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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

At the same time the post-civil rights multiracial population is likely to transform the demographics of American colleges and universities (Renn, 2009), neo-conservative agendas and liberal hopes misuse its perceived growth to suggest the declining significance of race (Daniel & Castañeda-Liles, 2006; Morning, 2005). Mixed messages about multiraciality from both of these as well as civil-rights constituents suggest it is undergoing what Omi & Winant (1994) call a rearticulation of its meaning in society (Brunsma, 2006), with such politicized socio-historical issues framing and impacting campus climate for diversity in college (Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pedersen, & Allen, 1998, 1999). The campus climate for diversity is a site in higher education where critical issues around race arise, which in turn shape key conditions for learning and success (Harper & Hurtado, 2007; Hurtado, Alvarez, Guillermo-Wann, Cuellar, & Arellano, 2012; Hurtado, Dey, Gurin, & Gurin, 2003). Campus climate affects vital transitions for underrepresented students, such as adjustment to college (A. Cabrera, Nora, Terenzini, Pascarella, & Hagedorn, 1999; Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pederson, & Allen, 1999; Hurtado et al., 2007), student retention (Rhee, 2008), and degree completion (Museus, Nichols, & Lambert, 2008), as well as multicultural competencies for an increasingly diverse society (Hurtado, Alvarez et al., 2012). Although campus climate research on racial groups in college is flourishing, this literature is scant for multiracial students (Hurtado, Alvarez, et al., 2012). This study therefore examines campus climate for multiracial college students within the context of public discourse on multiraciality and the contested significance of race.

Multiraciality and the Significance of Race in Public Discourse
Neo-conservative, liberal, and civil-rights constituents each advance different messages about the continuing significance of race, and position the post-civil rights multiracial population to support their claims. First, neo-conservative perspectives suggest that a perceived increase in interracial offspring after the civil rights movement (Morning, 2005) and the multiracial identity movement spanning the turn of the millennium (Spencer, 2010) implies that racial and ethnic identities are merely optional individual “choices” (e.g. Hollinger, 1995). Neo-conservative reasoning thereby advances colorblind agendas to erase race and racial identity from the social landscape, for example as seen in California’s 2003 “Racial Privacy Initiative” to ban the collection of racial data (Daniel & Castañeda-Liles, 2006; Pollock, 2004). Second, liberal proponents of a “post-racial” society that is “beyond race” view the post-civil rights multiracial population as indicative of a decrease in racism because they are the offspring of racial intermixture (Morning, 2005; Omi, 2001). In this sense, the multiracial population is considered an example of racial progress (Rockquemore, Brunsma, & Delgado, 2009) whose members serve as bridges toward further racial progress between groups (Morning, 2005; Olumide, 2002). Media additionally contributes to upholding multiraciality as a post-racial ideal by emphasizing individuals’ notable accomplishments, such as President Barak Obama’s election in 2008, that supposedly would not be possible if race still mattered (Morning, 2005). Such liberal reasoning centers on the assumption that anti-racism is embodied by multiraciality (Morning, 2005). Third, likely in reaction to both neo-conservative and liberal agendas, civil-rights constituents have viewed multiraciality as anti-civil rights (Morning, 2005), and socially as the downfall of minority solidarity (Rockquemore et al., 2009). Regarding civil rights, major concerns surround “census enumeration … [and] its impact on federal policies related to voting and civil rights” (Omi, 2001, p. 248) because marking more than one racial category could reduce racial group
numbers and thwart important trends in data over time (Morning, 2005; Rockquemore et al., 2009). Socially, the option of a multiracial identity facilitates escape from a single racial identity to a perceptibly privileged mixed race identity (Rockquemore et al., 2009), – an outlook that appears to be more common amongst communities of color and African American communities in particular (Morning, 2005). In essence, multiple-race data collection in the U.S. Census 2000 personified the feared escape route from social identification with a single racial group (e.g. Lopez, 2003). Given the mixed messages from these constituents, a critical understanding of multiraciality exposes their interrelatedness through a critique of the liberal post-racial emphasis on multiracial icons’ achievements in the media (e.g. President Obama) as de-historicizing racial hybridity, thus releasing whites from dealing with “historical guilt about the enduring racial stratification of U.S. society” (Morning, 2005, p. 6), and reinforcing idealized notions of neo-conservative colorblindness in what civil-rights groups know remains a persistently inequitable society (Morning, 2005).

The intertwined neo-conservative, liberal, and civil-rights messages hinder multiraciality from being part of a solution to truly eradicate racism and resulting racial group disparities (e.g. outcomes in health, education, incarceration rates, employment, income and wealth, etc.). However, better understanding the relationship between race and racism through multiraciality is one avenue for identifying and challenging racialized distributions of power, or racism, in society (Omi, 2001) – a reality likely desired by many constituents within public discourse surrounding multiraciality and the significance of race.

Historically Contextualizing Multiracially-Identifying Americans in Census 2000 and 2010

Much social and political anxiety notwithstanding, the U.S. Census 2000 for the first time allowed individuals to mark more than one racial category (Renn & Lunceford, 2004). In
Census 2000, 2.4 percent of the total population indicated two or more racial categories (about 6.8 million people), with 4.0 percent of persons under age eighteen falling into this category (about 2.9 million people), excluding those who marked Latina/o and a racial category (Lopez, 2003; Renn & Lunceford, 2004). This may seem miniscule, but proportions change dramatically taking geographic region into consideration. For example, 24.9 percent of children under age 18 in the Southwest have two or more racial groups according to Census 2000, compared to 3.0 percent in the South (Lopez, 2003). In Census 2010, national numbers rose by almost a third, with 2.9 percent of the total population marking two or more racial backgrounds (about 9.0 million people) and showing similar generational trends (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010). These younger Americans with two or more indicated racial backgrounds are likely to comprise a growing proportion of the college-going population (Renn, 2009); the U.S. Department of Education’s data collection and reporting regulations implicate higher education’s account of multiracially-identifying college students and the utilization of that data as well (DOE, 2007).

Although more college students may be identifying with multiple racial backgrounds (Renn, 2009), or explicitly as multiracial, this apparent shift must be considered within a history of multiraciality in the U.S.; that is, multiraciality is not a new phenomenon, but how society approaches it is changing. Prior to the civil rights era, society lacked comparable social freedom to ascribe, or choose, multiracial and multiple racial identities for individuals and groups, aside from a stint of derogatory mixed classifications such as mutatto (Morning, 2003). That is, although single monoracially-constructed categories and identities have become a social norm, most racial groups have mixed ancestry from periods of slavery and colonization (Daniel, 2001; Davis, 1991; Feagin, 2006; Gomez, 2007; Morning, 2000, 2005; Nadal, 2009; Smith, 1999). However, the post-civil rights multiracial population has been a-historically severed from earlier
periods of American history, when racial “mixing” was not legally permissible, nor was it as socially acceptable as it has become since the last anti-miscegenation law was overturned in 1967 (*Loving v. Virginia*). Despite growing openness to multiraciality since 1967, the polarized perspectives on mixed race within public discourse suggest it remains a contentious topic with regard to its political and social significance.

**Critiquing Mixed Racial Messages Though Campus Climate Research**

Racial data collection policy and the shifting racial language in public discourse comprise aspects of the current policy and socio-historical contexts of campus racial climate for college students in the U.S., especially for students who are the offspring of racial intermarriage. Despite the persistence of racial incidents on college campuses and continually inequitable outcomes amongst racial groups, when the validity of race as a concept is questioned, any mention of race therefore becomes racist from a colorblind perspective (Bonilla-Silva, 2010). Such colorblind outlooks obfuscate possibilities to consider that race and racism continue to play a significant role in education and society. In such a milieu, it is crucial to interrogate neo-conservative as well as liberal agendas that threaten to render any study of race invalid, and to examine important contexts and issues in higher education that pertain to college students with multiple racial backgrounds. Critically examining multiraciality and campus climate will help educators to better understand multiraciality in students’ lives, support them and their respective racial identity groups on campus, and dispel neo-conservative and liberal myths that marginalize the multiracial population and position them as a divisive wedge in civil-rights efforts.

Extant research on campus racial climate already counters neo-conservative and liberal racial ideology by documenting decades of racial incidents and hostility. The literature indicates that students have different perceptions of the climate by racial group, that prejudicial treatment
and racist campus environments persist, and that many educational benefits are associated with climates facilitating cross-racial engagement (Harper & Hurtado, 2007; Gurin, Dey, Hurtado, & Gurin, 2002; Hurtado et al., 2003). In addition, students’ experiences of campus racial climate impact cognitive and socio-cognitive outcomes, values and attitudes, and competencies for citizenship in a multicultural world (Hurtado, Alvarez et al., 2012; Hurtado, Griffin, Arellano, & Cuellar, 2008; Hurtado, Ruiz, & Guillermo-Wann, 2012), with the latter being sorely needed to navigate complex racial discourse, on topics such as the continuing significance of race.

However, despite extensive research on campus climate for diversity (Hurtado, Alvarez et al., 2012), the persistence of multiraciality in public discourse on the significance of race (Morning, 2005), and in light of how college campuses have become racially charged (e.g. Hoag, 2010), racial theory in higher education has not accounted for multiraciality other than important theories of multiracial identity (e.g. Renn, 2004a), and campus climate models had overlooked this population until recently (see Hurtado, Alvarez et al., 2012). In empirical work, students indicating more than one racial background are inconsistently categorized in quantitative research, which can mask the complexities within this group and differentially affect analyses (Inkelas, Soldner, & Szelényi, 2009). Against this complex backdrop, some multiracial college students express a lack of inclusion by their monoracially-constructed peer groups (Renn, 2004a), report more experience with prejudice compared to their monoracially-identifying black and white peers (Brackett et al., 2006; Hurtado, Ruiz et al., 2012), and indicate the lowest perceptions of institutional support and the second lowest levels of supportive relationships on campus (Laird & Niskodé-Dosset, 2010). Even so, only one known empirical study explicitly uses a campus climate framework to comprehend multiracial college students’ experiences (Guillermo-Wann, 2010). The lack of understanding around campus climate for multiraciality
renders these students invisible and hinders educators’ potential to improve campus climate to enhance important outcomes for all students. Across all racial groups, equitable college outcomes and multicultural competencies are needed in the twenty-first century, and are key goals for developing inclusive excellence in American higher education (AAC&U, 2002). Specifically, the current gap in knowledge about the campus climate for multiraciality allows assumptions to be made about the post-civil rights multiracial population, which leaves critical issues for these college students unaddressed, and consequently perpetuates speculations of a declining significance of race in the United States.

