ABSTRACT: Developmental education is an area of practice in higher education which continues to develop and expand. To date, it has been without a system portraying the logical relationships between various constructs employed in the field. A descriptive content analysis, considering 796 individual units from five different sources to construct a proposed architecture of the literature of developmental education, is presented. The project seeks to portray, in respect to the literature sampled, both the logical relationships existing between various topics in the literature of developmental education and the weight given to any particular topic. The result provides an overview of the field of developmental education and its literature based on the topics addressed and purposes advanced by the many practitioners and scholars who authored the manuscripts surveyed.

Developmental education is a young discipline even though it has roots in services provided to underprepared students at institutions of higher education for over 150 years (Arendale, 2002; Neuberger, 1999). The phrase developmental education, the organizations for practitioners, and the publications in the field are between 30 and 40 years old (Armitrington, 2003; Boylan & Bonham, 2007; Clowes, 1980). Further, the nature and scope of developmental education is an item of continuing debate (Bruch, 2001; Casazza, 1999; Davis, 1999; Higbee, 1996). As a result, no hierarchical system showing the relationships between various constructs has been developed for the field. In addition, meta-analytical studies and extensive critical reviews of the literature of developmental education are few in number. Therefore, author statements describing the scope and nature of the literature in the field are often brief and subjective or based upon a topic-specific sampling of the literature (Trenholm, 2006; Wheland, Konet, & Butler, 2003).

I was unable to quantify the emphasis placed on developmental mathematics in the literature of developmental education when preparing the literature review for my dissertation. In addition, it was impossible to portray the balance between the emphasis on mathematics and that given other critical concerns in the field of developmental education. To facilitate appropriate descriptions of the content of the literature for developmental education, the emphases in the literature, and the relationships between topics, I developed a proposed architecture of the literature of developmental education.

The architecture is referred to as "proposed" for a number of reasons. First, it was the work of one person and may, as a result, reflect bias. Second, the method is based upon a sampling of the literature rather than categorization of the literature in its entirety. Third, the literature of developmental education continues to develop and expand. Therefore, the structures and relationships portrayed in the architecture are undergoing change.

The term "architecture" was employed as the project sought to portray both the logical relationships that exist between various topics in the literature and the attention which has been given to any particular topic in the literature. Architecture seemed to best portray this consideration of the structure of, the relationships between the components of, and the relative size of the components of the developmental education literature. Like plans for a building, the proposed architecture sketches the primary components of the developmental education literature and the relationships between these components. This is its primary value: providing a schematic of the literature.

A joist-by-joist, room-by-room, and wing-by-wing perspective of the literature is advantageous for instructors, administrators, researchers, editorial boards, and the public. Like a blueprint, it can be employed at multiple levels to function as guide, tool, and set of evaluative criteria. For example, the architecture displays constructs such as a structured and hierarchical overview of the literature sampled, key topics of interest in the field, and areas of focus in major publications, and it does so in an easily discerned manner. Since it represents an overview of material published in the field, the conceptual grid revealed is applicable to interactions regarding the current state of affairs in developmental education and to program and institutional organization, planning, and evaluation. This second area of application addresses needs...
of practitioners, administrators, and public officials in respect to departmental, institutional, and state-system level programming and to editorial boards in respect to review and planning. It also shows the developed and underdeveloped topic areas, ideas of particular interest to researchers. As a description of the literature, an architecture can answer many factual questions and serve as a platform for and point of reference in considerations of purpose, direction, vision, and values.

Method
The content of a variety of publications was analyzed to develop the proposed architecture. Each of these sources is considered a major resource in the field of developmental education (Boylan & Bonham, 2007; O’Hear & MacDonald, 1995) and has a general rather than discipline-specific focus. However, the material employed was limited in some respects as the project was planned as an initial rather than an exhaustive exploration and served as a platform for and point of reference in considerations of purpose, direction, vision, and values.

The entire count of articles published in RTDE from 1998’s Volume 15, Issue 1 to 2006’s Volume 22, Issue 2 was included in the analysis. The use of a limited sample for RTDE was decided based upon the volume of material and convenience. The 85 articles in the issues were similar to the sample sizes for RiDE and the NADE publications, and the RTDE tables of contents and abstracts are available online at the organization’s Web site from Volume 15, Issue 1 forward.

