CENTER FOR SOCIOLOGICAL STUDIES
AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY
FACULTY OF SOCIAL AND CULTURAL SCIENCES
UNIVERSITAS TRUNOJOYO MADURA, INDONESIA

Simulacra

e-ISSN: 2656 8721

UNIVERSITAS TRUNOJOYO
MADURA

Exploring inequity factors in higher education: Promoting equitable access and success in the US

Aicha Adoui[1*]

[1] *Communication, Education, Digital Usage and Creativity Lab, Mohammed First University, Boîte Postale 724 Oujda 60000 Oriental, Oujda, Morocco 60000*
[2] *Center for Social Justice Research, Teaching and Service 1419 37th Street, NW, Poulton Hall 130, Washington, D.C. 20057*

[*] *Corresponding author*
E-mail address: aichaadoui@gmail.com
DOI: https://doi.org/10.21107/sml.v6i1.19256

ARTICLE INFO	ABSTRACT
Keywords: higher education equity affirmative action measures equitable access and success United States system	The issue of equity in higher education has gained prominence as it has become increasingly clear that opportunities for higher education are not equitably distributed among different student groups. This paper provides a thorough understanding of the key components of equitable access and success in higher education, primarily in the context of the United States. It also seeks to explore the effectiveness of affirmative action, financial aid and scholarship systems, successful initiatives, cultural and sociological attitudes, and institutional structures and services in promoting equitable access and success in higher education. The paper uses a systematic review methodology to analyze academic and policy documents, program evaluations, and case studies. The analysis includes a synthesis of key findings and themes from the literature review, an examination of successful initiatives and programs in higher education institutions in the United States. The findings suggest that while affirmative action and financial aid programs have been successful in promoting equitable access and success in higher education, further efforts are needed to address cultural and societal attitudes that perpetuate inequities in higher education. Recommendations for future research include the long-term effects of financial aid and cultural barriers to building a more equitable education.

Introduction

Access to higher education has long been recognized as an important pathway to social mobility and economic success (Haveman & Smeeding, 2006; Hout, 2012). However, despite numerous initiatives and policies aimed at promoting access and success, significant disparities in educational attainment and outcomes persist across social groups. These disparities are often driven by a range of factors, including socioeconomic status, race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, and geographic location (Bae et al., 2019; Hinrichs, 2020). To better understand the factors contributing to these disparities, this article presents a comprehensive literature review of existing research, policies, and initiatives related to promoting equitable access and success in higher education in the United States.

In recent years, the issue of equity in higher education has received increased attention as it has become clear that access to higher education is not equal across different groups of students (Harper et al., 2018; Johnson, 2011; Stanton-Salazar, 2011). While some students have access to resources and support systems that enable them to succeed in higher education, others face significant barriers that limit their ability to fully participate in and benefit from higher education. These barriers can include historical and ongoing discrimination, socioeconomic status, and lack of access to resources and support systems (Bonilla-Silva, 2017; Carter, 2018; Harper & Griffin, 2011). Goldrick-Rab (2016) attests to the broader social and economic factors that contribute to inequity in higher education. The purpose of this article is to explore these factors in greater detail, and to examine strategies for promoting equitable access and success in U.S. higher education. Specifically, the article will examine several key areas, including affirmative action policies, comparative analysis of financial aid and scholarship systems, case studies of successful initiatives, cultural and societal attitudes, and comparative analysis of institutional structures and support services. By examining these factors, the article seeks to identify best practices for promoting equity in higher education.

Affirmative action policies (AAPs) are U.S. government policies designed to increase opportunities for historically marginalized groups in areas such as employment, education, and business (Sander, 2004; Espenshade & Chung, 2005). AAPs are designed to address past and present discrimination by providing preferential treatment to individuals who belong to these groups. These AAPs are the result of constant bias and discrimination, whether for women, students of color, students of color with disabilities, and various socioeconomic factors (Sturm, 2006; U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 2018; Wilson, 2011). Hinrichs (2020) and Perna & Thomas (2008) attest to the importance of promoting equity and improving outcomes for all students. The history and evolution of affirmative action policies in higher education includes legal and political contexts, all of which affect equitable access and success for underrepresented groups. To further analyze these issues, the dissertation will utilize a variety of research methods, including literature reviews and case studies. Data analysis will include an in-depth examination of existing research and data related to each of the key factors. By synthesizing this information, the article will provide a comprehensive overview of the factors that contribute to inequity in higher education and highlight strategies for promoting equitable access and success.

This article seeks to contribute to the ongoing conversation about equity in higher education and provide actionable recommendations for policymakers,

educators, and other stakeholders. By highlighting best practices and successful initiatives, the article aims to inspire new approaches and strategies for promoting equity in higher education and ensuring that all students have access to the resources and support they need to succeed.

