but are not as pronounced nor serve to headline the page. Students are the primary actors and appear to be the typical college-age, similar to the students in the HSIs’ “Campus Life” visual discourse.

The themes of visuals in the “Campus Life” pages of UCLA and UT similarly compare with the HSIs because recreation is also the dominant theme. Miami’s visuals maintain a focus on its students, as they are usually smiling at the viewer, engaged in conversation with one another or hanging out in personal space.

The non-HSIs, in contrast to the HSIs, picture significantly more White students than students of color. White and Asian students, who are the two largest racial student groups on UCLA’s campus, populate its visuals, while African-American and Hispanic students are underrepresented. UT has mostly White students in its visuals, and Hispanics are scattered throughout the visuals yet not in equal proportion to Whites, as UT’s White student enrollment (48.4%) is more than double Hispanic student enrollment (19.1%).

Miami's visuals also contain mostly White students, the majority on its campus. Due to the small size of its visuals, Hispanic students are less identifiable.

The actors that chiefly saturate the schools' visuals might speak about the target audience of prospective students they are trying to recruit. The non-HSIs inclusion of mainly White students in their visuals could suggest the ascribed identity of a UCLA, UT or Miami student. These visual presentations also support societal notions of higher education as a White-dominated arena where the affluent and privileged are the key participants. The repeated representation of one social model (i.e. the White student) transmits a dominant social value (Fairclough, 2001). If prospective students who do not fit the dominant social model, for example prospective Hispanic students, are continually exposed to White actors on the "Campus Life" page, it might discourage them from applying to the institution or seeking more information because they do not fit the mold of the desired applicant. The occasional inclusion of a student of color shown in social interaction and close space with White students creates the impression of racial diversity and tolerance on campus, yet what it can mask is any potentially hostile relations on the campus with regard to race and class. For example, in March 2012, UT'S student newspaper, the *Daily Texan*, came under fire for its racial insensitivity when it printed a cartoon calling Trayvon Martin a "colored boy."

The HSIs do acknowledge diverse students in the prospective student pool through their marketing discourse, but their motives are questionable when it comes to the purposes of displaying, creating and wanting diversity on campus. Diversity must be thought of as a transformative aim where institutions do not seek diverse students for institutional and economic benefits, but because granting access and opportunity to

diverse students can potentially help alleviate socioeconomic inequalities on a larger scale, as well as more evenly distribute knowledge and college education as a form of societal power.

The next section contains the discussion of the research findings, as well as limitations and ideas for future research.

CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION

This section includes a discussion of the findings, the study's limitations and ideas for future research. The study sought to answer the following research questions:

1. What are the similarities/differences in the discursive strategies used among HSIs (Hispanic Serving Institutions) to attract Hispanic college students?
2. How do the discursive strategies used by HSIs compare to the discursive strategies used by non-HSIs?

The study was limited to the "Campus Life" discourse of the three HSIs and three non-HSIs. Visuals were also limited to only the "Campus Life" landing pages. For coherence, I organized the results of the research questions according to discursive themes that appeared in the discourse to contrast the discursive strategies of the six schools.

One of the most interesting findings is the relationship between the institutions and diverse prospective students. While the institutional discourse presents the institutions as advocates of diversity and valuing its celebration and benefits for their college campuses, a deeper analysis uncovers how campus diversity is not solely designed to support multicultural students. Diversity is a productive resource for attracting students, culturally educating White students and reaffirming the existing racial power structures on college campuses, which relates to Bell's (1980) interest convergence principle. Another important finding is the portrayal of "Campus Life" and the college experience as a place for the privileged because college is considered a commodity. It is somewhat troubling that the HSIs, who are supposed to serve racial

minorities, reflect these marketing practices that can marginalize diverse students. This research adds to knowledge of marketing college to diverse students because it shows how institutionalized marketing discourse can potentially engage or exclude certain prospective students because of racial, social, power and privilege dynamics, which are elements that other CDA studies did not explore (Fairclough, 1993; Chiper, 2006; Askehave, 2007; Leyland, 2011; Saichaie, 2011). Those who are responsible for marketing college to diverse students need to make a conscious and careful effort to construct inclusive discourse that speaks to the experiences of all prospective students.