**Definition of Terms**

This research aims to deepen understandings of the social construction of race and manifestations of racism through the lives of college students with two or more racial backgrounds. Inherent in this exercise is a critique of language around race that currently maintains singular monoracial constructions of race as a social norm. Accordingly, definitions of many terms that are used throughout this work can help clarify their meanings and how they are intended for use. If definitions are not clarified, this research may unintentionally reify race in an essentialist sense, rather than critically problematize its social construction (Renn, 2004b). I still choose to use racial terms rather than replace them with terms like ethnicity (e.g. Hollinger, 1995) that risk suggesting the erasure of race (Gallagher, 2003; Nayak, 2006) in order to recognize their existence as part of lived social realities, that is, as social constructions that have real bearing on lived experience (Omi & Winant, 1994; Smedley & Smedley, 2005). Suitably, I follow Renn’s (2000) suggestion to only capitalize racial terms if they pertain to a nation or continent of origin to “minimize the notion of racial categories as immutable entities” (p. 399). The historical context of multiraciality and racialization in the United States, and the
development of an integrative model for studying and addressing multiraciality in higher education, detailed in Chapter II, elaborate on some of the central concepts used in all three studies. These concepts are briefly defined here to guide the reader, and include the following:

- **Race**: “A concept which signifies and symbolizes social conflicts and interests by referring to different types of human bodies. Although the concept of race invokes biologically based human characteristics (so-called “phenotypes”), selection of these particular human features for purposes of racial signification is always and necessarily a social and historical process…. Race is a matter of both social structure and cultural representation” (Omi & Winant, 1994, pp. 55-56). Race and racial categories are not static, but rather their scope can change in different places and times. In this study, racial groups are conceptualized not only as federally designated categories, but also include groups that have been stigmatized in society due to racial markers (e.g. Arabs, Latina/os). Adjective: Racial.

- **Racial formation**: “The sociohistorical process by which racial categories are created, inhabited, transformed, and destroyed…. A process of historically situated projects in which human bodies and social structures are represented and organized… tied to the evolution of hegemony, the way in which society is organized and ruled” (Omi & Winant, 1994, pp. 55-56).

- **Racialization**: The social meaning attached to racial categories in the racial formation process.

- **Racial project**: The ideological “linkage between structure and representations. A racial project is simultaneously an interpretation, representation, or explanation of racial
dynamics, and an effort to reorganize and redistribute resources along particular racial lines” (Omi & Winant, 1994, p. 56).

- **Monoracial**: Referencing, pertaining to, or ascribing to only one racial group. Because racial groups are not truly monoracial in a biological sense (American Anthropological Association, 1998; Montagu, 1964), and internally racial groups are also socially heterogeneous (Feldman & Lewontin, 2008), terms like *monoracial-identifying* and *monoracially-constructed* will be used often to avoid reifying race as discrete categories that have been created and recreated over time. Monoracial categories may or may not accurately reflect an individual’s or social identity group(s)’ ancestry(s) or racial identity(s).

- **Interracial**: Any form of relations between two or more members from different monoracially-constructed groups.

- **Multiracial**: Referencing, pertaining to, or ascribing as the combination of two or more monoracially-constructed groups “understood in [one’s] day as combining distinct races regardless of whether this intermixture stemmed from their parents’ generation or farther back” (Morning, 2005, p. 42). Although the term multiracial is commonly used to refer to a group of people, its use in this study is primarily as an adjective that modifies a noun in order to de-essentialize multiracial solely as a group (e.g. multiracial ancestry, multiracial identity, multiracial category, etc.). Accordingly, who or what is considered multiracial depends on what is considered a race in a particular time (Morning, 2000). Presently, this could include groups such as Arab, Asian, black, Latina/o, Native American, and white, again regardless of the generation when this “mixing” occurred and despite that not all are federally recognized as racial groups.
• **Mixed race**: An interchangeable term with multiracial.

• **Biracial**: Referencing, pertaining to, or ascribing to the combination of only two monoracially-constructed backgrounds.

• **Mixed heritage**: Referencing, pertaining to, or ascribing to more than one racial or ethnic group; a broader term than *multiracial*. For example, mixed heritage can include members of only one racial group whose ancestry or culture pertains to more than one ethnic group (e.g. whites who have both English and Irish ancestry), as well as transnational adoptees. The full span of mixed heritage is beyond the scope of this study.

• **Mixed racial ancestry**: One’s family descent stemming from more than one monoracially-constructed group, which may signify perceived biological markers (such as blood, genes, etc.) that also have a socially constructed meaning. A distinct term from mixed heritage, mixed race, and multiracial.

• **Multiraciality**: Referencing or pertaining to multiracial identity, persons, groups, or phenomena, as used in a variety of studies (e.g. Harris & Sim, 2002; Omi, 2001; Renn, 2000; Root, 1997, 2001). This term is preferred to the term *multiracialism* also used in the literature in order to avoid confusion with terms such as *multiculturalism, racism, and monoracism*.

• **Racism(s)**: “Racism is a multi-faceted social phenomenon, with different levels and overlapping forms. It involves attitudes, actions, processes, and unequal power relations. It is based on the interpretations of the idea of ‘race,’ hierarchical social relations and the forms of discrimination that flow from this. Racism is not confined to extreme cases, but is present in a whole continuum of social relations. Specific societies see and do ‘race’ differently, and are organized in different ways” (Garner, 2010, p. 18). As Garner (2010)
notes, many scholars now contend there are many racisms (plural) that are particular to specific groups, geographies and eras (Garner, 2010; Modood, 2005; Omi & Winant, 1994; Phoenix, 1999; Solomos & Back, 1994, 1996). The term racism will be used to refer to an overarching racism that encompasses multiple racisms. The term traditional racism(s) will be used to refer to racism(s) that target monoracially-constructed groups.

- **Monoracism**: A form of racism characterized by “a social system of psychological inequality where individuals who do not fit monoracial categories may be oppressed on systemic and interpersonal levels because of underlying assumptions and beliefs in singular, discrete racial categories” (Johnston & Nadal, 2010, p. 125). In Chapter II, my co-author and I propose that monoracism operates in more ways than psychological inequality, and may have been more intimately intertwined with racism in early U.S. history given white interests in creating and maintaining racial purity (Frederickson, 2002). In contrast, in the current post-civil rights era, and particularly after anti-miscegenation laws fell in 1967, the changing social context seems to have allowed monoracism to manifest in more distinct ways from racism, even as earlier interracial anxieties persist (see Chapter II for details).

- **Post-racist**: A society in which all racisms have been fully eradicated, that is actively anti-racist, and has not erased or diluted neither histories nor racial identities in its citizens’ consciousness. This is the ideal towards which society might strive. The term can also be used to modify other nouns such as post-racist perspectives or ideology. (For additional perspectives, see Goldberg, 2002; Nayak, 2006).

- **Colorblind**: A neo-conservative racial ideology that commodifies racial identity, is non-racial in character through apparent race-neutrality, and justifies social norms that
maintain white privilege (Bonilla-Silva, 2010; Daniel & Castañeda-Liles, 2006; Gallagher, 2003). Colorblind ideology espouses that race is of little importance (N. Cabrera, 2009).

- **Post-racial**: A liberal racial ideology that espouses that race does not matter, that society is beyond race (N. Cabrera, 2009), and that racism no longer exists. Although this perspective is a popular optimistic view of race relations, it obscures the actual state of race relations, racism, and racial inequality (N. Cabrera, 2009). Recognizing the term post-racial lacks clarity of meaning within public discourse, Harris-Lacewell (2009) articulated that it seems to embody “an expression of social and political longing… [for] an America free of racism and discrimination, but others seem to hint at a society entirely free of racial identity or recognition” (p. 1). Similar to the latter expression, Gallagher (2003) suggests post-racial describes a society in which colorblind ideology is the norm in terms of discourse, practice, and explanation for group differences. I present these conceptualizations of post-racial to illustrate the complexities of racism and racial identity that are often conflated in the term. While Harris-Lacewell’s (2009) definition accurately reflects the ambiguity felt in society, and Gallagher’s (2003) concept grasps the pervasiveness of colorblindness in the current era, I opt for a definition more clearly distinguished from colorblind.

**Purpose and Scope of the Study**

The purpose of this research is to develop a theoretical model for multiraciality and to apply it to examinations of the campus climate for multiracial college students. To accomplish this goal, three distinct but related articles examine different aspects of the campus climate for multiracial college students and address current gaps in the literature, each of which comprises a
chapter that follows. Chapter II, *Investigating Theory and Research on Multiracial College Students: Toward an Integrative Model of Multiraciality for Campus Climate* (IMM), constructs the IMM framework from extant literature and theorizes racialization processes for multiracial students in college contexts. In doing so, it contests neo-conservative and liberal racial perspectives at the same time that it makes multiracial Americans visible in race-sensitive research on the racial dynamics higher education (Chang, 2000; 2002). It is co-authored with Marc P. Johnston (HEOC, GSE&IS doctoral candidate) and represents a collaborative effort to refine research on multiracial students through the advancement of theory. The investigation in Chapter III, *How You Count Matters: Using Multiracial Student Data to Examine Discrimination and Bias in College*, uses a quantitative methodology to look at how racially classifying students who mark two-or-more racial categories changes racial groups' representations of experiencing discrimination and bias in college. Data for 4,984 college students, 912 of whom indicate two or more racial groups, was collected from fourteen broad access institutions across the United States using the 2009-2010 Diverse Learning Environments pilot survey conducted by the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) at the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA). Analyses examine changes in sample size, mean differences in discrimination and bias, and significant predictive variables in multiple linear regressions based on how multiracial student data is classified. Finally, Chapter IV, *Mixed Race, Multiple Racisms: Student Perceptions of the Organizational Dimension of Campus Climate*, applies the IMM to interview data to problematize the norm of monoracial constructions of race at a single institution. It shows how perceptions of multiple racisms in organizational campus structures vary amongst multiracial students, creating nuances in campus climate for multiraciality. The chapter represents further development of a pilot project of fourteen interviews with
undergraduates conducted in 2010, with the addition of new analysis driven by the IMM
developed in Chapter II. Each of the three chapters reflects an independent (stand alone) study
intended to become a publishable article, and includes details about method, analysis, limitations,
results, and discussion. The articles critically connect racial theory, classification, and campus
climate to begin to address gaps in extant literature. The final chapter of this thesis summarizes
what was learned as a result of the three investigations.