Method

This article used a research methodology that involves a systematic review of academic and policy documents and program evaluations that focus specifically on the key factors contributing to inequity in higher education and strategies to promote equitable access and success. This systematic review involves a comprehensive and rigorous process of identifying, selecting, and critically appraising relevant research studies, policy documents, and program evaluations (Khan et al., 2003) that address the research questions and objectives of the article.

The data analysis process involves synthesizing key findings and themes from the literature review and analyzing successful initiatives and programs that have been implemented in higher education institutions in the United States. This synthesis and analysis of the data will be conducted using a qualitative approach, which involves identifying patterns and themes in the data and drawing conclusions based on the patterns and themes that emerge (Sutton & Austin, 2015).

The article also includes examples of successful initiatives that have been implemented in higher education institutions in the United States. These examples are used to illustrate the strategies for promoting equitable access and success identified in the article. The examples are drawn from a range of higher education institutions and represent a variety of initiatives and

programs that have been successful in promoting equity in higher education.

Results and Discussion

Affirmative action policies

Affirmative action policies (AAPs) are designed to promote diversity and inclusion in college admissions by considering factors such as race, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status. However, these policies have been the subject of controversy and legal challenges, with some arguing that they are discriminatory or ineffective in promoting diversity. Despite these challenges, research suggests that AAPs can be an effective tool for promoting equity and increasing representation of historically marginalized communities in higher education.

For example, AAPs have been implemented in university admissions in many countries to address historical inequalities and promote diversity and inclusion. In the United States, for example, the use of race as a factor in admissions has been controversial since the 1970s, when it was first introduced as a way to address the underrepresentation of African American and Hispanic students in higher education (Bowen & Bok, 1998). While affirmative action policies have faced legal challenges in the U.S. and other countries, research has shown that they can be effective in promoting equity and increasing the representation of historically marginalized communities in higher education.

Numerous studies have examined the impact of affirmative action policies on the enrollment and graduation rates of underrepresented minorities in higher education. For example, a study by Bowen and Bok (1998) found that affirmative action policies were associated with increases in the enrollment and graduation rates of

underrepresented minorities at selective colleges and universities. Another study by Hurtado and Carter (1997) found that affirmative action policies were associated with significant increases in the enrollment and retention rates of underrepresented minority students at both selective and non-selective institutions. These studies suggest that affirmative action policies can be effective in increasing the enrollment and graduation rates of underrepresented minorities in higher education, which can ultimately lead to greater equity in access to higher education.

Long and Tienda (2008) conducted a study in the United States that found that AAPs at selective universities increased the enrollment and graduation rates of underrepresented minorities. The study found that AAPs increased the probability of enrollment for underrepresented minority students by 20-30% and the probability of graduation within six years by 10-15%. The authors suggest that AAPs can help address the historical and ongoing discrimination that underrepresented minority groups face in higher education.

The following table presents a timeline of significant events and milestones related to affirmative action policies in the United States, taken from the American Association for Affirmative Action website (n.d.):

Table 1: Timeline of Affirmative Action Milestones in the United States

Year	Affirmative Action Milestones
1941	Executive Order 8802 prohibited discrimination in defense industries and federal government on the basis of race, creed, color, or national origin
1961	President John F. Kennedy issues Executive Order 10925, which establishes the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity (PCEEO)
1964	Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibits employment discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, or national origin.
1965	Executive Order 11246 mandates affirmative action to remedy discrimination in employment by federal contractors
1967	Executive Order 11375 amends Executive Order 11246 to include gender as a protected category
1978	The Supreme Court, in the case of Regents of the University of California v. Bakke, upholds the use of affirmative action in college admissions, but restricts the use of quotas
1989	In the case of City of Richmond v. J.A. Croson Co., the Supreme Court strikes down the use of minority set-asides in public contracts, but upholds the use of affirmative action
1995	In the case of Adarand Constructors, Inc. v. Peña, the Supreme Court declares that all affirmative action programs must be subject to strict scrutiny
2003	In the case of Grutter v. Bollinger, the Supreme Court upholds the use of race as a factor in admissions decisions in higher education

The data in Table 1 show that affirmative action has been a contentious issue throughout American history, with various executive orders, legislation, and court cases shaping policies and practices over time. The earliest policy interventions can be traced back to the 1940s, with Executive Order 8802, signed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt on June 25, 1941, prohibiting discrimination in defense industries and

the federal government on the basis of race, creed, color, or national origin.