Each of the monographs published by the National Association of Developmental Education (NADE) between 1996 and 2003 was analyzed and cataloged as well as the NADE Digests 1.2 through 3.1 (the author could not secure access to the NADE Digest 1.1). These monographs and digests were considered as issues of one collective publication. All articles and book reviews from the NADE monographs and digests were included in the proposed architecture but the descriptive introductions to each volume provided by the editors were not. A total of 97 individual units were included in the development of the architecture from the NADE publications.

Finally, abstracts for 33 doctoral dissertations which addressed developmental mathematics and were completed between 1980 and 2005 were examined and cataloged. This small sample of material was employed to gauge the ability of the architecture’s penultimate version to describe and categorize material from a specific content area. The combined total of articles and dissertation abstracts considered in the development of the proposed architecture was 796 units.

Some publications which address developmental education were excluded when developing the proposed architecture. Content from the Learning Assistance Review and the Journal of College Reading and Learning was not included. This decision was made with the intent of developing an initial architecture based upon a large sample of material from publications with a broad and general focus on developmental education and extending it to greater specificity through the use of material from other publications at a later date. The approximately 800 units categorized from RiDE, RTDE, NADE, and JDE were judged to fulfill this purpose. In addition, articles considering developmental education or some aspect of it which appeared in journals and publications not specifically identified with developmental education were not included in the development of the architecture.

Several existing systems for categorizing publications were considered as templates for the architecture of the literature. Each would have established a predefined set of abstract concepts under which to classify the subjects addressed in the literature, a deductive approach. The systems of this type considered were the Library of Congress (Library of Congress, n.d.) and Dewey Decimal (Thompson-Nicola Regional District Library System, n.d.) classification systems using an initial sort of the works by type of literature. Adapting these systems for the purpose of developing an architecture of the literature of developmental education was rejected as being inconsistent with the goals of the project and as having significant potential to skew the results of the project or impose limits on integration of all aspects of the literature.

Several existing systems for categorizing publications were considered as templates for the architecture of the literature.
reports, reports of scholarly and practitioner opinion, and other literature. This approach was also rejected as the reports of research results, discussions of scholarly opinion or practice, and the remaining balance of the literature address the same content areas and would have resulted in three roughly parallel outlines of the literature rather than one integrated outline.

Content analysis through descriptive labeling and comparison, a qualitative research pattern described as "descriptive content analysis" (Neuendorf, 2002, p. 53), was employed to construct the proposed architecture of the literature. "Human coding" (Neuendorf, 2002, p. 50) of the material sampled was utilized. The "unit of data collection" (Neuendorf, 2002, p. 50) was article length publications in the periodicals previously noted and the abstracts of 33 dissertations which addressed developmental mathematics. Individual classification of article content and comparison was employed in developing the labels for subcategories, categories, and primary headings and the relationships between them, a process Duranczyk described as "analytical induction and constant comparison strategies" (2007, p. 27). This process is widely known as outlining, a system taught to students for note taking (Kanar, 2004), employed by academics (Adler, 1981), and that operated as the basis of describing the relationships identified in the coding of qualitative data.

Although the outlining pattern employed was primarily an inductive approach, it was begun utilizing the categories developed by O'Hear and MacDonald (1995) in their two-part critical review of the research in developmental education published in 1995 and 1996. They divided the publications considered in their review into eight categories by subject matter (O'Hear & MacDonald, 1995). These categories were reading, program concerns, writing, study skills, students, math, multiple skills, and tutoring (O'Hear & MacDonald, 1995, p. 3; MacDonald & O'Hear, 1996). These eight descriptors, or primary headings, were employed as the initial "outline/key word" (Kanar, 2004, p. 120) system for the architecture. This list did not include each of the "seven major research and practice areas" (Lundell & Collins, 1999, p. 5) identified by NADE, but it expanded to include each of them during the full process, as described following. One researcher completed all the coding. Frequent and extensive "spot checking" (Neuendorf, 2002, p. 50) of the classifications was employed to ensure reliability of the resulting architecture of the literature.