**Rationale for Three Studies**

The three chapters that compose this volume independently and interdependently begin to
fill the gaps in the bodies of literature on multiraciality and campus racial climate. In order to
conduct a study of the campus climate for multiracial college students, a model is needed that
effectively accounts for having multiple racial backgrounds aside from multiracial identity
theory. Identity development is primarily a psychological process, although Renn (2003, 2004a)
situates it within an ecological context; for a study of the campus climate, a more sociological
theory is also needed to highlight how students are racialized within their learning environments.
Although this can be understood using qualitative inquiry, to enhance generalizability and
address broad implications for the study of campus climate for multiracial college students,
quantitative data must also be used. Many national higher education databases, for the first time,
have the capability of identifying multiracial students if they mark two or more racial
categories\(^1\), and central to any findings of this broad scale, the question of how to classify and
operationalize race for these students must be addressed. Accordingly, each study
operationalizes multiracial differently by nature of the problem and the data, while keeping in
mind that most monoracially-constructed groups have mixed racial ancestry from colonization

---

\(^1\) The Higher Education Research Institute at UCLA has allowed multiple race identification categories in data
collection since its inception in 1966. IPEDS requires all institutions to report mixed race students as a single,
aggregate category and will exclude them from monoracial counts (NCES, n.d.).
and slavery (Daniel, 2001; Davis, 1991; Feagin, 2006; Gomez, 2007; Morning, 2000, 2005; Nadal, 2009; Smith, 1999). The two methodological approaches, using different samples, indicate what we learn from using *a priori* racial categories (that vary) and also from students’ own ways of choosing to define their multiraciality. The sample in the qualitative analysis encompasses all of Renn’s (2000, 2003, 2004a) multiracial identity patterns, as students who have mixed racial ancestry, but identify monoracially, are able to be included. Conversely, these students are not identifiable in quantitative research if they only indicate one racial background on data collection forms. Both methodological approaches are needed in order to begin to understand the complexity of multiraciality in higher education. Each of the three studies address related but unique aspects of the campus climate for multiracial college students, with implications for both quantitative and qualitative research.

In sum, studying the campus climate for multiracial college students necessitates the development of an adequate theory as well as an exploration of methodological challenges in operationalizing race; conversely, in developing theory it is best to test it empirically. The three articles have aimed to accomplish this together by developing theory and applying it in two distinct methodological approaches that address different problems pertaining to multiraciality in higher education contexts.

**Restricting the Scope**

Unfortunately, focusing on important examinations of mixed racial ancestry within monoracially-constructed groups such as African American, Latina/o, and Native American populations is beyond the scope of this study. The same applies to students who may be multiethnic but whose respective heritages may fall within a single racial group despite distinct histories (e.g. Chinese and Vietnamese), as the topic is related to the present study, but too broad
to include at this time. However, the development of the IMM may prove useful in such endeavors when combined with additional theory pertaining to each racial or ethnic group. Even so, individuals singularly identifying with these or any racial groups are not excluded as long as they acknowledge having at least two or more racial backgrounds.

**Significance of the Study**

The development and empirical application of a model for multiraciality through three distinct studies has several implications for educational policy, practice, and research on campus climate for diversity in a time when the significance of race continues to be contested. Theory development towards the IMM may allow researchers to aptly examine the complexities within multiraciality, assist educators in supporting mixed race students, and helpfully reframe academic and popular understandings of multiraciality. By comparing different racial classification approaches in quantitative analyses, we can better understand within- and between-group differences in the campus climate for college students who mark two or more racial backgrounds on survey forms. The qualitative inquiry begins to paint a picture of similarities and differences in multiracial perceptions of organizational aspects of campus climate, and factors along which distinctions arise. Together, this series of three articles provides policy makers, researchers, and practitioners with theoretical, analytical, and practical tools to proactively investigate and improve campus climate for multiracially- and monoracially-identifying students, demonstrating a commitment to collaborating with monoracially-constructed groups.

First, the newly developed IMM can be helpful to researchers and educators working with underrepresented students in general, and multiracially-identifying students in particular, in conceptualizing race and racism, developing approaches to improve campus climate, and pursuing equity and social justice in and through higher education. This theory development
helps determine the current state of research and push the boundaries of existing theory to be inclusive of multiraciality. In doing so, the model deepens the conversation about the nature of race, racism, power, privilege, group boundaries, and intergroup relations as higher education strives to truly embody inclusive excellence in the twenty-first century.

Second, quantitatively examining discrimination and bias at interpersonal levels of campus climate across racial groups can challenge opinions that multiracial persons are exempt from such experiences. This is critical for multiracially-identifying students, as scholars have yet to quantitatively document their experiences with discrimination in this way across numerous institutions, especially in the current social milieu. This study also addresses critical issues for all racial groups in improving campus climate and operationalizing race. Colleges and universities across the country must now collect students’ racial background in multiple categories, but report multiracial data in a single aggregate category to the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) (DOE, 2007). The data collection allows for institutional-level analysis of this for the first time in history, while federally-reported data requires examining multiracial students as a separate racial group, in which they are not able to be re-categorized into other racial groups. This is a severe limitation of the federally required racial data reporting policy (Renn, 2009). Independently conducted national survey research as used in this study, however, has the opportunity to collect and report multiracial data in a number of ways that may facilitate various operationalizations of race, so long as the original data collection categories are preserved. This study alerts researchers that the racial classification approach they choose may have significant implications for results and conclusions. In the future, longitudinal study will help assess the impact of early college experiences on student
experiences of the campus climate for cohorts, as well as the effects of climate on educational outcomes for multiracially-identifying students.

Finally, better understanding how multiracial college students perceive and experience race and racism in college builds upon and contributes to theoretical and empirical work examining race, multiraciality, and the campus racial climate. The third study questions normative monoracial constructions of race, neo-conservative, and liberal racial ideology that pervade U.S. society, and contributes to our understanding of the campus racial climate for this typically overlooked population. It adds to the body of campus climate research by showing how traditional racisms and monoracism pervade organizational aspects of the college environment. Conversely, if race no longer mattered, we would not see manifestations of any form of racism, especially for this population given assumptions made about multiraciality in society. This work provides further evidence against neo-conservative and liberal claims that racism no longer exists or that race does not matter, realigning multiracial research with social justice aims.

In closing, research on the campus climate for diversity must consider the complexity of multiraciality for both multiracially- and monoracially-identifying students, as mixed race students are located within and between monoracially-constructed communities. In order to do so, it is crucial to move towards a new racial theory in our changing social context (Winant, 2000), one that accounts for multiraciality and balances the historical significance of race with current experiences. This work aims high to contribute to this endeavor. In light of the current social milieu, we must take the complexities of multiraciality into thoughtful consideration. We must critically examine how multiple racisms function for multiracial students in institutions of higher education, considering that college has the potential to prepare all students to effectively engage in our increasingly diverse society (Hurtado, 2007).
Perspective of the Researcher

My interest in studying multiraciality in higher education, and specifically the campus climate for diversity, stems from my own lived experience as a multiracially-identifying woman. My bias is that I assume a campus racial climate for multiracial students because I am one. With regard to racial identity, I primarily identify as multiracial, and specify having Pilipino, Mexican, and white backgrounds. I also identify situationally, and at times do so as mixed, or singularly as Latina or Pilipina, but I almost always qualify a monoracial identity with being mixed, as my phenotype tends to be viewed as racially ambiguous by many, to some as white, and to some as generically ‘of color.’ With regard to my experience in higher education, I have attended and worked in both predominantly white institutions and compositionally diverse institutions. In each context and at different times, I have been perceived as a multiracial person, as a white person, and as a person of color; I infer then, that I have thus experienced different campus racial climates respectively, often at the same institution, because of my mixed race status. In light of my racial identity, multiracial experience, and the relative dearth of higher education research on multiracial populations other than multiracial identity development theory, I seek to break new ground within the bodies of research on multiraciality and campus climate.
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CHAPTER II

INVESTIGATING THEORY AND RESEARCH ON MULTIRACIAL COLLEGE STUDENTS: TOWARD AN INTEGRATIVE MODEL OF MULTIRACIALITY FOR CAMPUS CLIMATE

Introduction

Higher education has witnessed a recent surge in scholarly literature on multiracial college students (e.g., C. Harper, 2007; King, 2011; Literte, 2010; Museus, Yee, & Lambe, 2011; Renn, 2004a; Renn & Shang, 2008); however it primarily examines racial identity, and often overlooks how it may be integrated with monoracially-framed research to advance broader social justice goals. Accordingly, at times this literature fails to contextualize multiraciality, meaning all multiracial phenomena such as identity, persons, scholarship, etc. (e.g. Root, 1997), within its longer history in the United States prior to the civil rights era (for an exception, see Kamimura, 2010). In fact, Elam (2011) suggests the recent increase in popularity of multiraciality unfortunately “has occurred in inverse relation to the perceived irrelevancy of race” (p. xiv), as scholars’ attempts at illuminating multiracial experiences were actually “in concert with the quiet dismantling of affirmative action” (p. xiv). Additionally, scholarly and public discourse on multiraciality in the post-civil rights era includes conflicting views of multiraciality as anti-civil rights (Morning, 2005; Omi, 2001), largely for neo-conservative’s misuse of it to try to eliminate racial data collection (Daniel & Castañeda-Liles, 2006; Pollock, 2004), as well as evidence of progress toward racial tolerance and equality (Morning, 2005; Olumide, 2002; Omi, 2001). This discourse may signal unintentional disconnect between scholarship and advocacy for multiracial and monoracially-constructed communities of color. Although higher education research on multiraciality has done much to expose contemporary mixed race experiences (e.g. multiracial identity theory, Renn, 2004a), an explicit and historically contextualized connection to the
continued struggle against racism, as began in Brunsma (2006) for multiracial scholarship more broadly, might provide a critical lens on multiraciality and better align multiracial scholarship in higher education with challenging all racial injustice.