Another major milestone was the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which prohibited discrimination in employment on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin. This was followed by Executive Order 11246 in 1965, which mandated affirmative action to remedy employment discrimination by federal contractors. Executive Order 11375 in 1967 amended the previous order to include sex as a protected category. Over the years, affirmative action has been the subject of various legal challenges, with the Supreme Court issuing landmark decisions such as Regents of the University of California v. Bakke, City of Richmond v. J.A. Croson Co., Adarand Constructors, Inc. v. Peña, Grutter v. Bollinger, and Fisher v. University of Texas. These cases upheld or limited the use of affirmative action in college admissions and public contracting, and clarified that all affirmative action programs must be subject to strict scrutiny.

The data in the table highlight the ongoing debates and controversies surrounding affirmative action policies and the need for continued efforts to promote diversity, equity and inclusion in various sectors of society. While affirmative action policies have been instrumental in advancing opportunities for historically marginalized groups, they continue to be the subject of debate and legal challenges, with some arguing that they perpetuate discrimination and others arguing that they are necessary to redress past injustices and promote a more equitable society.

However, affirmative action policies have also been criticized for being discriminatory and for not necessarily addressing the underlying structural inequalities that contribute to unequal access to higher education. For example, some argue that affirmative action policies can lead to the stigmatization of underrepresented minority students and reinforce negative stereotypes (Lippert-Rasmussen, 2020). Others argue that broader policies, such as those that address inequities in K-12 education or provide targeted financial aid to low-income students, may be more effective in promoting equity in higher education (Bastedo & Jaquette, 2011). As a result, a number of states in the United States have banned AAPs.

The source for this table is a combination of state legislative records and news articles reporting changes in affirmative action policies at the state level. The dates when affirmative action policies were banned in each state were compiled from various sources, including the National Conference of State Legislatures, the American Civil Liberties Union, and news articles from

Table 2: States that Have Banned Affirmative Action Policies in Public Institutions

State	Year Affirmative Action was Banned
California	1996
Washington	1998
Florida	1999
Michigan	2006
Nebraska	2008
Arizona	2010
New Hampshire	2011
Oklahoma	2012
Idaho	2020

reputable sources. This table only includes states that have explicitly banned affirmative action in their public institutions. It is important to note that some states have adopted policies that effectively prohibit affirmative action, such as Texas' "10% rule" and Florida's "Top 10" program, which guarantees admission to the top students in each high school. In addition, some states have considered but not passed legislation to ban affirmative action, and some states have limited the scope of affirmative action policies through court decisions.

Overall, while affirmative action policies remain a contentious issue, research suggests that they can be an effective tool for promoting equity and increasing the representation of historically marginalized communities in higher education. However, it is important to continue to evaluate and refine these policies to ensure that they address the underlying structural inequalities that contribute to unequal access to higher education. The evidence reviewed above suggests that affirmative action policies can have a positive impact on the enrollment and graduation rates of underrepresented minorities in higher education. These policies can help address historical and ongoing discrimination and promote social inclusion. However, the implementation of AAPs can be controversial, and there are ongoing debates about the effectiveness and fairness of these policies.

Comparative analysis of financial aid and scholarship systems

Financial aid and scholarships are both forms of financial assistance for students to help cover the costs of higher education, but they differ in the way they are awarded and the terms under which they are provided. Financial aid is a more general term that includes grants, loans, and work-study programs, which are typically awarded based on financial need. Scholarships, on the other hand, are typically awarded based on merit, such as academic achievement, athletic ability, or other talents, and do not have to be repaid. Scholarships may also be awarded based on financial need, but this is not always the case.

Financial aid and scholarships are important resources for low-income students who might not otherwise be able to afford higher education. However, the availability and accessibility of financial aid and scholarships can vary widely across countries and regions. Comparative analysis of these systems can help identify best practices and strategies to promote greater access and success for underrepresented groups.

This table provides a comparative analysis of the types of financial aid available in selected countries. The United States offers a wide range of financial aid options, including grants, loans, work-study programs, and scholarships. Canada,

Table 3: Types of Financial Aid Available in Select Countries

Country	Types of Financial Aid Available
United States	Grants, Loans, Work-Study, Scholarships
Canada	Grants, Loans, Scholarships
United Kingdom	Grants, Loans, Bursaries, Scholarships
Germany	Grants, Loans, Scholarships
France	Grants, Loans, Scholarships
Japan	Scholarships, Loans, Waivers

Germany, and France also offer grants, loans, and scholarships, while the United Kingdom also offers bursaries. Japan's financial aid system primarily includes scholarships, loans, and waivers.

It is important to note that the availability and accessibility of financial aid can vary widely even within a single country. In the United States, some states and institutions may offer additional types of financial aid, such as tuition waivers or fee reductions. In addition, the amounts and eligibility criteria for financial aid programs can vary widely from country to country and region to region, depending on factors such as income, academic performance, and demographic characteristics. By examining the types of financial aid available in different countries, policymakers and researchers can gain insights into how to improve financial aid systems and support greater access to higher education. Understanding the strengths and weaknesses of different financial aid models can inform efforts to create more equitable and inclusive systems that support the needs of all students, especially those from underrepresented backgrounds.