The “Campus Life” discourse promotes an experience outside of academia, one that is social and recreational with numerous opportunities for the student. Olive (2009) stressed that a comfortable academic environment influences first-generation Hispanic college students’ desire for higher education, and Cortes (2011) found that campus climates that validate Hispanic culture and promote collaboration also attract Hispanics to institutions. The HSIs and non-HSIs both demonstrate discursive properties that might be appealing to Hispanic students and validate Hispanic culture, such as religious information, value systems that align with Hispanic cultural values, subtle ethnic cues, and programming and student clubs that cater to diverse students. But other discursive presentations of “Campus Life” might actually exclude and exploit Hispanic students because of their race or social class. The lavish portrayal of campus living, the association of living on campus as getting the full college experience and the lack of discourse on commuter student involvement does not take social class into consideration when it comes to the prospective student pool. Instead, this discourse speaks to an affluent prospective student who can afford the privileges of living on campus. The

continued build up of living facilities and amenities, which can increase room and board fees, could further perpetuate the divide between the commuter student and on-campus student experience.

Miami was the lone school that featured religion and multicultural programming in its student life section. It is possible that Miami's private identity is advantageous for using religion as a marketing strategy. Miami also incorporates religious imagery that speaks to the Hispanic experience. Furthermore, Miami was the only school in the sample to feature content on its multicultural programming, apart from UTSA's inclusion of a link to this information, despite most of the schools having this discourse in other areas of their websites. Multicultural programming discourse functioned to create a community of support and resources for multicultural students, as well as to communicate the benefits and value of diversity and culture to the entire campus community. Most often, a multicultural student was defined as someone racially or ethnically marked, with the exception of whiteness.

Diversity in the "Campus Life" discourse appears to be a marketing strategy for recruiting prospective students, rather than connected to organizational change to better serve diverse student populations and remove any racial tensions on campus. Both UCLA and FIU use their cities' Hispanic culture as a marketing tool to sell the prospective student on the city. In this sense, race is property, which is a fundamental aspect of the CRT perspective. Racially or ethnically marked students are also seen as productive resources that, through their presence, lend their cultural competency for the benefit of the university community and individuals who are unmarked by race. To change this perception, higher education marketing discourse could also include marketing for the

public good and point out how educating diverse individuals to be leaders in diverse communities can help strengthen society. Commitment to diversity not for the material gains of the institution but because higher education for diverse students can help us empower and improve our communities shows a diversity discourse of social justice and societal change regarding access to knowledge.

The evolution of marketing discourse to sell higher education to prospective students and the view of education as a commodity rather than something that transforms the student or requires their own initiative, potentially overpromises success to students in life after graduation. “Campus Life” visuals that mostly emphasize a recreational and social higher education setting with fun and little hassle contribute to creating these expectations. Research shows that a college degree does help improve SES and can increase happiness and satisfaction (Leonhardt, 2011). But living the “good life” because college is something one can buy does not always hold true, especially for students who do not pursue lucrative fields of study. Institutions should be careful not to oversell themselves and must be transparent about what the student must do individually to succeed in school.

The lack of promotion of the schools’ diversity profiles also calls into question as to whether diversity actually exists on the schools’ college campuses, in particular those of the non-HSIs. Visuals with predominantly White students communicate the racial inequality that still exists in higher education. The HSIs do not outwardly project their diversity profiles in the “Campus Life” discourse, perhaps because it is assumed the universities are diverse due to their identities as HSIs. However, the HSIs might feel pressured to conform in the higher education market because identifying too strongly as

an HSI might “other” them as places for only diverse students, which could produce issues for attracting non-Hispanic students and achieving total student numbers. This strong ethnic identification also might impede their students from jobs and opportunities in the professional world because of possible assumptions people have about ethnic groups, such as their social class and work ethic. The similar content among the HSIs and non-HSIs brings to light that although the HSIs do heavily recruit Hispanic students, they also cannot survive on these students alone to continue offering education. The competitive nature of the higher education market and the inherent need for revenue most likely put pressure on the HSIs to attract students who can afford tuition without the aid of scholarships, whether they can pay from their own pocket or with other sources.

Although higher education institutions do not just target one specific pool of prospective applicants, a total market approach will fail to resonate with all prospective students. Schools who do not consider the ethnicity, race, class and culture of prospective students and how those elements come into play with the college decision will lag behind others in bringing in diverse students. A marketing strategy that completely adopts mainstream prospective student communication reinforces the establishment of White power structures and higher education as a private good and experience for only the privileged.