Higher education is one site where race, racism, and multiraciality get contested often (e.g., through scholarship, student activism, identity development, college admissions), with racial issues being of key importance in evaluating and improving a campus climate for diversity (Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pedersen, & Allen, 1998, 1999). Campus climate affects numerous educational outcomes including multicultural competencies, adjustment to college, and degree completion, among others (A. Cabrera, Nora, Terenzini, Pascarella, & Hagedorn, 1999; Hurtado, Alvarez, Guillermo-Wann, Cuellar, & Arellano, 2012; Hurtado et al., 1998, 1999; Hurtado, Griffin, Arellano, & Cuellar, 2008; Museus, Nichols, & Lambert, 2008; Hurtado, Ruiz, & Guillermo-Wann, 2012), and is critical in preparing students for effective engagement in a diverse society toward a more just and equitable future (Hurtado, 2007). However, research examining racial (including multiracial) dynamics in college typically lacks an integrated theory of race and racism (N. Cabrera, 2011; S. Harper, 2012), which seems important for improving negative climates for diversity and eliminating group disparities in outcomes. In addition, studying the climate for multiracial college students is an important next step (Renn, 2004a), but only one known study explicitly does so (Guillermo-Wann, 2010). Therefore, this article seeks to address how multiraciality can help fight racism through higher education by connecting multiracially- and monoracially-framed scholarship on race in modeling a relationship between race, racism, and multiraciality in the campus climate for diversity.

Specifically, we argue for an integrated model that connects two interwoven systems of oppression in college contexts: traditional racisms targeting monoracially-constructed racial
groups, and monoracism targeting multiraciality (Johnston & Nadal, 2010). We contend that educators must better examine and understand multiraciality within higher education as one of several ways to work toward collectively improving campus climates, and exposing systems of racism. An awareness of the interrelated nature of traditional racisms and monoracism in the campus climate might help align the scholarship and advocacy on multiracial and monoracially-constructed groups. This is particularly crucial as perspectives within public discourse use (and potentially abuse) multiraciality for different purposes within the larger racial landscape. Accordingly, we build upon aspects of race-based theories and frameworks common in American higher education research to develop an Integrative Model of Multiraciality (IMM) for campus climate that more comprehensively accounts for historical and contemporary contexts, social identities, college campus structures, and societal systems of oppression.

**Multiraciality and Higher Education**

Higher education’s interdisciplinary nature encompasses a wide literature on diversity and equity in college including matters pertaining to specific racial groups. However, the body of scholarship on racial groups in higher education presents at least three interrelated limitations regarding racial theory, methodology, and multiraciality.

First, the literature generally tends to be atheoretical regarding race, and racism in particular (N. Cabrera, 2011; S. Harper, 2012), other than the cursory acknowledgement that race is a social construction (López, 1994; Omi & Winant, 1994), and that students from racially minoritized groups might have more negative experiences or inequities in outcomes than others. A growing body of higher education research on racial groups employs critical race theory (CRT), which centralizes race and racism in educational experiences and processes, and focuses on exposing how social, political, and educational structures produce racial inequality (Delgado
& Stefancic, 2001). However, CRT is not exactly theory, since it offers more of a perspective than a relational model of interconnected concepts such as race, racism, educational processes, and outcomes (N. Cabrera, 2011; Duncan, 2006; Gillborn, 2006), although some scholars are moving in this direction (e.g. Yosso, 2006). By not explicitly acknowledging the influence of racism outside of CRT work, research may not effectively expose or address the roots of racial oppression in educational settings. This is particularly important for campus racial climate research, which aims to improve higher education contexts for learning and student outcomes (S. Harper, 2012).

The lack of theory on race and racism influences the second issue, whereby the higher education literature typically lacks consideration of multiraciality, aside from multiracial identity research (e.g. Renn, 2004a). This limitation is a methodological issue that will be increasingly important considering the rising number of youth identifying multiracially who are or will soon be college students (Renn, 2009; Saulny, 2011). While the importance of continued examinations of diversity and equity issues for monoracially-constructed groups is paramount, higher education research tends not to address how students indicating multiple racial groups are accounted for in the sample of a study (C. Harper, 2007). For instance, quantitative research typically “controls” for race methodologically by including racial groups, yet the continued operationalization of only discrete racial groups to investigate important topics such as equity in outcomes (e.g., academic achievement, career placement, and various indicators of student development) may also perpetuate thinking of racial groups as being essentially, and potentially biologically, different (Johnston, 2011). This masks similarities and differences students may be experiencing based on how race is operationalized (e.g. Inkelas, Soldner, & Szelényi, 2009), and reflects the atheoretical nature of the literature regarding race. To be clear, examining structures
of inequality across racial groups is crucial, however, researchers must be transparent about how multiple-race data is classified for such quantitative analyses (Johnston, 2011). In contrast, CRT’s primary methodology of qualitative counterstorytelling, as empowering as it may be for oppressed groups, often relies too heavily upon “data derived from subjective ontological categories… that refer to existing states of mind and feelings to which only one actor has access” (Duncan, 2006, p. 192, 198), such as the singular use of narrative data uncorroborated with other forms of data, which render counterstories vulnerable to rejection by dominant group members whose lived experience does not encompass such states of mind or feelings (Duncan, 2006, p. 205); this could apply to multiracial counterstories as well. Ultimately, higher education research must address multiraciality and tackle methodological complexities.

Third, the nascent body of higher education literature on multiraciality generally lacks a focus on racism and instead, explores the “experiences” of multiracial students (e.g. Nishimura, 1998; Sands & Schuh, 2004) or identity (e.g. Renn, 2004a), without explicitly examining the role of racism or campus climate as a context for development. Understanding the influence of racism, and climate as distal and more proximal contexts in experiences and developmental processes, can inform how to improve the climate for multiraciality and link it with combating racism. Although multiracial literature makes an important contribution, its relatively narrow scope may reinforce the idea that race is solely an individual “choice” (e.g. Hollinger, 1995) separate from systems and structures of oppression.

In sum, higher education scholarship on racial groups lacks a critical connection between theories of race and racism, multiraciality, and campus climate, and is therefore ripe for theory development to begin to fill this gap. Therefore, we bring prominent theories together under a lens of monoracism to examine the nexus of these topics in American higher education literature.
First, we employ Omi and Winant’s (1994) theory of racial formation to clarify key racial concepts. Then we use the notion of monoracism to evaluate and augment three relevant racial frameworks used in higher education research: critical race theory (e.g. Delgado & Stefancic, 2001), multiracial identity theory (e.g. Renn, 2000, 2003, 2004a), and the campus climate for diversity framework (Hurtado, et al., 1998, 1999; Hurtado, Alvarez et al., 2012; Milem, Chang, & Antonio, 2005). This process of reviewing and evaluating theory moves us towards introducing the IMM for campus climate, which integrates aspects of the aforementioned theories, and adapts them in light of multiraciality as it has evolved over time. Finally, we suggest implications for research and practice.

Clarifying Concepts Through Racial Formation Theory

Before critiquing or drawing upon current theory and frameworks, it is important to clarify some often conflated or misunderstood racial concepts to avoid reifying race in an essentialist sense (Renn, 2004b), and to subvert colorblind erasures of race (Gallagher, 2003). We apply Omi and Winant’s (1994) theory of racial formation to clarify commonly misunderstood racial concepts. We incorporate additional perspectives to arrive at our understanding of *race*, including *monoracial* and *multiracial*, and our conceptualization of *racism(s)*, including monoracism and its relationship to traditional racisms. Racial formation offers an integrated theory of race and racism that exposes the fallacy of earlier biological understandings of race, and de-essentializes socially-constructed racial groups.

**Race**

The concept of race is central to theory development around multiraciality. According to Omi and Winant (1994), “*race is a concept which signifies and symbolizes social conflicts and interests by referring to different types of human bodies*.... Race is a matter of both social
structure and cultural representation” (pp. 55-56), and serves to oppress and privilege members of formed groups. The socio-historical process of racial signification, often called racialization, is what Omi and Winant specify as racial formation, or the “process by which racial categories are created, inhabited, transformed, and destroyed… A process of historically situated projects in which human bodies and social structures are represented and organized… tied to the evolution of hegemony, the way in which society is organized and ruled” (1994, pp. 55-56). The concept of racial projects allows the theory to distinguish between race and racism, and can be understood as the ideological “linkage between structure and representations. A racial project is simultaneously an interpretation, representation, or explanation of racial dynamics, and an effort to reorganize and redistribute resources along particular racial lines” (Omi & Winant, 1994, p. 56). Therefore, race and racial categories are not static, but rather their scope can change in different places and times. Consequently, we conceptualize racial groups to encompass not only those legitimized by federally designated categories, but also groups that have been stigmatized in society due to racial markers (e.g. Arabs, Latina/os), and follow Renn’s (2000) suggestion to only capitalize racial terms if they pertain to a nation or continent of origin to “minimize the notion of racial categories as immutable entities” (p. 399).

From a theoretical perspective of racial formation, throughout U.S. history, racial formation has consistently created and maintained falsely discrete racial categories, obscuring centuries of racial intermixing. Thus mixed racial ancestry signals that one’s family descent stems from more than one racial group, which may signify perceived biological markers (such as blood, genes, etc.), but the groups to which these markers may belong are socially constructed. Although rules of hypodescent (e.g., the “one-drop” rule) have applied differently to groups over time (Davis, 1991; Gomez, 2007; Smith, 1999), typically, persons of mixed European and non-
European ancestry have been categorized exclusively as “non-white,” which serves to keep the “white” racial group ‘pure’ (Omi & Winant, 1994; Spickard, 1989). For example, monoracially-constructed groups that often have African, indigenous, and European ancestry include black Americans (Daniel, 2001; Feagin, 2006; Fishkin, 1995), Native Americans (Smith, 1999), and Latina/os, the latter whom often have Asian ancestry as well (Gomez, 2007). Pilipinos have a long history of mixing of Spanish, indigenous, and Asian ancestries (Nadal, 2009), and perhaps more obscured is that many individuals categorized as white in the U.S. typically have non-white racial ancestry (Morning, 2000, 2005). Racial formation theory asserts that race is fluid and changing across time and place through political struggle; it is not an essence, nor is it static, and in this way the theory demonstrates anti-essentialism in conceptualizing race – a key foundation for developing an integrative model of multiraciality.