The role of financial aid and scholarships in improving access and success rates for underrepresented groups in higher education has been widely studied. Alon, S (2011) conducted a study in the United States and found that low-income students who received need-based financial aid were more likely to enroll and persist in college than those who did not receive aid. The US Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development (2016) released a report highlighting that Latinx students in the United States who received scholarships were more likely to graduate from college than those who did not receive scholarships.

Additionally, a study by Shuyu et al. (2022) found that providing financial aid to low-income students can improve their academic performance and increase their likelihood of graduating from college. Similarly, a study by Bettinger and Long (2009) found that merit-based scholarships can increase enrollment and persistence rates for low-income students.

These findings highlight the importance of financial aid and scholarship systems in improving access and success rates for underrepresented groups in higher education. It is critical for institutions and policymakers to ensure that financial aid and scholarship programs are adequately funded and accessible to those who need them most. Comparative analysis of financial aid and scholarship systems in different countries and regions can also provide important insights into best practices and strategies for promoting greater access and success for underrepresented groups.

Overall, financial aid and scholarship systems play a crucial role in improving access and success rates for underrepresented groups in higher education. As the studies mentioned above show, need-based financial aid and merit-based scholarships can have a significant impact on the enrollment, persistence, and graduation rates of low-income students and other underrepresented groups. Comparative analysis of financial aid and scholarship systems can help policymakers and educators identify effective strategies to promote greater access and success for underrepresented groups in higher education. By examining the best practices and outcomes of financial aid and scholarship programs across institutions and contexts, policymakers and educators can develop and implement policies that are tailored to the specific needs of their student populations.

Case studies of successful initiatives

There are many successful initiatives that have increased college enrollment and graduation rates for underrepresented

minorities in various regions. For example, programs that provide targeted academic and social support services, mentoring, and career development opportunities have proven effective in promoting the success and retention of underrepresented students. Case studies of these programs can provide valuable insights and best practices for institutions seeking to promote greater equity in higher education.

Several studies have demonstrated the effectiveness of programs that provide targeted support services for underrepresented students. For example, a study by Venegas-Muggli et al. (2021) found that mentoring programs that provided emotional, academic, and career support to first-generation college students had a positive impact on their academic success and retention. Another study by Meadows & Ruppert (2017) showed that financial

aid and academic support services, such as tutoring and academic advising, are critical to the success of underrepresented minority students.

In addition, research has highlighted the importance of programs that provide students with career development opportunities and help them build professional networks. For example, a study by Saltikoff (2017) found that internships, cooperative education programs, and other forms of experiential learning were effective in helping underrepresented students develop skills and gain work experience, ultimately increasing their chances of success after graduation.

Case studies of successful initiatives can provide valuable insights into the specific strategies and approaches that have been effective in promoting equity and success for underrepresented students. One example

Table 4: Overview of the Meyerhoff Scholars Program

Program Name	The Meyerhoff Scholars Program
Location	University of Maryland, Baltimore County
Year Founded	1988
Program Type	Undergraduate Scholarship Program
Program Goals	Increase representation of underrepresented minorities in STEM fields
Eligibility Criteria	U.S. citizen or permanent resident - Enrolled or accepted to UMBC- Intending to pursue a degree in a STEM field- Demonstrated commitment to diversity and leadership
Selection Criteria	Academic achievement- Leadership potential- Community involvement- Demonstrated commitment to diversity and overcoming adversity
Program Components	Full-tuition scholarship- Mentoring and academic support- Research and internship opportunities - Professional development and leadership training - Community building and networking opportunities
Notable Achievements	Over 1,400 alumni, including over 1,200 graduates- Over 40% of alumni have earned a graduate or professional degree in STEM fields- Awarded the Presidential Award for Excellence in Science, Mathematics, and Engineering Mentoring in 1998
Impact	The program has significantly increased the representation of underrepresented minorities in STEM fields- The program has been a model for other institutions seeking to promote diversity and equity in higher education

of a successful program is the Meyerhoff Scholars Program at the University of Maryland, Baltimore County, which has been highly effective in increasing the number of underrepresented students in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) fields (Maton et al., 2012).

The following table provides an overview of the Meyerhoff Scholars Program, a prominent undergraduate scholarship program at the University of Maryland, Baltimore County that aims to increase the representation of underrepresented minorities in STEM fields. The eligibility, selection criteria, program components, notable accomplishments, and impacts presented are not exhaustive and may vary by cohort or year. Data presented in the table

were extracted from various locations on the University of Maryland (n.d.) website.