Predominantly White institutions, particularly the prestigious ones, are challenged when it comes to using segmentation strategies because a discourse that caters to the disadvantaged can be viewed as weakening their educational product and prestige while threatening their quality control of attracting the “best” students in the country. Racial and ethnic minority students are some of the most highly prepared, and there are those

who can afford to go to these schools. But because higher education has historically been a White, male-dominated arena, and minority students are more likely to come from less affluent, less educated families, that can sometimes impede their high school success, which is crucial to even being considered by these top-tier schools. The pressures of quality control to keep their “products” prestigious and coveted transmit the dominant social value that does not include the racially subordinated and underprivileged.

The HSIs, whose primary goals are to serve Hispanic students, potentially do their key prospective student target a disservice by marketing in a way that does not speak to their experiences. Too much mainstreaming of their content to that of their non-HSI competitors appears to perpetuate the White power structures in higher education and society that the HSIs are trying to eradicate by increasing access and opportunity for minority students.

Limitations

A limitation of this research is that its purpose was to describe and analyze the similarities and differences in the “Campus Life” discursive strategies of three HSIs and three non-HSIs on their institutional websites. It is possible that if I had examined three different pairs of institutions in different geographic areas, the results would have been different. Moreover, the primary source of investigation was textual and visual discourse, and the study did not include interviews with those who create the “Campus Life” marketing discourse to understand the strategy from their points of view.

In addition to examining how university marketing professionals think about reaching Hispanic prospective students, looking at other website content might provide additional insights. For instance, analyzing webpages on institutional diversity policies

might also produce fruitful information about the institutional integration of diversity and what objectives it serves, as well as the institutional construction of diverse individuals' identities in these policies.

CRT as the guiding theory for this study was limited to institutional marketing discourse and did not employ the narrative storytelling technique that allows marginalized people, in this case diverse students, to speak about their experiences in the university setting. Other theories, such as Latino critical race theory (LatCrit) or critical legal theory (CLT), could also be applied to higher education institutional marketing discourse and other policies in order to create social and legal transformation within higher education.

The textual and visual coding rubrics were also a limitation of this study, as only certain categories proved useful for answering the research questions and discussing how power, privilege, social class and race impact higher education marketing discourse. Useful categories on the textual coding rubric were lexicalization, overlexicalization, lexical cohesion, transivity and pronoun usage. Other useful categories on the visual coding rubric were descriptors, setting and sequencing of information.

Future Research

Future studies of how universities market education to Hispanics could involve interviews or focus groups with admissions, advertising or public relations professionals to discuss the strategy and formulation of marketing discourse to attract prospective students, in particular diverse prospective students. Other research could involve interviews or focus groups with prospective Hispanic students and their parents to determine what they prioritize in the college search process when evaluating and

comparing schools to better serve this specific group of college applicants with tailored marketing content.

Furthermore, prospective student media communication, such as social media or college viewbooks, could produce interesting results as well. In fact, centering particularly on social media may be especially significant because of its popularity with the Hispanic market. Future research and discussion are needed for how to best foster an environment of support for multicultural students and promote equality, access, matriculation, retention, while at the same time foster a campus climate where racial issues are discussed and solved to create real unity on campus. This research has contributed to knowledge about marketing college to prospective Hispanic students because it presents how marketers' discursive conceptions of Hispanic students, their culture and diversity provide material benefits to schools without a focus on increasing Hispanics' knowledge/access to higher education, which in turn benefits our communities and society. It also provides insight as to how particular discourses can alienate Hispanic students because of their race or social class. But it also shows that it is possible to create marketing discourses that value and understand Hispanic students and their culture and that speak inclusively about the opportunity of higher education.

References

- Arrona, J., Lynn, M., Morfin, O., Parker, L., & Perez, V. (2006). Hiding the politically obvious: A critical race theory preview of diversity as racial neutrality in higher education. *Educational Policy*, 20(1), 249-270. doi: 10.1177/0895904805285785
- Anctil, E. J. (2008). Marketing and advertising higher education. *ASHE Higher Education Report*, 34(2), 19-30.
- Alonso-Zaldivar, R., & Tompson, T. (2010, July 30). 87% of Hispanics value higher education, 13% have college degree. Retrieved November 24, 2012, from http://usatoday30.usatoday.com/news/education/2010-07-30-poll-hispanic-college_N.htm
- Askehave, I. (2007) The impact of marketization on higher education genres — the international student prospectus as a case in point. *Discourse Studies*. 9(6), 723-742. doi: 10.1177/0895904805285785
- Avila-Saavedra, G. (2011). Ethnic otherness versus cultural assimilation: U.S. Latino comedians and the politics of identity. *Mass Communication and Society*, 14(3), 271-291. doi: 10.1080/15205431003650478
- Baack, D., Baack, D.W., Pereira, A., & Singh, N. (2008, June). Culturally customizing websites for U.S. Hispanic online consumers. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 48(2), 224-234. doi: 10.2501/S0021849908080264
- Baker, C. (2008). Under-represented college students and extracurricular involvement: the effects of various student organizations on academic performance. *Social Psychology of Education*, 11(3), 273-298.
- Barthes, R. (1961/1977). The photographic message. In *Image, music, text* (pp. 31-51). New York: Hill and Wang.