**Monoracial and multiracial.** Also at the core of this work are the terms *monoracial* and *multiracial* in considering forms of racial oppression that play out in college contexts. We define *monoracial* as a modifier for nouns referencing, pertaining to, or ascribing to only one racial group. Presently, this could include the combination of monoracially-constructed groups in the U.S. such as Arab, Asian, black, Latina/o, Native, and white. Although racial groups are not truly distinct in any biological sense (American Anthropological Association, 1998; Daniel, 2006; Montagu 1964), and any so-called racial group is also biologically and socially heterogeneous (Feldman & Lewontin, 2008), terms like *monoracially-identifying* and *monoracially-constructed* are useful for demonstrating how monoracial categories have been created and recreated over time. Monoracial categories may or may not accurately reflect an individual’s or group’s ancestry(s) or racial identity(s), but reflect the dominant way race is currently conceptualized and operationalized in most higher education research.
Similarly, we argue for the use of multiracial as an adjective referencing, pertaining to, or ascribing to the combination of two or more monoracially-constructed groups, as “understood in [one’s] day as combining distinct races regardless of whether this intermixture stemmed from their parents’ generation or farther back” (Morning, 2005, p. 42). Accordingly, who or what is considered multiracial depends on what groups are considered races in a particular time (Morning, 2000). Thus, multiracial may be used as a moderating term for a number of concepts (e.g., identity, ancestry, identification, classification, and category; Johnston, Ozaki, Pizzolato, & Chaudhari, 2009; Rockquemore, Brunsma, & Delgado, 2009; Wijeyesinghe, 2001). This allows the concepts rather than the term to indicate generation of racial intermixture or specification in identifying as multiracial (e.g., in a given situation vs. a more permanent self-perception). A spectrum of applications of the term multiracial is necessary to undermine the fictitious assumption that there are biologically distinct races, keeping in mind that how people and groups are “raced” has real consequences for lived experience (Smedley & Smedley, 2005). Some might use the term multiracial to indicate the presence of many monoracially-constructed groups, however, we prefer the use of campus climate language compositional diversity (Milem et al., 2005) to describe the relative presence of multiple monoracially-constructed groups. Using multiracial as a modifier as defined here allows for various operationalizations of race in theoretical and empirical work in order to examine specific educational issues around multiraciality, such as multiple-race data collection at institutional and national levels.

Racism(s)

The literature on racism supports the idea that there is an overarching racism, which encompasses multiple racisms that are contextually based in time and place, and that also intersect with additional social identities such as class, gender, sexual orientation, etc. (e.g.

Racism is a multi-faceted social phenomenon, with different levels and overlapping forms. It involves attitudes, actions, processes, and unequal power relations. It is based on the interpretations of the idea of ‘race,’ hierarchical social relations and the forms of discrimination that flow from this. Racism is not confined to extreme cases, but is present in a whole continuum of social relations. (p. 18)

From a racial formation perspective, political, economic, cultural, and social forces ultimately produce racial projects that may or may not be racist (Omi & Winant, 1994). According to the theory, a racial project is “racist if and only if it creates or reproduces structures of domination based on essentialist categories of race” (p. 71). Thus racial projects and forms of racism, or racisms, vary over time and place.

The social nature of the forces at play in racial formation that create racist racial projects can be seen in historical accounts of multiple racisms. For example, particularly in U.S. contexts, racism began and continues from white supremacy - that is, the belief in the superiority of those deemed white and/or the power structure maintaining their social, cultural, economic, and political dominance - which first hideously oppressed and exploited blacks through slave labor, and continues to systemically oppress black Americans in contemporary society (Feagin, 2006). This original white-on-black racism in the U.S. from which other racisms likely evolved (Feagin, 2006) can be thought of as biologically “justified” racism, perpetuated through “scientific” ideologies such as eugenics, that has since morphed into various culturally justified racisms (Fredrickson, 2002; Phoenix, 1999). Changing racisms thus reflect the racial formation process and general understandings of what race means at specific points in time. Omi and
Winant (1994) highlight the shifting aspects of race and racism, and importantly contend that not all racisms are the same, particularly regarding power, which is crucial for being able to identify their fluctuating complexities.

The notion of multiple racisms allows for changing forms and sites of racism that can be distinguished in how they manifest, who the targeted groups are, and who the agent groups, or perpetrators, are. First, to oversimplify, the literature on how racisms manifest seems to describe three attributes (see also Blum, 1999; Garcia, 1997): 1) racism that is systemic, institutional, cultural, or structural, 2) racism that is interpersonal, ideological, or discursive, and 3) the extent to which racism is subtle or explicit. Examples of systemic manifestations of racism include structural or systematic racism (Feagin, 2006; Jones, 1997), institutional racism (López, 2000), and cultural racism (Jones, 1997). Examples of interpersonal, ideological, or discursive racism include colorblind racism (Bonilla-Silva, 2010), interpersonal racism (Jones, 1997), discursive or discourse-manifest racism (Bonilla-Silva, 2010; Goldberg, 1993; Solomos & Back, 1996), and volitional racism (Garcia, 1997), among others. Omi and Winant (1994) contend racism is both structural and ideological. Regarding the subtlety of racism, it can manifest as overt or covert (Ture & Hamilton, 1992), although scholars suggest racisms have become more covert (e.g. colorblind racism, Bonilla-Silva, 2010; laissez-faire racism, Bobo, Kluegel, & Smith, 1997; symbolic racism, Sears & Henry, 2003; aversive racism, Dovidio & Gaertner, 2000; racial microaggressions, Sue, 2010). Second, diverse examples of who the targeted groups can be include African Americans (Feagin, 2006), Muslims (Modood, 2005), and immigrants (e.g. racist nativism, Huber & Lopez, 2008), among others; monoracism falls into this set of examples although we will distinguish it slightly from other forms momentarily. Third, scholars hotly contend the question of which racial groups can be agents in generating racism; this is the
question of power. Some assert that within the U.S. context, only whites can be racist because they are the dominant racial group with power (Hacker, 1992; Marable, 1992). Others challenge this position by illustrating ways in which people of color can and have also exhibited and contributed to racism, whether through colluding with white supremacy or other less-powerful and situational forms (N. Cabrera, 2011; Johnston & Nadal, 2010; Omi & Winant, 1994). Still others suggest that people of color can be prejudiced on an interpersonal level but not racist due to a lack of power to oppress other groups (Bonilla-Silva, 2010), or distinguish between horizontal racism by people of color and vertical racism by whites (Harris & Ordona, 1990). The possible perpetrating group(s) largely depends on the conceptualized form(s) and site(s) of racism, and relative group power.

Following Omi and Winant (1994), we contend that racism is both ideological and structural, can be directed at various racial groups, and by anyone or any structural process, although not all racisms are the same in power. At its core, racism is about oppressing and privileging racial groups, which change over time and place. In the U.S. context, racism works to maintain white supremacy and hegemonic whiteness (N. Cabrera, 2009). We use racism (singular) to refer collectively to all forms of racism, and racisms (plural) to draw attention to different forms. The severity of racism’s outcomes lies heavily in the reality of the agent racial groups’ historical and contemporary power – hence not all racisms are the same, but this does not preclude members of less powerful groups from creating and perpetuating racisms. Racism also intersects with additional social identities, which guards against essentializing racial groups (Adams et al., 2000; Delgado & Stefancic, 2001; Garner, 2010; Omi & Winant, 1994; Rattansi, 2005). That is, “no person has a single, easily stated, unitary identity…. Everyone has potentially conflicting, overlapping identities, loyalties, and allegiances” (Delgado & Stefancic,
Accordingly, in order to dismantle one system of oppression necessitates dismantling them all (Adams et al., 2000; Delgado & Stefancic, 2001). In addition, we contend that racism need not always be ideologically intentional – that is, racial inequity in outcomes (e.g. educational attainment, health disparities, etc.) is still a marker of institutionalized racist processes and structures, whether intentional or not. This guards against claims of “reverse racism” against whites that focus on equal treatment while overlooking equitable outcomes resulting from structural oppression of people of color (N. Cabrera, 2009; Feagin & O’Brien, 2003). Such an understanding of multiple racisms allows one to conceptualize various forms of racial oppression for a wide spectrum of racial groups in the U.S. context, including the unique oppression facing individuals who may not fit neatly into monoracially-constructed groups.

**Monoracism.** Monoracism (Johnston & Nadal, 2010) builds upon the understanding of multiple racisms and is another key concept in linking multiracially- and monoracially-framed scholarship. Monoracism asserts that there is a “social system of psychological inequality” based on monoracial constructions of race “where individuals who do not fit monoracial categories may be oppressed on systemic and interpersonal levels because of underlying assumptions and beliefs in singular, discrete racial categories” regardless of whether or not they may have mixed racial ancestry or identify multiracially (Johnston & Nadal, 2010, p. 125). This earlier focus on psychological inequality highlights that the evaluation of whether or not an individual fits into a monoracial category is proximally a psychological process, but is informed by the social construction of race as discrete monoracial categories. The inability to categorize individuals into a single race, and subsequently considering them phenotypically ambiguous (regardless of whether or not they may actually identify as multiracial), reflects the “common belief in the essentialist nature of discrete racial categories” (Johnston & Nadal, 2010, p. 127) but
more importantly, may lead to differential evaluation and treatment on behalf of the perceiver (e.g. Sanchez & Bonam, 2009). Monoracism works to maintain the invisibility of monoracial norms since the privileges accompanying those who fit monoracial constructions of race often go unnoticed or unchallenged. Monoracism also promotes and perpetuates thinking of race monoracially by calling on members of society or communities to (1) believe in discrete monoracial categories; (2) maintain group boundaries by not intermarrying across monoracially-constructed racial groups (e.g. through historical anti-miscegenation laws and contemporary cultural norms); and (3) when offspring are produced, to promote their following of strict rules of hypodescent (e.g., the “one-drop rule”) in terms of racially identifying and group membership. Monoracism is particularly concerned with the “who” racism can target, and suggests a commonly overlooked demographic – persons who do not easily conform to monoracial norms – and more generally, multiraciality. We also suggest monoracism can manifest in structural and interpersonal forms, covertly or overtly, and can be perpetuated by members of any racial group. Our understanding of multiple racisms therefore allows for the identification of monoracism, both historically and contemporarily, and how it may have been changing over time and in different contexts (such as college) along side other racisms.