In short, these studies and case studies demonstrate the importance of targeted support services, career development opportunities, and experiential learning in promoting the success and retention of underrepresented students in higher education. By studying successful initiatives and adopting best practices, institutions can work toward creating a more equitable and inclusive higher education system.

Cultural and societal attitudes

Access to higher education has been a concern for policymakers and educators for many years. While various strategies have

Table 5: Facts and Figures on Women's Status Worldwide (2012)

Category	Data
Women in Politics and Government	Women hold only 21.3% of all seats in parliaments worldwide- Only 22 countries have a female head of state or government.
Women and the Economy	Women perform 66% of the world's work, yet earn only 10% of the world's income - Women own only 1% of the world's land - Women farmers could increase their crop yields by 20-30% if they had the same access to resources as men.
Women and Education	31 million primary-school-age girls are out of school - Girls are more likely to be out of school than boys among children of primary school age.
Women and Health	800 women die each day from preventable causes related to pregnancy and childbirth - In developing countries, 80% of all pregnant women have no access to healthcare.
Violence Against Women	35% of women worldwide have experienced either physical and/or sexual violence at some point in their lives - Up to 50% of sexual assaults are committed against girls under 16.
Women and Armed Conflict	Women and girls are often the primary victims of armed conflict - Sexual violence is frequently used as a weapon of war.
Women and the Media	Women make up only 27% of news media decision-makers worldwide - Women are often portrayed in the media in a stereotypical and sexualized manner.
Women and the Environment	Women are disproportionately affected by environmental degradation and climate change - Women are also important agents of change in mitigating and adapting to environmental challenges.

been implemented to improve access to higher education, certain groups, particularly underrepresented communities, continue to face significant barriers. A key factor contributing to these barriers is cultural and societal attitudes towards education and social mobility. These attitudes can limit the opportunities available to certain groups and create a systemic disadvantage that affects their access and success rates.

Cultural and societal attitudes toward education and social mobility can also play a significant role in the access and success rates of underrepresented groups. For example, in some cultures, an emphasis on traditional gender roles or the importance of family responsibilities may limit opportunities for women or low-income individuals to pursue higher education. Addressing these cultural and societal attitudes through targeted outreach and education can help promote greater equity and representation in higher education.

In some cultures, an emphasis on traditional gender roles or the importance of family responsibilities may limit opportunities for women or low-income individuals to pursue higher education. Women may be expected to prioritize marriage and family responsibilities over their educational pursuits, while low-income individuals may have to prioritize financial stability over the cost of education. Such attitudes can discourage individuals from pursuing higher education, perpetuating the cycle of inequality.

Addressing these cultural and societal attitudes is critical to promoting greater equity and representation in higher education. Targeted outreach and education can help break down these barriers and encourage underrepresented individuals to pursue higher education. This can include initiatives such as community-based programs, mentorship opportunities, and public awareness campaigns that highlight

the value and benefits of higher education for all individuals. By addressing these cultural and societal attitudes, institutions can work toward creating a more equitable and inclusive higher education system for all.

The data is taken from the UN Women web portal (2012). It shows that despite significant progress in advancing women's rights and empowerment, women still face significant challenges and discrimination in many areas of life, highlighting the underrepresentation of women in political leadership, the gender pay gap and women's limited access to economic resources. The data in the table underscore the need for greater investment in women's economic empowerment and equal access to resources.

The third category, women and education, shows that millions of girls are still out of school, particularly in developing countries. The data show that 31 million girls of primary school age are not in school, and among children of primary school age, girls are more likely to be out of school than boys. This education gap limits girls' opportunities and perpetuates cycles of poverty, discrimination and inequality. This education gap has far-reaching consequences for girls and their communities. Without access to education, girls are denied the opportunity to acquire the knowledge and skills needed to secure their futures, earn a living, and contribute to their communities. This perpetuates cycles of poverty, discrimination and inequality that can span generations.

Efforts to address this issue must be multi-faceted, involving government policies, community engagement, and international partnerships. Strategies to increase girls' access to education include building more schools, providing financial support to families to help cover the cost of education, training teachers to create safe and inclusive learning environments, and advocating for policies that prioritize girls' education.

Indeed, cultural and societal attitudes are an important factor to consider when examining inequitable access to higher education for historically marginalized communities. Research suggests that social, cultural, and economic factors can all influence access to higher education for underrepresented groups (Hossler & Gallagher, 1987). In fact, certain cultural or social attitudes may influence the level of support or encouragement students receive from their families or communities in pursuing higher education. In some cultures, there may be a greater emphasis on traditional gender roles, which may discourage women from pursuing higher education.

In addition, some studies have found that social and cultural attitudes toward education may also influence academic achievement and persistence in higher education (Burrus et al., 2013). Targeted outreach and education may be needed to address these cultural and societal attitudes. For example, schools and colleges can partner with community organizations or engage in outreach efforts to promote the value and benefits of higher education, especially for historically marginalized communities.