The rough outline composed of eight "key words" (Kanar, 2004, p. 120) or phrases was then used to begin a sort of the material in the literature. Articles were categorized by subject matter and assigned a subject matter descriptor. These descriptive labels were derived from the title of the article and confirmed through a reading of the abstract. In the instances in which some uncertainty remained about the appropriateness of the assigned descriptor, the entire article was read. The assigned descriptors were then compared to the 8-point outline or a later revision of it. When subject matter descriptors for articles matched the existing set of outline headings, the article was included in the list of material assigned to the existing heading. When the descriptor did not match an existing heading or category in the outline, the subject matter descriptor was added to the outline as an appropriate point in the hierarchy. Every effort was made to utilize terms or phrases in the labeling which would be self-explanatory. Each major grouping of content in the proposed architecture (headings, subheadings, categories, subcategories) included a mixed content section, as some of the material addressed multiple subject areas, a number of purposes, or both. For example, Boylan, Bonham, and Bliss (1994); Jehangir (2002); and Johnson (1994) included material classified as mixed content publications.

In the process just described, it became clear that a sort of the articles based solely upon subject matter would be inadequate. It did not allow sufficient differentiation in some areas of the literature. For example, not all articles discussing developmental reading focused on instruction. Some articles described particular institutional characteristics desired to support a reading instruction program, others described theoretical systems used in the design of instructional programs, and still others described the viewpoints of persons from outside developmental education regarding the programming and instruction taking place in developmental education. Therefore a second defining characteristic of each article was considered when categorizing the articles: purpose. For example, was the author's purpose to describe the results of classroom research, to explain the particulars of a theoretical construct applicable within the field of developmental reading, or to inform readers of the potential impact of popular perspectives or state and national legislation on developmental reading programming? The combination of subject matter and purpose resulted in a simple, useful, and effective classification tool.

The articles published in RiDE were the first to be categorized with the 8-point outline. The outline remained without subjugation until all 100 articles in RiDE had been classified. At this point, an attempt was made to identify and represent the logical relationships between some of the headings by arranging them hierarchically. The resulting outline had only primary headings and one subsumed level of associated subheadings. This outline was then applied to the 85 articles published in RTDE between 1998 and 2006. The same pattern of labeling, comparison, and cataloging described previously was utilized. The result was an increase in the breadth and depth of the outline. The expanded outline was then applied to the content of RiDE, which had already been classified and sorted using the first outline. Each descriptor formerly assigned to articles and the position they had been assigned in the outline of content found in their "home" publication was reconsidered in light of the revised outline. Any adjustments made necessary by the increased specificity of the outline were made to the article classification list for RiDE. The 97 articles found in the NADE monographs and digests were then considered. The same pattern of adaptation of the outline based upon the characteristics of the new literature and regression of the adapted outline upon already classified literature was conducted. Following the work with NADE content, a 4-level outline of content from RiDE, RTDE, and NADE was created as well as catalogs of the articles in each publication. Each of the catalogs had been repeatedly reviewed for accuracy.

The contents of the JDE were reserved for classification until a substantial outline had been generated using the RiDE, RTDE, and NADE materials. As mentioned previously, 481 articles, excluding introductions to special issues and the feature "Developments," were published in the issues consulted. Seeking to classify this large and diverse body of literature served as a test of the breadth, depth, and function of the outline. Adaptations were made to the outline in response to the JDE content, and these were regressed upon the previously compiled catalogs of articles from RiDE, RTDE, and NADE. Following this, the classification of each article in the JDE was also reviewed. At this point, the outline began to reflect its potential as a robust architecture of the literature sampled since it was based upon a thorough review of over 750 articles published over periods of 7 to 24 years in four major publications in the field. It represented the topics in the literature, their relationships, and the volume of material associated with each topic.
The final test to which the proposed architecture was subjected was its ability to accurately classify and describe content in a specific subcategory of the literature. Toward this purpose the author selected abstracts from 33 dissertations published between 1980 and 2005. Each of these dissertations focused on developmental mathematics. The proposed architecture was able to separate these publications related to a single area in developmental education into their areas of emphasis. The utility of the proposed architecture was illustrated by its ability to sort a diverse and complex set of published materials like that from the JDE and a specific content area related set of investigations like that represented by the 33 dissertation abstracts. This was evidence that the architecture both described and could be used to characterize the literature of developmental education. It supported the accuracy of the logical relationships between the topics addressed in the literature as portrayed in the hierarchy of the proposed architecture. That very few of the published articles in the four periodicals and the collection of dissertations were classified in the "catch all" categories of mixed content was also support of the veracity of the hierarchy of the proposed architecture.