The relationship between racism and monoracism. Given that traditional racisms targeting monoracially-constructed groups have necessitated maintaining a myth of racial purity, both biologically and socially, in order to oppress racial minorities for centuries in various countries (Feagin, 2006; Fredrickson, 2002), monoracism has likely been working in tandem with traditional racisms in the oppression of non-white groups over time in the U.S. context, including those with mixed European and non-European ancestry (Johnston & Nadal, 2010).
That is, the forces creating traditional racisms as well as monoracism seem highly interrelated, although they may evolve, converge, and diverge over time.

In the U.S. context, we suggest that multiple racisms have evolved and intertwined in a way that ultimately maintains white supremacy; hence the importance of modeling their intersections. First, this may occur by the racial formation of erroneously distinct racial groups (racial formation incorporating monoracism) with the purpose of oppressing people of color and privileging whites (traditional racism), next by the policing of those racial group boundaries through the oppression of racially mixed bodies (monoracism), which then perpetuates sustained group-based racial oppression (multiple traditional racisms). Elam (2011) specifies that persons of mixed racial ancestry throughout U.S. history were most certainly oppressed as the physical sites of this hyper-anxiety around racial purity, particularly in the pre-civil rights era. However, the intertwined relationship we postulate between traditional racisms and monoracism in the pre-civil rights era likely had little need for distinction given that the perpetrators of both were overwhelmingly those categorized as white (even if they had non-European ancestry, see Morning, 2003), and the victims those ascribed to be black and other racial groups of color. That is, apart from an overt monoracist belief of racially mixed persons/bodies as deviant and inferior made prominent by the eugenics movement (Black, 2003; Pascoe, 2009; Sommerville, 2000), little distinction can likely be made between traditional racisms targeting monoracially-constructed groups and monoracism in the pre-civil rights era that would not be entirely anachronistic; their manifestations, targets, and actors were nearly identical, given the usual classification of mixed bodies as non-white in light of whites’ hyper-anxiety over racial purity (Morning, 2003).
Conversely, in the post-civil rights era, race and multiraciality seem to be in an extended period of what Omi and Winant (1994) call rearticulation (Brunsma, 2006), in which racial social meaning is redefined - as questions about what race is and about multiraciality’s relationship to racism have begun to distinguish monoracism from other racisms. As the post-civil rights era pertains to multiraciality, it is characterized by the legality of interracial marriage in all states since 1967 (Loving v. Virginia), and that multiracial as an identity, category, and classification has become a viable social possibility (e.g. U.S. Census 2000, Renn & Lunceford, 2004; DaCosta, 2007; Renn, 2004a). However, it is critical to keep in mind that identity options may be limited for some based on physical appearance and additional factors (Wijeyesinghe, 2001). As multiracial identities are claimed, contested, and viewed with suspicion, multiraciality’s rearticulation appears to be complicated by pervasive neo-conservative colorblind and liberal post-racial ideologies that question the validity of the concept of race, which have generated fear within communities of color of multiraciality (e.g. Thornton, 2009).

In particular, manifestations of neo-conservative and liberal racial ideologies (e.g., anti-affirmative action and race-neutral policies; see Bonilla-Silva, 2010; N. Cabrera, 2009; Morfin, Perez, Parker, Lynn, & Arrona, 2006) seem to be new forces distinguishing monoracism from other forms of racism. For example, neo-conservative politics has at times co-opted multiraciality as a justification for erasing race, racial groups, and racial identity (e.g., the use of multiracial persons by Ward Connerly to promote the 2003 “Racial Privacy Initiative” in California; Pollock 2004). On the other hand, liberal racial ideology champions multiracial persons as evidence that society is “post-racial,” or beyond race (e.g. President Obama’s ability to garner support across racial groups; Morning, 2005). When thus viewed as representative of neo-conservative and liberal racial ideologies, multiraciality has understandably fueled fears
amongst people of color, and black Americans in particular, that racial identities will become obsolete; these groups certainly have much more at stake than white Americans, for whom the loss of racial identity may be a welcome shedding of a racist history rather than feeling accountable to a history of oppression that created and defined these groups (Morning 2005; Nayak 2006; Thornton 2009). Hence, when stemming from within communities of color, monoracism seems to be a reaction to neo-conservative and liberal racial ideologies that have rearticulated multiraciality to justify their interests. In fact, the unfortunate collusion of aspects of the multiracial movement with white interests (Elam 2011) probably allows many advocates of racial colorblindness and post-racialism to interpret multiraciality as a sign of the irrelevance of race and racial identity; these assumptions likely reinforce suspicion of multiraciality amongst communities of color and perpetuate monoracism. Such assumptions have been documented on the interpersonal level as multiracial microaggressions (e.g., Johnston & Nadal, 2010).

**Multiracial Microaggressions**

*Multiracial microaggressions* are “daily verbal, behavioral, or environmental indignities, whether intentional or unintentional, … that communicate hostile, derogatory, or negative slights towards multiracial individuals or groups…. [They] involve individuals’ mixed-heritage status and are experienced by multiracial persons of any racial makeup or phenotype” (Johnston & Nadal, 2010, p. 126). Although Johnston & Nadal (2010) originally state the actors are monoracial persons, in light of our discussion on multiple racisms, we contend that multiracial persons may internalize monoracism and perpetuate monoracial constructions of race as a social norm. Categories of multiracial microaggressions include occurrences of exclusion and isolation, exoticization and objectification, assumption of monoracial identity and mistaken identity, denial of multiracial reality and experiences, and pathologizing of identity or
experiences (Johnston & Nadal, 2010). Multiracial microaggressions may be interpersonal or structural, and may or may not be intentional. They may also change based on intersections of other social identities; this shows that there is no single multiracial experience, but rather highlights the importance of intersectionality and anti-essentialism (e.g. Delgado & Stefancic, 2001; Garner, 2010; Omi & Winant, 1994) even in finding commonalities in experience. Johnston and Nadal’s (2010) taxonomy of multiracial microaggressions and their concept of monoracism are useful in critically evaluating prominent racial theories used in higher education research because they allow us to make visible monoracial norms and privilege that dominate relevant racial theories and frameworks in higher education. The taxonomy has been empirically validated, with an important observation that multiracial persons also experience stereotypes targeting monoracially-constructed groups (Guillermo-Wann, 2010; Nadal et al., 2011).

**Relevant Racial Theories and Frameworks in Higher Education Research**

**Considering Critical Race Theory**

A way that higher education scholars have examined racial matters is through employing critical race theory (CRT), which has its roots in legal scholarship (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001), and has been applied to education (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995). In education, CRT has been used and often modified to address monoracially-framed community issues for African Americans (e.g., S. Harper, 2009; S. Harper, Patton & Wooden, 2009; Solórzano, Ceja & Yosso, 2000), Asian Americans (e.g., Teranishi, 2002; Teranishi & Behringer, 2009), Latina/os (e.g., Delgado Bernal, 2002; Villalpando, 2003; Yosso, 2006), Native Americans (e.g., Brayboy, 2005), and even critical whiteness studies (e.g., Owen, 2007). Critical race theory centralizes race in the law and in educational experiences, and asserts that the structure of the law as well as educational systems perpetuate white privilege (Dixon & Rousseau, 2006). Drawing upon the
articulated theory by several CRT scholars (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Matsuda, Lawrence, Delgado, & Crenshaw, 1993; Solórzano, 1997, 1998; Solórzano et al., 2000), key concepts of critical race theory that we incorporate include: 1) that racism is ordinary, pervasive, and permanent in daily life in the United States; 2) interest convergence; and 3) different racializations. We extend these areas by including other key concepts such as the social construction of race, intersectionality and anti-essentialism through racial formation theory and theories of multiple racisms (Garner, 2010; Omi & Winant, 1994), and social justice by integrating monoracism (Johnston & Nadal, 2010) with traditional racisms. We also recognize CRT tenets were developed primarily on studies of monoracially-constructed populations. They still seem viable, however, as the model we advance maintains that students experience multiple forms of racism as potential members of multiple racial groups. We focus our discussion on these three concepts and how they may be augmented to better account for multiraciality in college contexts.

**Racism is ordinary, pervasive, and permanent.** CRT posits that racism is ordinary, pervasive, and permanent in daily life in the United States. From a CRT perspective, racism is a system of power that privileges whites over people of color and positions all groups in relation to whiteness; racism permeates institutions and cultural norms (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001; Ladson-Billings, 2006; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995). The ordinariness means that racism manifests through colorblind, formal conceptions of equality, where the focus is on equal treatment rather than equal outcomes (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001; Dixon & Rousseau, 2006; Gillborn, 2006); it is endemic to the everyday functions of society rather than being seen as isolated rare incidents, and is thereby pervasive. Racism’s permanency is not one of despair, but rather reflects a balance between struggle and hope recognizing much remains to be done (Dixon
& Rousseau, 2006; Ladson-Billings, 2006). Thus, CRT challenges the dominant ideology of objectivity, neutrality, colorblindness, and merit, which mask underlying structures of racism (Gillborn, 2006).

From a perspective of multiraciality, we question CRT’s focus on a singular racism - one which seems to suggest that only whites can be racist (e.g. Marable, 1992), by drawing upon the concept of multiple racisms in which non-white groups may also be racist (e.g. Garner, 2010; Omi & Winant, 1994), adding that monoracism is also ordinary, pervasive, and permanent in U.S. society. Although we agree that racism positions all groups in relation to whiteness, we add that monoracism also positions all groups in relation to monoracial norms, and that in tandem they maintain white supremacy. This is a definite break from a CRT concept of racism, but we find the assertion that only whites can be racist incompatible with multiracial experiences with racism (e.g. Guillermo-Wann, 2010; Johnston & Nadal, 2010; Nadal et al., 2011). As suggested earlier, monoracism and traditional racisms targeting monoracially-constructed groups interact to oppress persons based on mixed racial ancestry as well as monoracially-identifying persons of color. Paradoxically, when some persons with mixed racial ancestry may be classified as white (rather than self-identifying singularly as monoracially white), monoracism marginalizes the person by reinforcing monoracial norms, yet traditional racism grants white privilege to the person with mixed ancestry at the same time. This type of nuance seems important for research examining multiraciality, since the lived experiences of students of color (monoracially- and multiracially-identifying) are filled with such complexity.