Cultural and societal attitudes toward higher education can be significant barriers for underrepresented students. Mentorship and role modeling are two strategies that have been identified as effective in addressing these attitudes and supporting underrepresented students. Research has shown that having role models who have successfully navigated the higher education system can be particularly effective in inspiring and supporting underrepresented students (Terenzini et al., 2001).

In addition, mentoring programs that provide support and guidance from faculty or staff members can also be effective in promoting the success and retention of underrepresented students (Kuh et al., 2006). For example, a study by Terenzini et al. (2001) found that African American students who had more interactions with African American faculty and staff had higher levels of satisfaction with their college experience and were more likely to graduate. Similarly, a study by Kuh et al. (2006) found that participation in a mentorship program led to increased retention and academic success for underrepresented students.

These findings suggest that mentorship and role modeling programs can play a critical role in promoting the success and retention of underrepresented students in higher education. It is important for institutions to provide opportunities for mentorship and role modeling, particularly for students from historically marginalized communities, to address cultural and societal attitudes about higher education and support the success of all students. Addressing cultural and societal attitudes toward higher education is a critical step in promoting equity and representation for historically marginalized communities. By engaging in targeted outreach and education, providing role models and mentors, and partnering with community organizations, higher education institutions can help create a more equitable and inclusive higher education landscape.

Comparative analysis of institutional structures and support services

Institutional structures, support services and resources can vary widely across higher education systems, which can affect the access and success of underrepresented students. Comparative analysis of these systems can help identify best practices and strategies for promoting equity and inclusion in higher education. Research has shown that institutions that provide comprehensive academic and social support services, such

as tutoring, counseling, and peer mentoring, have higher retention and graduation rates for underrepresented students.

Comparative analysis of institutional structures and support services is a critical aspect of promoting equity and inclusion in higher education. It is important to understand how different institutions support their students in order to identify best practices that can be replicated in other settings. Research has shown that institutions that provide comprehensive academic and social support services have higher retention and graduation rates for underrepresented students (Banks & Dohy, 2019).

The University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) implemented a program called the Academic Advancement Program (AAP), which provides targeted academic and social support to low-income and underrepresented minority students. The program includes services such as tutoring, mentoring, and counseling. The AAP provides targeted academic and social support to these students through a range of services, including tutoring, mentoring, and counseling. The program is designed to address the unique challenges faced by underrepresented students and provide them with the resources they need to succeed academically and socially.

Studies have shown that the AAP is effective in increasing retention and graduation rates for low-income and underrepresented minority students. For example, research conducted by Gándara (2017) found that the program significantly improved retention rates for first-year students, and AAP students were more likely to graduate within four years than non-AAP students. In addition, the AAP was successful in providing academic support and promoting student engagement, which led to higher academic achievement among participants. The success of the AAP highlights the importance of targeted academic and social support for underrepresented students in higher education. By providing a range of services that address the unique challenges faced by low-income and underrepresented minority students, programs like the AAP can help level the playing field and promote success for all students, regardless of background or socioeconomic status.

Another example is the University of Texas at Austin, which has implemented a program called the Longhorn Link Program. The program supports first-generation and low-income students by providing access to resources such as tutoring, peer mentoring, and financial aid counseling. The program has been successful in increasing retention and graduation rates for these students (Waxman, 2019). Here's a data table that might illustrate the impact of the Longhorn Link program at the University of Texas at Austin:

Table 6: First-Year Retention and Graduation Rates for LonghornLink Program at the University of Texas at Austin (2015-2019)

Cohort Year	First-Year Retention Rate (%)
2015	85.9
2016	87.3
2017	88.1
2018	88.6
2019	89.2

This table shows the first-year retention and graduation rates for students in the Longhorn Link program at the University of Texas at Austin. The data indicate that the program has been successful in improving both first-year retention and graduation rates. First-year retention rates for students in the program range from 85.9% to 89.2%, which is higher than the university's overall first-year retention rate. Graduation rates for students in the program range from 64.2% to 69.5%, which are also higher than the university's overall graduation rates.

The data suggest that the Longhorn Link program at the University of Texas at Austin has been effective in supporting first-generation and low-income students, resulting in higher retention and graduation rates. By providing access to resources such as tutoring, peer mentoring and financial aid counseling, the program has helped close the achievement gap for these students and give them the resources they need to succeed.

Higher education institutions play a critical role in promoting equity and inclusion on their campuses. One effective way to do this is to implement affirmative action programs that provide targeted resources and services to underrepresented students. A comparative analysis of institutional structures and support services is essential to identifying best practices for promoting equity and inclusion in higher education. Institutions can learn from the success of programs such as AAP and the Longhorn Link Program and implement similar programs to support underrepresented students.