Results

Table 1 illustrates the results of the development process for the architecture. The left column of the table identifies the headings, subheadings, categories, and subcategories of the proposed architecture. This table also represents the percentage of published content in the sample related to each. In ascending order, subcategory percentages will total to equal the category percentages, category percentages to equal the subheadings, and subheading percentages to equal the figures associated with the primary topic headings.

Discussion

Terminology and Headings

Every effort was made to use self-explanatory terms and phrases as category titles. For example, two of the four category headings in the primary topic area "Developmental Programs" are easily understood, especially when the subcategories are considered. "Persons and Participants" includes students, faculty, and other personnel. "Administration and Supervision" includes content pertinent to the oversight of developmental programs. Specifically, this category includes content regarding goals and outcomes, real and desired, of developmental programming; the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>NADE</th>
<th>RIDE</th>
<th>RTDE</th>
<th>JDE</th>
<th>DISSERT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Developmental Education Programs</td>
<td>83.5%</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
<td>97.6%</td>
<td>76.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Persons/participants</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Administration and supervision</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Goals and outcomes</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Mixed content</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Philosopical/theories of practice</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Theoretical systems/theories of action</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Computer Based Instruct/technology</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Mathematics</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Study skills</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Reasoning/Critical thinking</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. ESL</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Other/general</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Multiple content areas</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Support programming</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Tutoring</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Writing/English</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Mathematics</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Study skills</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Reasoning/Critical thinking</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. ESL</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Other/general</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Mixed content</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Equity and access and balance issues</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Multicultural/diversity</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Gender</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Ethnic groups</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Age</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Disability</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Affective/noncognitive topics</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Mixed</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued on page 18
There were instances in which the subject matter and purpose...dictated classification in a different category.

Developmental Education Programs: Educational Theory and Practice: Instructional Design/Models. Although the majority of the "Techtalk" feature was classified as either "Resources for Developmental Education: Technology" or "Developmental Education Programs: Educational Theory and Practice: Computer Based Instruction/Technology"—a combination that equals over 11% of the content of the JDE across 24 years—there were instances in which the subject matter and purpose of the feature’s content dictated classification in a different category and subcategory. This circumstance is not limited to the feature “Techtalk.” For example, Ausubel and Hirsch’s 1991 “Selected Studies on Math Placement” might appear to be a mathematics-specific article until one understands that its focus is placement of students in developmental mathematics, a program administration concern. It was classified as “Developmental Education Programs: Administration and Supervision: Policies and Processes” since the content would inform the process of planning and monitoring student placement in developmental mathematics, an administrative or supervisory function.

The reader should note that the proposed architecture is not an annotated bibliography. These are available from the National Center for Developmental Education. It is an attempt to represent the range of topics addressed in the literature of developmental education, to examine the relationships between these topics, and to gauge the volume of and sources of information in each topic area. This occasionally involved categorizations of articles which could appear inaccurate using the title of the article as the sole criterion.

This proposed architecture of the literature can be considered representative although not exhaustive. It is based on nearly 800 items published across a 24-year period. This group includes nearly every item published in four of the major source publications in the field of developmental education and dissertations specific to developmental mathematics. To the extent that the proposed architecture is representative, the following can be said about the literature of developmental education.

The literature of developmental education has three primary topics. These are "Developmental Programs," "Perspectives of Developmental Education," and "Resources for Developmental Education." Occasionally authors draft literature which includes emphasis in two or even three of these areas. To account for this, the proposed architecture of the literature has a fourth primary heading, “Mixed Content.” In each of the publications that have been incorporated into the architecture, consideration of the topic "Developmental Programs" represents the bulk of the literature (see Table 1). There is little content in the literature that straddles two or three of the major divisions which, again, can be seen as evidence that these divisions accurately represent primary emphases in the literature.