- Bell, D. (1980). Brown v. Board of Education and the interest-convergence dilemma. *Harvard Law Review*, 33, 1-34.
- Blair, E., & Norriega, J. (2008, September). Advertising to bilinguals: Does the language of advertising influence the nature of thoughts? *Journal of Marketing*, 72(5), 69-83. doi:10.1509/jmkg.72.5.69
- Brown, A., & Hugo Lopez, M. (2013, August 29). *Mapping the Latino population, by state, county and city*. Retrieved December 8, 2013, from <http://www.pewhispanic.org/2013/08/29/ii-ranking-latino-populations-in-the-states/>
- Cabrera, A. F. and La Nasa, S. M. (2002). Hispanics in higher education. In J. Forest & K. Kinser (Eds.), *Higher education in the United States: An encyclopedia* (pp. 1-5). Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO Retrieved November 14, 2013, from University of Maryland: <http://www.education.umd.edu/Academics/Faculty/Bios/facData/CHSE/cabrera/HispanicsinHigherEducation.pdf>
- California State University, Fullerton. (2013 Fall). *CSUF news*. Retrieved December 8, 2013, from <http://news.fullerton.edu/ForMedia.aspx>
- Carolan-Silva, A., & Reyes, J.R. (2013) Navigating the path to college: Latino students' social networks and access to college. *Educational Studies: A Journal of the American Educational Studies Association*, 49(4), 334-359. doi:10.1080/00131946.2013.808199

- Carter, D.F., & Hurtado, S. (1997). Effects of college transition and perceptions of the campus racial climate on Latino students' sense of belonging. *Sociology of Education*, 70, 324-345.
- Chang, M.J. (2002). Preservation or transformation: Where's the real educational discourse on diversity? *The Review of Higher Education*, 25(2), 125-140.
doi:10.1353/rhe.2002.0003
- Chiper, S. (2006). The discourse of Romanian universities. *Journal of Organizational Change*, 19(6), 713-724. doi: 10.1108/09534810610708369
- Conchas, G.Q. (2001). Structuring failure and success: Understanding the variability in Latino school engagement. *Harvard Educational Review*, 71(3), 475-505.
- Cortez, L.J. (2011, September 25). A road map to their future: What Latino students need to graduate. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved December 8, 2013, from <http://chronicle.com/article/A-Road-Map-to-Their-Future-/129091/>
- Crenshaw, K. (1995). Race, reform, and retrenchment: Transformation and legitimation in antidiscrimination law. In K. Crenshaw, N. Gotanda, G. Peller, & K. Thomas (Eds.), *Critical race theory: The key writings that formed the movement* (pp. 103-122). New York: The New Press.
- Dávila, A. (2002). Culture in the ad world: Producing the Latin look. In F.D. Ginsburg, L. Abu Lughod, & B. Larkin (Eds.), *Media worlds: Anthropology on new terrain* (pp. 264-280). Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Dávila, A. (2001) *Latinos, inc.: The marketing and making of a people*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.

- Dávila, A. (2000). Talking back: Hispanic media and U.S. latinidad. *Centro Journal*, 12(1), 37-47.
- Dehyle, D., & Villenas, S. (1999). Critical race theory and ethnographies challenging the stereotypes: Latino families, schooling resilience and resistance. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 29(4), 413-445. doi: 10.1111/0362-6784.00140
- Delgado, R., & Stefancic, J. (2001). *Critical race theory: An introduction*. New York: New York University Press. Retrieved April 25, 2013, from University of Maryland <http://www.odec.umd.edu/CD/RACE/CRT.PDF>
- Ellison, C. G., & Muller, C. (2001). Religious involvement, social capital, and adolescents' academic progress: Evidence from the national education longitudinal study of 1988. *Sociological Focus*, 34, 155–183.
- Fairclough, N., & Wodak, R. (1997). Critical discourse analysis. In T. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as social interaction* (pp. 258–284). London, UK: Sage.
- Fairclough, N. (1993). Critical discourse analysis and the marketization of public discourse: The universities. *Discourse and Society*, 4(2), 133-168. doi: 10.1177/0957926593004002002
- Fairclough, N. (1992). Discourse and text: Linguistic and intertextual analysis within discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society*, 3(2), 193-217. doi: 10.1177/0957926592003002004
- Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and power* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Longman.
- Fernández, L. (2002). Telling stories about school: Using critical race and Latino critical theories to document Latina/Latino education and resistance. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 8(45), 44-65. doi: 10.1177/107780040200800104
- Florida International University. (2013). *About us*. Retrieved December 8, 2013, from