**Interest convergence.** Interest convergence draws from the concept of material determinism, and posits that because racism provides material benefits to white elites, and psychological benefit to the white working-class, white Americans will rarely be motivated to
eradicate racism as a system of privilege and oppression, but may support specific changes within the system when it serves their interests (Bell, 1980; Delgado & Stefancic, 2001). Interest convergence may have played out between two distinct threads of the movement to change U.S. Census racial data collection (J. Spencer, 1997; R. Spencer, 2010). First, multiracial individuals’ desire for more accurate racial identification options fueled the initiative to allow individuals to “mark one or more” racial categories. Even if unintentional, those interests likely converged with a second thread, which was the early push to have a “multiracial box” in data collection processes that was eventually defeated. The desire for a multiracial box largely stemmed form monoracial white individuals (especially parents) wanting to allow multiracial others (especially their offspring) to be able to identify as something other than a person of color (particularly other than black) (J. Spencer, 1997; R. Spencer, 2010). So although a multiracial box was not created, white interests likely converged with multiracial individuals’ desires for more accurate representation to accomplish the change that did occur, because it still provided opportunity to identify as something other than a person of color. In such ways, interest convergence with regard to multiraciality works to maintain the hierarchy of monoracially-constructed whites in a more powerful social status.

**Different racializations.** Different racializations result from the social construction of race (e.g. Omi & Winant, 1994), meaning that there are different consequences for people based on the historically derived meanings attached to their racialized groups (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001). That is, what it means to be white, for example, is very different from what it means to be Asian American, which is different from Arab American, black, Latina/o, Native American, multiracial, etc., and the lived experiences derived from these attached meanings differ as well.
With multiraciality, the racial classification of multiracial persons into racial categories may result in multiple different and sometimes contradictory classifications, particularly in relation to how the legacy of rules of hypodescent work for different racial groups. That is, as potential members of multiple racial groups, multiracial persons might also experience the different racializations attached to dissimilar racial groups when classified in different ways. Thus, we acknowledge potential differences in classification, and subsequent racializations and experiences, for persons based on their particular racial ancestries. We thus incorporate both racial ancestry and racial classification into the proposed model (Figure 1-3), acknowledging the resulting different racializations that can ensue.

In sum, we draw upon and modify CRT’s concepts of racism, interest convergence, and different racializations in light of the concept of monoracism, as they prove useful to move towards a model for examining multiraciality in American higher education. CRT is not without other constructive criticisms (e.g. N. Cabrera, 2011; Dixon & Rousseau, 2006; Duncan, 2006), although it remains a useful perspective (Duncan, 2006). As mentioned, like other higher education research, CRT’s current conceptualizations of race and racism are limited to discrete monoracial constructions. CRT also relies on a definition of racism that posits racial power is only located within the dominant white group. When considering monoracism, relative power may also be located within monoracially-constructed communities of color that can intentionally and unintentionally marginalize persons based on their multiraciality (Johnston & Nadal, 2010). Even so, we still agree racism ultimately positions all groups in relation to monoracial whiteness as the norm, as suggested by CRT (Ladson-Billings, 2006). In essence, this can be understood through interest convergence and the internalization of the dominant monoracial norms, which may uphold white privilege and power through the maintenance of a racial hierarchy; although
the social positions of multiracial persons within that is another topic of discussion (see Bonilla-Silva, 2010) that also has yet to account for monoracism. It is not that traditional racisms based on monoracial constructions of race do not exist, but rather that traditional racisms and monoracism intersect with other forms of oppression. Through the human psyche and social structures, these multiple racisms intersecting with additional oppressions work together to oppress all people of color, and may surface in the experiences of multiracial persons. These will depend on racial classification, which in turn may result in experiencing multiple different racializations. The model we develop maintains that mixed race students can experience multiple forms of racism as potential members of multiple racial groups, the latter being a key feature of multiracial identity theory.

Theorizing Multiracial Identity

There has been a long history of researching multiracial identity, from the problem-based approaches of the “marginal man” hypothesis (Park, 1928; Stonequist, 1937) to more recent ecological approaches in higher education (e.g. Renn, 2004a). Recent work examining the ecology of multiracial identity places students and their developmentally instigative characteristics at the center of a model, acknowledges the component of time, and highlights factors, processes, and contexts influencing multiple racial identity patterns (Renn, 2004a). The latter four in particular each inform the building of an integrative model of multiraciality for campus climate, which hypothesizes what happens in proximal processes in Renn’s (2004a) ecological identity model (Figure 1-1), but understanding campus climate as a context for development that is influenced by racism.

Identity patterns. Students acknowledging multiracial ancestry will identify along five patterns: one monoracial identity, two or more monoracial identities, a multiracial identity,
extraracial identification (opting out), or a situational identity that changes between at least two of the four other patterns (Renn, 2000, 2003, 2004a). In reviewing the research on multiracial identity both within and outside of higher education, Renn (2008) notes that these patterns were similarly found in work by other researchers (e.g. Kilson, 2001; Rockquemore & Brunsma, 2002; Root, 1990; Wallace, 2001). Renn’s (2000, 2003, 2004a) five racial identity patterns show they are normal and healthy; we specify that this is true within the post-civil rights era, and that student self-selection and/or classification into the patterns likely reflect differences in racial formation processes and racial projects pertaining to multiraciality in college contexts.

**Influential factors in multiracial identity.** The prominent factors that contribute to how mixed race college students identify are physical appearance, cultural knowledge, and the fluidity or rigidity of peer culture, particularly regarding “peer-supported ability” of students to move between various social identity groups on campus (Renn, 2008, p.19). Additional factors influencing multiracial identity include racial ancestry, early socialization, political awareness and orientation, spirituality, other social identities, and the social and historical context (Wijeyesinghe, 2001). Focusing on the first of the three prominent factors in addition to racial ancestry, if a student’s physical appearance is congruent with the underlying conception of what a person from a specific monoracially-constructed group should look like (Omi & Winant, 1994), they may be more likely to associate with the group, and that group may be more likely to grant them in-group status (Tajfel, 1981; see also Morning, 2003). Physical appearance in this sense is “cognitively economical” (Wimmer, 2008, p. 979). Similarly, if a student’s cultural knowledge fits with the cultural knowledge of a specific monoracially-constructed group, they may also gain access to that group membership at that place and time. More recently, research has also demonstrated that socioeconomic status may play into a student’s cultural knowledge.
and representation (Khanna, 2010). The notion of a rigid or fluid peer culture (Renn, 2000; Renn & Arnold, 2003) is perhaps the most intriguing factor influencing multiracial identity patterns. If a peer culture is rigid, there may be stricter expectations as to what it means to be racially classified as a valid member of a specific monoracially-constructed group. In a more fluid peer culture, monoracial-conforming expectations may be relaxed, allowing students to move between and within monoracially-constructed communities with more ease (Renn, 2008). Renn (2004a) suggests that students will identify situationally where there is a more fluid peer culture, which implies that the fluidity of a peer culture may be telling of a campus’ racial climate. In sum, physical appearance and cultural knowledge including socioeconomic status may conform to monoracial expectations to various extents; differing fluidity of peer cultures may render some
racial identities more or less available to different students, which may be indicative of a climate for multiraciality.

**Processes.** Renn’s (2003, 2004a) ecological model of multiracial identity also describes proximal processes that influence multiracial identity development. The proximal processes are ongoing, progressively complex, reciprocal between the person and environment, involve influential persons, objects, and symbols, and occur in contexts containing the person (Bronfenbrenner, 1995; Renn, 2004a). However, the proximal processes as they pertain to multiraciality are not explicitly outlined, which we aim to do by drawing upon multiple theories and frameworks, and are a major contribution of our work.

**Context.** Lastly, processes occur within multiple interrelated contexts in micro-, meso-, exo-, and macro-systems that inform the relative importance of various influences on identity development (Renn, 2004a). “Three important ones are the *degree to which settings are diverse, the degree to which settings are congruent, and the existence of ecological niches that favor different developmentally instigative characteristics*” (p. 43). While a strength of the ecological model is that it does not divide contexts into the typical curricular/co-curricular dichotomy (Renn, 2004a), it does not overtly consider how racism and the campus climate for diversity permeate each of the more proximal contexts. In fact, Renn (2004a) states that studying the climate for multiracial college students in an important and next step for research.

**Campus Climate for Diversity**

The campus climate for diversity is a conceptual framework that allows educators to assess several dimensions of college campuses as they pertain to race in order to improve educational environments (Hurtado et al., 1998, 1999, 2008; Hurtado, Alvarez et al., 2012; Milem et al., 2005). It originally developed as the campus racial climate but has since
incorporated multiple social identities, and has been broadened as the MMDLE to account for multiple contexts of compositionally diverse learning environments (Figure 1-2; Hurtado, Alvarez et al., 2012). The MMDLE is distinct in that it places student identity at the center, is focused on multiple identities including multiracial identities, faculty and staff identities, and acknowledges multiracial research. Campus climate dimensions include an institution’s historical legacy of inclusion and exclusion, compositional diversity, psychological attitudes and values, behavioral interactions (Hurtado et al., 1998, 1999), and organizational structures that embed privilege for some groups and oppress others through institutional processes (Milem et al., 2005). The historical, compositional, and organizational dimensions reflect institution-level aspects of the climate, whereas the psychological and behavioral dimensions comprise individual-level aspects (Hurtado, Alvarez et al., 2012). We understand all five dimensions as permeating contexts that inform proximal processes in multiracial identity development (e.g. Renn, 2004a). Externally, the climate framework situates the college environment within contemporary socio-historical and policy contexts (Hurtado et al., 1998,1999). These are similar to Renn’s (2004a) exo- and macro- systems, which we also specify including racial formation (Omi & Winant, 1994), traditional racism, and monoracism (Johnston & Nadal, 2010). More recently, climate models have also incorporated the local community context, as well as internal curricular and co-curricular contexts, much like Renn’s micro- and meso- systems, which are all conceptualized to inform the campus climate as well as equity and diversity outcomes along additional multiple social identities (Hurtado, Alvarez et al., 2012). We understand hostile climates to be the fruits (or thorns) of racisms and their intersections with other systems of oppression (e.g. sexism, heterosexism, etc.).
The campus climate for diversity is an important aspect of higher education to continually improve, as research shows it influences cognitive and socio-cognitive outcomes, such as values, attitudes, and competencies for citizenship in a multicultural world (Hurtado et al., 2008; Hurtado, Ruiz et al., 2012), adjustments to college (A. Cabrera et al., 1999; Hurtado et al., 1998, 1999, 2007), retention (Rhee, 2008), and degree completion (Museus et al., 2008).