Frequency of Articles in Categories

Developmental Programs, the topic area in developmental education receiving the most consideration by authors, presently includes content related to four areas: "Persons or Participants in Developmental Education," "Administration and Supervision of Developmental Education," "Educational Theory and Practice," and "Equity, Access and Balance Issues." The most commonly addressed category in this group is "Educational Theory and Practice," comprising between 44% and 56% of the articles published by NADE and in RIDER, RIDE, and the JDE. Understandably, this category includes much smaller percentage of the dissertations considered.

The category receiving the most attention in the literature is "Content Area Theories/Applications" (e.g., reading, English, mathematics, reasoning/critical thinking). Between 21% and 40% of all the articles published in the periodicals used to
develop the proposed architecture focus on a content-area specific application. Of the publications considered. RTDE has focused most heavily on this category. The focus on content-area specific considerations is, in the opinion of this author, a product of the nature of the field. The vast majority of persons active in the field are practitioners who specialize in providing instruction within a given content area. That the focus of published articles is predominantly "Educational Theory and Practice," as it relates to the academic discipline in which practitioner-readers teach, should be expected.

One primary topic area and several subcategories reflect very little consideration in the literature of developmental education. The primary heading "Resources for Developmental Education" includes five subsumed topics in which content was found in only one of the periodicals. With the exception of "Technology" which has been addressed in a regular feature in the JDE for the last 24 years, these categories and subcategories contain 1% or less of the published material for the periodical. These areas are "Personal Professional Development," "How to Approach the Literature," "Meta-Analysis of the Literature," and "Professional Organizations." Each is an important topic for developmental educators. The limited content in these areas indicates an opportunity for authors and a possible need for practitioners. Outside this group, there are other topic areas with very limited content.

Other areas which have received limited consideration in the literature are "Other Personnel" under the subheading "Persons/Participants," "By Funding Type" and "International" under the subheading "Administration and Supervision," and "Gender" under the "Equity, Access, and Balance Issues" subheading. Knowledge of the characteristics of successful program directors or successful academic assistance advisors, "Other Personnel," would be valuable to community college administrators and supervisors of developmental programming. In addition, knowledge of sources of funding, the particulars of acquiring and administering these funds, and an understanding of developmental education activities outside the United States would be valuable. Finally, a better understanding of gender distinctions and their impact on developmental education is in order. Although many investigations have included this characteristic, a continuing discussion focused on the research results and their implications has not yet developed as evidenced in the literature sample. That these and other topic areas have received less attention may be a result of the relative youth of the publications, a perception among parties active in the field that these topics were not pressing concerns, or a number of other circumstances.

Even though the proposed architecture cannot address the causes for activity in the literature in one area as opposed to another, it can and does highlight the relative weighting of topic areas in the literature of developmental education, and it notes some gaps in information if not knowledge gaps.

The significant weighting of the literature toward "Educational Theory and Practice" across the major publications considered together with the areas in the literature which have garnered little interest illustrate another characteristic of the field of developmental education. The field has, to date, had an internal as opposed to external focus. As an area of practice in higher education which has relatively recently developed organizing structures and which has faced resistance, this is to be expected. However, such a focus can be limiting. The problems faced by American educators with respect to underprepared college students are not unique. Much could be learned from educators who work with these populations in other countries like Australia (Green, Hammer, & Stephens, 2005; Milnes, 2005; O'Regan, 2005). In addition, the challenges and opportunities faced by developmental educators are, for the most part, not unique to developmental education. Many academic disciplines have developed theorems and content directly applicable to the field of developmental education. A primarily internal focus inhibits the ability of developmental educators to model the type of thought and practice many postsecondary professionals champion for students, integrating theory and practice across multiple academic disciplines.