<http://www.fiu.edu/about-us/>

- Fry, R. (2011, August 25). *Hispanic college enrollment spikes; narrowing gaps with other groups*. Retrieved November 24, 2012, from <http://www.pewhispanic.org/2011/08/25/hispanic-college-enrollment-spikes-narrowing-gaps-with-other-groups/>
- Fry, R., & Lopez, M.H. (2012, August 20). *Hispanic student enrollments reach new highs in 2011*. Retrieved October 18, 2012, from <http://www.pewhispanic.org/2012/08/20/hispanic-student-enrollments-reach-new-highs-in-2011/>
- Fry, R., & Taylor, P. (2013, May 9). *Hispanic high school graduates pass whites in rate of college enrollment*. Retrieved December 8, 2013, from <http://www.pewhispanic.org/2013/05/09/hispanic-high-school-graduates-pass-whites-in-rate-of-college-enrollment/>
- Gee, J. P. (2005). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Gilroy, M. (2010). Tools for success in recruiting and retaining Hispanic students. *The Hispanic Outlook in Higher Education*, 20(15), 32-35.
- Goldsmith, P.A. (2004). Schools' role in shaping race relations: Evidence on friendliness and conflict. *Social Problems*, 51, 587-612.
- Gonzalez-Barrera, A., Lopez, M.H., & Pattern, E. (7, March 2013). *Closing the Digital Divide: Latinos and Technology Adoption*. Pew Hispanic Center. Retrieved September 25, 2013, from <http://www.pewhispanic.org/2013/03/07/closing-the-digital-divide-latinos-and-technology-adoption/>

- Halliday, M.A.K (1985). *An introduction to functional grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1978). *Language as social semiotic*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Hartley, M., & Morphew, C. C. (2008). What's being sold and to what end? A content analysis of college viewbooks. *Journal Of Higher Education*, 79(6), 671-691. doi: 10.1353/jhe.0.0025
- Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities. (2013). *Hispanic-Serving Institution Definitions*. Retrieved December 8, 2013, from http://www.hacu.net/hacu/HSI_Definition.asp
- Hui, D., Malancharuvil-Berkes, E., Mosley, M., O'Garro, J.G., & Rogers, R. (2005). Critical discourse in education: A review of the literature. *Review of Educational Research*, 75(3), 365-416. doi: 10.3102/00346543075003365
- Iedema, R. (2001). Analysing film and television: A social semiotic account of *Hospital: An Unhealthy Business*. In T. van Leeuwen & C. Jewitt (Eds.), *Handbook of visual analysis* (pp. 61-91). London: Sage.
- García, A.M. (1999). Multiculturalism: An “as if” phenomenon. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, (12)3, 299-310.
- Janks, H. (2005). Language and the design of texts. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, 4(3), 97-110.
- Jewitt, C. & Oyama, R. (2001). Visual meaning: a social semiotic approach. In T. van Leeuwen & C. Jewitt (Eds.), *Handbook of visual analysis* (pp. 134-156). London: Sage.
- Jeynes, W. H. (2003). The effects of the religious commitment of twelfth graders living

- in non-intact families on their academic achievement. *Marriage & Family Review*, 35, 77–97.
- Jorgensen, M., & Phillips, L. J. (2002). *Discourse analysis as theory and method*. London: Sage Publications Ltd. Retrieved April 26, 2013, from Sage: <http://www.rasaneh.org/Images/News/AttachFile/27-3-1391/FILE634754469767402343.pdf>
- Koslow, S., Shamdasani, P. N., & Touchstone, E. E. (1994). Exploring language effects in ethnic advertising: A sociolinguistic perspective. *Journal Of Consumer Research*, 20(4), 575- 585.
- Kress, G., & van Leeuwen, T. (2006). *Reading images: The grammar of visual design* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Kurtzleben, D. (2010, December 14). *U.S. Hispanic population is booming*. Retrieved November 18, 2012, from <http://www.usnews.com/news/articles/2010/12/14/us-hispanic-population-is-booming>
- Kwong, J. (2000) Introduction: Marketization and Privatization in Education. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 20, 87-92. doi: 10.1016/S0738-0593(99)00060-7
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1998). Just what is critical race theory and what's it doing in a *nice* field like education?. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, 11(1), 7-24.
- Ladson-Billings, G. & W.F. Tate. (1995). Toward a critical race theory of education. *Teachers College Record*, 90(1), 47-68.