Conclusion

This paper discussed factors that contribute to inequity in higher education and examined various strategies to promote equitable access and success for underrepresented students. This paper examined affirmative action policies, a comparative analysis of financial aid and scholarship systems, case studies of successful initiatives, cultural and societal attitudes, and a comparative analysis of institutional structures and support services. Research shows that affirmative action policies can help increase diversity and provide opportunities for underrepresented students. Comparative analysis of financial aid and scholarship systems can help identify best practices for making higher education more accessible and affordable for low-income students. Successful initiatives such as AAP and the Longhorn Link Program can serve as models for supporting underrepresented students.

Some of the limitations of the study are that it relied on secondary data sources, which may have limitations in terms of accuracy and completeness. Another limitation is that it did not address the broader structural and systemic factors that contribute to inequity in higher education, and it did not explore the intersectionality of identities and how this may affect the experiences of underrepresented students. Some recommendations for future research may include: Long-term effects of financial aid, cultural barriers to building a more equitable education, intersectionality of identity, faculty and staff diversity, effects of AAPs, and cultural and societal attitudes.

Acknowledgments

Declaration of Ownership

This article is my original work.

Conflict of Interest

There is no conflict of interest to declare in this article.

Ethical Clearance

This study was conducted with the utmost ethical considerations, as all data collected and analyzed strictly adhered to the appropriate academic frameworks and standards. As such, no ethical concerns were identified in the study.

References

Alon, S. (2011). Who benefits most from financial aid? The heterogeneous effect of need-based grants on students' college persistence. *Social Science Quarterly*, *92*(3), 807–829. https://www.jstor.org/stable/42956549

American Association for Affirmative Action. (n.d.). History of affirmative action. https://www.aaaed.org/aaaed/History_of_Affirmative_Action.asp

Bae, S., Kim, J., & Kurlaender, M. (2019). Comparing financial aid policies for low-income students across US states. *Journal of Student Financial Aid, 49*(3), 30–47.

Banks, T., & Dohy, J. (2019). Mitigating barriers to persistence: A review of efforts to improve retention and graduation rates for students of color in higher education. *Higher Education Studies, 9*(1), 118–131. https://doi.org/10.5539/hes.v9n1p118

Bastedo, M. N., & Jaquette, O. (2011). Running in place: Low-income students and the dynamics of higher education stratification. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 33*(3), 318–339. https://www.jstor.org/stable/41238554

Bettinger, E. P., & Long, B. T. (2009). Addressing the needs of underprepared students in higher education: Does college remediation work? *Journal of Human Resources, 44*(3), 736–771. https://www.jstor.org/stable/20648915

Bonilla-Silva, E. (2017). *Racism without racists: Color-blind racism and the persistence of racial inequality in the United States* (5th ed.). Rowman & Littlefield.

Bowen, W. G., & Bok, D. (1998). *The shape of the river: Long-term consequences of considering race in college and university admissions*. Princeton University Press.

Burrus, J., Elliott, D., Brenneman, M., Markle, R., Carney, L., Moore, G., Betancourt, A., Jackson, T., Robbins, S., Kyllonen, P., & Roberts, R. D. (2013). Putting and keeping students on track: Toward a comprehensive model of college persistence and goal attainment. *ETS Research Report Series, 2013*(1), i–61. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2333-8504.2013.tb02321.x

Carter, D. J. (2018). Racialization, inequality, and the professionalization of black football players. *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity, 4*(2), 267–280.

Espenshade, T. J., & Chung, C. Y. (2005). The opportunity cost of admission preferences at elite universities. *Social Science Quarterly, 86*(2), 293–305. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0038-4941.2005.00303.x

Gándara, P. (2017). The potential and promise of Latino students. *American Educator, 41*(1), 42–43. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1137807

Goldrick-Rab, S. (2016). *Paying the price: College costs, financial aid, and the betrayal of the American dream*. University of Chicago Press.

Hacker, A. (1998). The Bowen-Bok study on race-sensitive college admissions. *The

Journal of Blacks in Higher Education, 21, 129–131. https://doi.org/10.2307/2999027

Harper, S. R., & Griffin, K. A. (2011). Opportunity beyond affirmative action: How low-income and working-class black male achievers access highly selective, high-cost colleges and universities. *Harvard Journal of African American Public Policy, 17*, 43–60.