Content of Included Publications
The proposed architecture also provides a perspective of the publications included in its development. Two of the periodicals are comprehensive. In the years of content considered, the JDE has addressed nearly every topic present in the literature of developmental education. It is the most comprehensive source cataloged in the proposed architecture. The NADE monographs and digests are the next most comprehensive source, and they share a significant emphasis on historical and philosophical perspectives of developmental education with the JDE. The average developmental educator could establish a broad perspective of the field reading either;
Two of the periodicals used to construct the proposed architecture are not comprehensive in their consideration of developmental education. Overall, 81% of the content of RTDE has been classified under three subheadings of "Developmental Education Programs." These three categories are "Persons/Participants," "Administration and Supervision," and "Educational Theory and Practice." It appears that RiDE has intentionally, as a result of the interests of the authors submitting manuscripts or for other reasons, specialized in these areas. When the attention given to resources regarding research is included, 90% of the content of RiDE is accounted for. Similarly, 94.2% of the content of RTDE was classified in the first three subheadings of "Developmental Education Programs." Based upon the proposed architecture, one can say this publication has had the most narrow focus of the four publications cataloged with 85.6% of its content in the "Administration and Supervision" and "Educational Theory and Practice" subheadings. The only topic which was covered in the "Persons/Participants" subheading by RTDE was "Students." However, these are simply characteristics of the publications and should not be interpreted as short comings.

For developmental educators seeking a concentrated exposure to research focused on developmental programming and many of the traditional concerns of developmental education, RiDE is a good choice. RiDE content can be said to be traditional, as the "Educational Theory and Practice: Content Areas" subcategory is almost exclusively focused on reading, writing/English, and mathematics (the only exceptions are the three "Multiple Content Areas" articles; two include critical thinking, the third includes study skills), and there is very limited content in the "Equity, Access, and Balance Issues" topic area and in the "Support Programming" category. Of RTDE's 94.2% content classified in the first three categories of "Developmental Education Programs," it has 12% more content in "Educational Theory and Practice" than RiDE, showing strong emphasis on this topic area. RTDE includes manuscripts addressing more of the content areas of developmental education than RiDE with twice as much attention given to "Support Programming" than RiDE; however, it shows slightly less content in the "Equity, Access and Balance Issues" and "Perspectives of Developmental Education" topic areas and no content under the "Resources for Developmental Education" heading.

Limitations
The work completed has a number of limitations. As noted, it was the work of one researcher and may show bias as a result. Second, the sample was large but drawn from a limited number of sources. As a consequence, some of the relationships portrayed may not represent the nature of the entirety of the literature of developmental education, some detail may be absent in respect to the categories and subcategories, and the volume of material regarding given topics may not represent that found in all the publications addressing developmental education. Third, the proposed architecture is descriptive and, like a blueprint, portrays components and their relationship, not their importance. The importance of each structural component is dependent upon its relationship to other components and the stresses they are designed to withstand as individual units and integrated systems. In a similar manner, the proposed architecture has many potential descriptive applications, but it can make no claims regarding the relative value of the components of the literature of developmental education or the values and circumstances which contributed to the relationships that exist between them in the literature. Further, the proposed architecture cannot be up-to-date as it seeks to represent content and relationships in a dynamic circumstance and must wait for a published record to exist before content can be integrated.

The impact of the included publications' manuscript review processes could not be gauged by the architecture, either. All publications must draw from material submitted and deemed acceptable via their individual review processes; they can select for print only from what authors send them. In addition, the proposed architecture is not the only way to describe the literature. It does not weigh the merits of the articles classified nor does it divulge the type of literature: report of research or scholarly opinion. Its utility will be found in consideration, use, and critique by persons other than the author. With that end in mind, I offer the following list of potential applications and implications.

Applications/Implications
The most apparent application for the proposed architecture of the developmental education literature is in the comparison of the periodicals used to construct it. Readers may use the architecture to identify areas of emphasis and topics omitted in these publications. This information has utility for the average practitioner in developmental education as it allows for selective use of the major publications based upon the user's purposes. Given a particular purpose, they may use the architecture to form a general perspective of which of the periodicals will best serve their intentions. Researchers and authors can extend these applications to include use of the architecture in descriptions of the literature, the identification of areas of historic interest, the identification of topic areas in which little research exists, and the planning of reviews of the literature. Editorial boards may also find utility for the architecture in respect to a number of these applications.