- Larsen, P. (1991). Media contents: textual analysis of fictional media content. In N. Jankowski & K. Jensen (Eds.), *A handbook of qualitative methodologies* (pp. 121-134). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Leonhardt, D. (2011, June). Even for cashiers, college pays off. *New York Times*. Retrieved May 8, 2014, from <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/06/26/sunday-review/26leonhardt.html>
- Leyland, C. (2011). Does the rebranding of British universities reduce international students to economic resources? A critical discourse analysis. *Novitas Royal*, 5(2), 199-214.
- Li, C., & Tsai, W. S. (2012, May). Bicultural advertising and Hispanic acculturation. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 34(2), 305-322. doi: 10.1177/0739986311435224
- Llopis, G. (2012, May 14). Don't sell to me! Hispanics buy brands that empower their cultural relevancy. *Forbes*. Retrieved November 28, 2012, from <http://www.forbes.com/sites/glennllopis/2012/05/14/dont-sell-to-me-hispanics-buy-brands-that-empower-their-cultural-relevancy/>
- Lopez, G. R. (2003). The (racially neutral) politics of education: A critical race theory perspective. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 39(1), 68-94.
- McKee, A. (2003). *Textual analysis: A beginner's guide*. London, UK: Sage.
- Meyer, M. & Wodak, R. (Eds.). (2009). *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage.
- Milan, S. & Turcios-Cotto, V.Y. (2013). Racial/ethnic differences in the educational expectations of adolescents: Does pursuing higher education mean something

- different to Latino students compared to white and black students? *Journal of Youth Adolescence*, 42, 1399-1412. doi: 10.1007/s10964-012-9845-9
- Molesworth, M., Nixon, E., & Scullion, R. (2009). Having, being and higher education: The marketisation of the university and transformation of the student into consumer. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 14(3), 277-287.
doi:10.1080/13562510902898841
- Morgan, G. (1992) Marketing discourse and practice: Towards a critical analysis. In M. Alvesson & H. Willmott (Eds.), *Critical Management Studies* (pp. 136-158), London: Sage Publications.
- Nagasawa, R., & Wong, P. (1999). A theory of minority students' survival in college. *Sociological Inquiry*, 69(1), 76-90.
- National Conference of State Legislatures. (2012). *Ensuring Latino success in college and the workforce*. Retrieved March 24, 2014, from <http://www.ncsl.org/research/education/ensuring-latino-success-in-college-and-workforce.aspx>
- Olive, T. (2009). *Desire for higher education in first-generation Hispanic college students enrolled in the McNair Postbaccalaureate Achievement Program*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://udini.proquest.com/view/desire-for-higher-education-in-pqid:1855158121/>
- Oseguera, L., Solorzano, D.G., & Villalpondo, O. (2005). Inequities and Latino/a undergraduate students in the United States: A critical race analysis of their educational progress. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education*, 4(3). 272-294.
doi:10.1177/1538192705276550

- Palumbo, F. A., & Teich, I. (2005). Segmenting the U.S. Hispanic market based on level of acculturation. *Journal of Promotion Management*, 12(1), 151-173.
doi:10.1300/J057v12n01-09
- Pérez, P. A. (2010, January 1). College choice process of Latino undocumented students: Implications for recruitment and retention. *Journal of College Admission*, (206), 21-25.
- Perna L.W. (2004). Impact of student aid program design, operations, and marketing on the formation of family college-going plans and resulting college-going behaviors of potential students. Retrieved April 27, 2013, from
http://www.nassgap.org/library/docs/impact_of_student_aid_program_design.pdf
- Pew Hispanic Center. (2013, July 1). *Between two worlds: How young Latinos come of age in America*. Retrieved October 18, 2012, from
<http://www.pewhispanic.org/2009/12/11/between-two-worlds-how-young-latinos-come-of-age-in-america/>
- Public Religion Research Institute. (2013). *2013 Hispanic values survey: How shifting religious identities and experiences are influencing Hispanic approaches to politics*. Retrieved March 24, 2014, from
<http://publicreligion.org/research/2013/09/hispanic-values-survey-2013/>
- Regnerus, M. D. (2000). Shaping schooling success: Religious socialization and educational outcomes in metropolitan public schools. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 39, 363–370.
- Rodriguez, A. (1997). Commercial ethnicity: Language, class and race in the marketing of the Hispanic audience. *The Communication Review*, 2(3), 283-309. doi:

10.1080/10714429709368561

Rogers, R. (Ed.). (2004). *An introduction to critical discourse analysis in education*.

Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Saichaie, K. (2011). *Representation on college and university websites: An approach using critical discourse analysis*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from

<http://ir.uiowa.edu/etd/1071/>

Said, E. (1977). *Orientalism*. London: Penguin.

Sanders, M. G. (1998). The effects of school, family, and community support on the academic achievement of African American adolescents. *Urban Education*, 33, 385-409.

Scarborough Research. (2008). *The power of the Hispanic consumer online*. Retrieved October 17, 2012, from http://www.scarborough.com/search_results.php?q=power+of+the+hispanic+consumer+online&search.x=34&seach.y=9

Tate, W.F. (1997). Critical race theory and education: history, theory, and implications. *Review of Education Research*, (22), 195-247.

University of California-Los Angeles. (2013 Fall). *Enrollment*. Retrieved December 8, 2013, from <http://www.aim.ucla.edu/enrollment.aspx>

University of Miami. (2013 Fall). *Student enrollment—2013*. Retrieved December 8, 2013, from http://www.miami.edu/index.php/about_us/fast_facts/student_enrollment_-_fall_2013/

- University of Texas at Austin (2013, September 17). *Fall enrollment report indicates improvement in recruitment and retention*. Retrieved December 8, 2013, from https://sp.austin.utexas.edu/sites/ut/rpt/Documents/IMA_S_EnrollAnalysis_2013_Fall.pdf
- University of Texas at San Antonio. (2013 Fall). *Fact Book*. Retrieved December 8, 2013, from <http://utsa.edu/ir/factbook.html>
- Urciuoli, B. (2009). Talking/not talking about race: The enregisterments of culture in higher education discourses. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 19(1) 21-39.
- Urciuoli, B. (2010). Entextualizing diversity: Semiotic incoherence in institutional discourse. *Language & Communication*, 30, 48-57.
- U.S. Census (2013, January). *Educational attainment*. Retrieved November 18, 2013, from <http://www.census.gov/hhes/socdemo/education/data/cps/historical/index.html>
- U.S. Census. (2010). *Overview of race and Hispanic origin: 2010*. Retrieved September 10, 2013, from www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/briefs/c2010br-02.pdf
- van Dijk, T. A. (1997). Critical discourse analysis. In H.E. Hamilton, D. Schrifflin, & D. Tannen (Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 352-371). London, UK: Sage. Retrieved April 26, 2013, from Discourse in Society: <http://www.discourses.org/OldArticles/Critical%20discourse%20analysis.pdf>
- van Dijk, T.A. (1991). The interdisciplinary study of news as discourse. In N. Jankowski & K. Jensen (Eds.), *A handbook of qualitative methodologies for mass communication research* (pp. 108-120). New York, NY: Routledge.

Yosso, T.J. (2005). Whose culture has capital? A critical race theory discussion of community cultural wealth. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 8(1), 69-91. doi: 10.1080/1361332052000341006

Zern, D. S. (1989). Some connections between increasing religiousness and academic accomplishment in a college population. *Adolescence*, 24(93), 141–154.