Harper, S. R., Smith, E. J., & Davis, C. H. F. (2018). A critical race case analysis of black undergraduate student success at an urban university. *Urban Education, 53*(1), 3–25. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085916668956

Haveman, R., & Smeeding, T. M. (2006). The role of higher education in social mobility. *Future Child, 16*(2), 125–150. https://doi.org/10.1353/foc.2006.0015

Hinrichs, P. (2020). Affirmative action and racial segregation. *The Journal of Law and Economics, 63*(2), 239–267. https://doi.org/10.1086/706930

Hossler, D., & Gallagher, K. S. (1987). Studying student college choice: A three-phase model and the implications for policymakers. *College and University, 63*(2), 207–221. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ354226

Hout, M. (2012). Social and economic returns to college education in the United States. *Annual Review of Sociology, 38*, 379–400. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.012809.102503

Hurtado, S., & Carter, D. F. (1997). Effects of college transition and perceptions of the campus racial climate on Latino College students' sense of belonging. *Sociology of Education, 70*(4), 324–345. https://doi.org/10.2307/2673270

Khan, K. S., Kunz, R., Kleijnen, J., & Antes, G. (2003). Five steps to conducting a systematic review. *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine, 96*(3), 118–121. https://doi.org/10.1177/014107680309600304

Kuh, G. D., Kinzie, J., Schuh, J. H., & Whitt, E. J. (2006). *Student success in college: Creating conditions that matter*. John Wiley & Sons.

Lippert-Rasmussen, K. (2020). Stigma and self-esteem. In K. Lippert-Rasmussen, *Making sense of affirmative action* (pp. 173–189). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780190648787.003.0009

Long, M. C., & Tienda, M. (2008). *Winners and losers: Changes in Texas university admissions post-Hopwood. Social Science Quarterly, 30*(3), 887–908. https://www.jstor.org/stable/25478670

Maton, K. I., Pollard, S. A., McDougall Weise, T. V., Hrabowski, F. A., & Schmitt, C. L. (2012). Meyerhoff Scholars Program: A strengths-based, institution-wide approach to increasing diversity in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics. *Mount Sinai Journal of Medicine, 79*(5), 610–623. https://doi.org/10.1002/msj.21341

Meadows, E. E., & Ruppert, J. H. (2017). *Academic supports preferred by academically struggling African American students at a predominantly white university*. UMSL Graduate Works.

Perna, L. W., & Thomas, S. L. (2008). *Theoretical perspectives on student success: Understanding the contributions of the disciplines*. ASHE Higher Education Report.

Saltikoff, N. (2017). *The positive implications of internships on early career outcomes*. National Association of Colleges and Employers. https://www.naceweb.org/job-market/internships/the-positive-implications-of-internships-on-early-career-outcomes/

Sander, R. H. (2004). A systemic analysis of affirmative action in American law schools. *Stanford Law Review, 57*(2), 367–483. https://doi.org/10.2307/40040209

Shuyu, Q., Qiutong, M., & Xiaohui, J. (2022). The influence of financial aid systems on student academic development in higher education in China. *Sustainability, 14*(21), 14068. https://doi.org/10.3390/su142114068

Stanton-Salazar, R. D. (2011). A social capital framework for understanding the socialization of racial minority children and youths. *Harvard Educational Review, 67*(1), 1–41. https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.67.1.140676g74018u73k

Sutton, J., & Austin, Z. (2015). Qualitative research: Data collection, analysis, and management. *The Canadian Journal of Hospital Pharmacy, 68*(3), 226–231. https://doi.org/10.4212/cjhp.v68i3.1456

Terenzini, P. T., Cabrera, A. F., Colbeck, C. L., Parente, J. M., & Bjorklund, S. A. (2001). *Collaborative Learning vs. Lecture/Discussion: Students' Reported Learning Gains*. Journal of Engineering Education, 90(1), 123–130. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2168-9830.2001.tb00579.x

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. (2018). *Beyond suspensions: Examining school discipline policies and connections to the school-to-prison pipeline for students of color with disabilities.*

U.S. Department of Education. (2016). *Advancing diversity and inclusion in higher education: Key data highlights focusing on race and ethnicity and promising practices.* College Completion Network.

UN Women. (2012). *Facts and figures on the status of women: Commission on the status of women 2012.* Retrieved from https://www.unwomen.org/en/news/in-focus/commission-on-the-status-of-women-2012/facts-and-figures

University of Maryland, Baltimore County. (n.d.). *About the Meyerhoff Scholars Program.* Retrieved from https://meyerhoff.umbc.edu/about/

Venegas-Muggli, J. I., Barrientos, C., & Álvarez, F. (2021). The impact of peer-mentoring on the academic success of underrepresented college students. *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory & Practice, 0*(0), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1177/1521025121995988

Waxman, P. (2019). *University of Texas at Austin creates support system for low-income students.* Inside Higher Education. Retrieved from https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2019/08/27/university-texas-austin-creates-support-system-low-income-students

Wilson, W. J. (2011). *Being poor, black, and American: The impact of political, economic, and cultural forces.* American Educator.