A second area of application for the proposed architecture is as an organizational scheme. The primary topic headings and their subcategories can function as an outline of the topics of interest and concern in developmental education. This could aid developmental educators as they continue to form and share perspectives and converse about the persons, administration, theory, issues, and resources in their area of practice. It provides an organizational pattern for what has to this point been predominately a "free form" conversation.

Perhaps more significantly, it could aid developmental educators as they discuss the same constructs with faculty peers, administrators, members of the public, and politicians. The proposed architecture provides a fairly simple rubric by which one's thoughts and the information to be shared with persons outside the field can be organized. The ability to direct these conversations based upon a mutual desire to understand programs, perspectives, and resources and the ability to discuss programming in terms of persons; administration; educational theory and practice; support programming; and equity, access, and balance issues using a common language would greatly facilitate interaction and understanding.

The proposed architecture itself could be expanded. Content the Learning Assistance Review, the Journal of College Reading and Learning and other publications could be included. The material cataloged could be summarized in a topical index or bibliography of the literature of developmental education. Such a product would increase opportunities for authors.
and researchers by providing a reference which would facilitate reviews of the published works of notable figures, considerations of the historical developmental of concepts and emphases in the discipline, greater ease in preparing reviews of the literature and meta-analytical publications, and identification of persons who have developed areas of specialization within developmental education. Knowledge of professional experts in particular areas could also be helpful to institutions, departments, or programs looking for consultants or experts to present professional development workshops.

Conclusion
The proposed architecture of the literature was developed using four of the primary publications in developmental education. It was developed in an inductive manner seeking to reveal the existing structure of the literature. It identifies the three primary topic areas in the sampled literature of developmental education and the related categories, subcategories, and topics. It has utility for all persons interacting with the literature or field of developmental education as it provides an initial schematic of the literature and its key concepts. This schematic can function as guide, tool, and set of evaluative criteria for instructors, administrators, researchers, editorial boards, and the public at multiple levels. Its conceptual grid reveals the combined wisdom of many persons active in developmental education in the last 3 decades and is applicable in respect to understanding the current state of affairs in developmental education and for department, institution, and state-system level program organization, planning, and evaluation. It also shows the developed and underdeveloped topic areas, information of particular interest to researchers. In short, it is an answer to many factual questions and can serve as a platform for and point of reference in considerations of purpose, direction, vision, and values in developmental education.
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NADE News
By Rosemary M. Karr, NADE President

The NADE 2008–2009 Strategic Plan is now posted on the Web site at www.nade.net. The Executive Board invited NADE members in key leadership positions to offer feedback prior to the finalization of the plan. All interested members are encouraged to read it and submit comments to the Board.

NADE’s two primary long-term goals are to strengthen NADE’s internal units and to strengthen NADE’s external relationships. We have worked to improve membership support and communication, and to develop contingency plans for critical external relationships. Recently, NADE and the College Reading and Learning Association (CRLA) collaborated to submit a proposal to the Council for Learning Assistance and Developmental Education Associations (CLADEA) regarding the development of an individual certification in the field of reading. If this is accepted and developed, it could be replicated in other fields of interest.

At a recent Forum for Access and Continuing Education (FACE) conference, the agenda for the international community dealt with basically the same concerns as the United States: access, placement, pedagogy, funding, and bias. There is a growing trend for alliances among the national and international organizations. In addition to the opportunity to learn from each other, there is a perception that the larger numbers will increase the political clout of the organizations as they lobby for funding and support.

In your own professional growth and development, consider increasing your involvement in state, chapter, national, and international leadership roles. Be one who helps determine who, what, when, where, why, and how we, as developmental education experts, practice and apply the principles of the field. If we do not make these determinations regarding our professions, someone else will, and that could be counterproductive. We have chosen to work in developmental education because we believe that, in our small corners of the world, we each CAN make a difference.

Please join us at the 2010 national conference in Columbus, Ohio, March 10–14, 2010, to help us make that difference. The NADE Executive Board looks forward to seeing you there!

NADE: Helping underprepared students prepare, prepared students advance, and advanced students excel!
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