Appendix A

Table A1: Janks Linguistic Analysis Rubric

Linguistic feature	Explanation	Data
Lexicalization	The selection/choice of wordings. Different words construct the same idea differently.	
Overlexicalization	Many words for the same phenomenon.	
Lexical cohesion	Created by synonymy, antonymy, repetition, and collocation.	
Euphemism	Hides negative actions or implications.	
Transitivity	Processes in verbs: are they verbs of?	
	• <i>doing</i> : action and material processes	
	• <i>being or having</i> : relational processes	
	• <i>thinking/feeling/perceiving</i> : mental	
	• <i>saying</i> : verbal processes	
	• <i>physiological</i> : behavioral processes	
Voice	Active and passive voice constructs participants as <i>actors</i> or as <i>reactors</i> to actions.	
	Passive voice allows for the deletion of the agent.	
Nominalization	A process is turned into a thing or an event without participants or tense or modality. Central mechanism for reification.	
Quoted speech	Direct speech (DS) Indirect speech (IS)	
Mood	Is the clause a statement, question, offer or command?	
Modality	Social authority and degrees of uncertainty Modality created by modals (may, might, Could, will), adverbs (possibly, certainly, hopefully) intonation, tag questions.	
Pronouns	Inclusive: we/exclusive we/you	
	Us and them: othering pronouns	
	Sexist/non sexist pronouns: generic "he"	
	The choice of first/ second/third person.	
Sequencing of information Logical connectors: conjunctions set up the logic of the argument.	Sequence sets up cause and effect. Conjunctions are:	
	• <i>Additive</i> : and, in addition	
	• <i>Causal</i> : because, so, therefore	
	• <i>Adversative</i> : although, yet	
	• <i>Temporal</i> : when, while, after, before	

Source: Janks, H. (2005). Language and the design of texts. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, 4(3), 97-110.

Appendix B

Table B1: Kress and van Leeuwen Visual Analysis Rubric

Visual feature	Explanation	Data
Descriptors	A basic description of the visual elements such as: actors and carriers; angle; colors; graphics; font; page design; perspective; settings; spatial relationships.	.
Actor	The active participant(s) in an action process is the participant(s) from which the vector emanates or which is fused with the vector.	
Goal	The passive participant in an action process is the participant at which the vector is directed.	
Interactors	The participants in a transactional action process where the vector could be said to emanate from, <i>and</i> be directed at, both participants.	
Reacter	The active participant in a reaction process is the participant whose look creates the eyeline.	
Transactional reaction	An eyeline vector connects two participants, a Reacter and Phenomenon.	
Non-transactional reaction	An eyeline vector emanates from a participant, the Reacter, but does not point at another participant.	
Setting	The setting of a process is recognizable because the participants in the foreground overlap and hence partially obscure it; (e.g. soft focus, over/under color saturation) and overall darkness or lightness between foreground and background.	
Means	A process used to created image (e.g. photograph, graphic, logo).	
Symbolic Attributes	Symbolic Attributes are made salient in the representation in one way or another. For instance, by being placed in the foreground, through exaggerated size, through being especially well lit, through being represented in fine detail or sharp focus, or through their conspicuous color or tone.	
Symbolic Suggestive	Symbolic Suggestive depictions are not represented as a general essence rather than a specific instance. Visuals of this nature may use soft focus, blending of colors, outlines or silhouettes.	
Sequencing of information.	Sequence sets up cause and effect. placement of images on a page (e.g. high, low).	

Source: Kress, G., & van Leeuwen, T. (2006). *Reading images: The grammar of visual design*. London, UK: Routledge.

Appendix C

Campus Life Website Links <i>Hispanic Serving Institutions</i>		
FIU	CSUF	UTSA
Intro	Associated Students Inc.	Housing
Student Life	Athletics	Dining
Miami	Clubs and Organizations	Student Services
Retail	Daily Titan Newspaper	University Center
Sports	Dean of Students	Campus Recreation
Arts & Culture	Campus Dining / Gastronome	Student Activities & Organizations
Housing	Freshman Programs	
Library	Get Involved	
Other Links	Greek Life	
Apply Now	Housing and Residence Life	
	Resources for AB540 Students	
	Student Leadership Institute	
	Student Life	
	Student Recreation Center	
	Titan Radio	
	Titan Student Union	
	Volunteer Services Center	
	Veteran Student Services	
	*Campus Life listed under current students	

Figure 2. HSI campus life website links. This figure illustrates the HSIs' organization of campus life discourse.

Campus Life Website Links <i>Non-HSI Universities</i>		
UCLA	Texas	Miami
Overview	Campus Life	Dean of Students
Values	Getting Involved	Dining Services
Housing and Dining	Living & Eating	Housing & Res Life
LA Lifestyle	Health & Wellness	Parking & Transportation
Health & Safety	Explore & Have Fun	Rathskeller
Clubs, Organizations and Recreation	Sports & Recreation	Spiritual Life
Student Support	Getting Around	Student Center Complex
	Safety & Security	University of Miami Police
		Getting Involved (located in separate tab)

Figure 3. Non-HSI campus life website links. This figure illustrates the non-HSIs' organization of campus life discourse.