Figure 1-2. Multicontextual Model for Diverse Learning Environments

The extant research on campus climate for racial diversity has focused almost exclusively on monoracially-constructed groups, although the MMDLE acknowledges multiraciality and does not stipulate that the climate is particular to any one group. Some research related to the racial climate shows that multiracially-identifying college students express not feeling accepted by their monoracially-identifying peers (Renn, 2004a), report experiencing more prejudice.
compared to their black and white peers (Brackett et al., 2006), and indicate the lowest perceptions of institutional supportiveness and the second lowest levels of supportive relationships on campus (Laird & Niskodé-Dossett, 2010). One study examines the campus racial climate for fourteen multiracial college students, who describe multiracial microaggressions across all dimensions of the campus climate, illustrating interpersonal, institutional, and societal aspects of monoracism (Guillermo-Wann, 2010). Participants also report experiences of traditional racisms, and white privilege for some, although this was not a major focus of the paper. Research suggests that traditional racisms and monoracism intersect in the lives of multiracial students across multiple dimensions of the campus climate. However, campus racial climate research would benefit from more explicit uses of racial theory (see also N. Cabrera, 2011; S. Harper, 2012), whether examining monoracially- or multiracially-identifying students because it could then identify and address the root causes of negative climates and unequal outcomes where they persist. Therefore, the integrative model we propose draws upon an understanding of multiple racisms and elements of racial formation theory, critical race theory, and multiracial identity theory to better understand multiraciality in the campus climate.

**Toward an Integrative Model of Multiraciality**

In light of the theoretical void connecting multiraciality, race, racism, and campus climate in higher education research, the aim of developing an Integrative Model of Multiraciality (IMM) for campus climate is to help scholars and practitioners constructively address issues of race and racism as they pertain to multiraciality in college contexts. The primary focus and contribution of the IMM is to show that traditional racisms targeting monoracially-constructed groups and monoracism intersect in the campus racial climate, and to
propose proximal climate processes that can be followed in order to appropriately assess and improve campus racial climates for multiraciality. Specifically, we hypothesize how racial formation, traditional racism, and monoracism inform proximal climate processes leading to students’ quality of experience that involves components of multiracial identity theory, interest convergence, racial classification, and subsequent racializations, with multi- and mono-racial microaggressions and racial privilege for some. The model is broad enough to allow for different components to work differently based on one’s racial ancestry and interpretations of the legacy of how so-called rules of hypodescent (e.g., the “one-drop” rule) work differently for different groups. Although not the primary focus here, the IMM also acknowledges that the campus climate for multiraciality influences various student outcomes, much like previous climate research (Hurtado, Alvarez et al., 2012). Intermediary and final college outcomes in turn influence the college context and societal process of racial formation, and thus challenge or maintain systems of racism including monoracism; the time elapsed in these cyclical relationships naturally vary, so although it depicts processes, it is helpful to also maintain an ecological mindset in conceptualizing the effects of the process on students’ contexts. Using the IMM, scholars may zoom in on any particular aspect (e.g. climate), while maintaining an understanding of the interrelatedness of monoracism and traditional racisms in the campus climate in relation to a host of educational outcomes. In this way, the IMM calls scholars and educators to remain mindful of traditional racisms targeting monoracially-constructed groups when examining and addressing monoracism and multiraciality.

We walk the reader through the IMM (Figure 1-3) in two steps in order to draw upon the literature reviewed earlier and integrate different aspects of the theories and frameworks. First, we explain the lower and middle portions of the figure, which cover the concepts of societal
contexts, systems of racism, and campus climate. Second, we describe the upper and far right portions of the figure, which detail processes leading to students’ quality of experience in college and of the climate more specifically, and acknowledges climate effects on outcomes.

**Societal Contexts, Systems of Racism, and Campus Climate**

An institution’s socio-historical, policy, (Hurtado et al., 1998, 1999; Milem et al., 2005), and local community contexts influence the campus racial climate (Hurtado, Alvarez et al., 2012), and are indicated by the light grey background in the IMM (Figure 1-3). Renn’s (2004a) ecological model of multiracial identity accounts for these external contexts as aspects of more distal systems from the student (i.e., exo- and macro-systems), which also influence multiracial identity. For example, across time the socio-historical context could shift from the pre-civil rights era to the post-civil rights era, policies might reflect this evolution, and local community demographics might also change. The various contexts that frame campus climate and multiracial identity in college likely contribute to the social, economic, political, and cultural forces at play in racial formation throughout society and across time.

Drawing upon an institution’s external contexts, we theorize that racial formation produces traditional racisms as well as monoracism, depicted at the bottom of the figure; together, these racisms in turn influence the campus racial climate, shown by the respective arrows connecting each of the concepts. Racial formation serves to create racial groups to privilege the dominant white group and oppress groups of color (Omi & Winant, 1994). As hypothesized earlier, we also suggest racial formation has established monoracial norms in various ways throughout U.S. history that marginalize multiraciality through the co-existence of traditional racisms and monoracism, conceptualized as interrelated systems of power, privilege, and oppression (Johnston & Nadal, 2010). Together multiple racisms operate within and
manifest through the five dimensions of the climate shown in the lower grey plane. We suggest that structural or institutional racisms particularly permeate the institution-level dimensions (i.e., historical, compositional, and organizational), whereas interpersonal racisms are more evident in the individual-level dimensions (i.e., psychological and behavioral), although they are not mutually exclusive (Hurtado, Milem et al., 1998, 1999; Hurtado, Alvarez et al. 2012; Milem et al., 2005). These foundational components contextualize the main processes regarding multiraciality highlighted in the IMM.

Figure 1-3. Integrative Model of Multiraciality for Campus Climate


**Proximal Climate Processes for Multiraciality**

The campus racial climate is thus intertwined in processes we propose can be followed in order to appropriately assess and improve campus climates for multiraciality, shown next in the upper grey plane. We also suggest these may be processes important in racial identity development that occur in various contexts over time. Each of the concepts in white text is a part
of the processes determining the quality of multiracial students’ experiences in college, particularly as they pertain to the racial climate. We will explain each concept and briefly indicate its relationship to following concepts.

**Physical appearance, cultural knowledge, socioeconomic status, and racial ancestry.**

The first concept encompasses individual-level characteristics, particularly one’s physical appearance, cultural knowledge, socioeconomic status, and racial ancestry, which are important components influencing multiracial racial identity (Khanna, 2010; Korgen, 1998, 2010; Renn, 2004a; 2008; Wijeyesinghe, 2001). Also implicit within these concepts are family and pre-college socialization, which are important factors in identity salience and development (Sanders-Thompson, 1999; Wijeyesinghe, 2001). These individual-level characteristics are most clearly illustrative of a campus’ compositional diversity and likely play out differently for students of different multiracial backgrounds based on a campus’ compositional diversity. Compositional diversity is also influenced through the historical dimension in that it may be dependent upon an institutions’ history of inclusion or exclusion (Hurtado et al., 1998, 1999), and specifically how prospective multiracially-identifying students are categorized in admissions processes, if such identification options are available. Individual-level characteristics may be thought of in part as pre-college characteristics, although they may change through a students’ time in college as racial identity develops. A student’s physical appearance, cultural knowledge, socioeconomic status, and racial ancestry are thought to be important characteristics influencing racial classification (to which we will return), which is also informed by interest convergence as well as the fluidity of peer culture and group boundaries on campus.

**Interest convergence.** Interest convergence is the next concept and is a driving force identified by critical race theory that attaches dominant group intentions to subordinate group
initiatives to produce outcomes favorable to the dominant group (Bell, 1980). In the IMM, interest convergence sheds light on why white and/or monoracial interests would result in racially classifying a multiracial student in various ways, and is propelled by traditional racisms and monoracism through the climate. We suggest that interest convergence may directly and indirectly influence the ways in which the individual-level characteristics get translated into racial classification and subsequent racializations. For instance, direct influence could be at play when a predominately white institution promotes the classification of racially mixed students as “multiracial” (e.g., through providing a “multiracial” option on institutional racial demographic questions). In such scenarios, multiracially-identifying students may see the campus as a welcoming place for multiraciality, while the institution may see the classification of a multiracial group as a way to break down any “strength in numbers” advocacy strategies of monoracially-constructed communities of color on campus. Interest convergence may also indirectly influence racial classification through the fluidity of peer culture and/or group boundaries that may be less interpersonal (e.g. data systems).

**Fluidity of peer culture and group boundaries.** Fluidity of peer culture is an important factor in multiracial identity for college students (Renn, 2004; 2008). We consider it an aspect of the psychological and behavioral dimensions of the campus climate because it combines racial attitudes and perceptions (e.g. criteria for legitimate racial in-group status) with interactions across race (Hurtado et al., 1998, 1999). Compositional diversity of campus climate may also influence the fluidity of peer culture depending on the representation of monoracially- and multiracially-constructed groups on campus, as how one self-identifies in different contexts often depends on whom they are constructing their identity against (Wimmer, 2008). The fluidity of peer culture is one way in which traditional racisms and monoracism may intersect – in the
determination of the relative importance of individual-level components in racial classification, and the extent to which they serve to maintain white and/or monoracial privilege. Group boundaries may be created in the organizational dimension through racial categorization in data use and storage irrespective of the fluidity of peer culture in the behavioral and psychological dimensions. Accordingly, individual-level characteristics may become more salient in certain climates with a more rigid peer culture that reflects a strict psychological concept of what it means to be a member of a specific monoracial group, and/or inflexible organizational policies regarding racial data categorization that create group boundaries that may or may not reflect or influence peer culture.

**Racial classification.** As previously discussed, the racial classification of multiracial persons into racial categories may result in multiple different and sometimes contradictory classifications. Racial classification may also depend on the extent to which there is a critical mass of multiracial students willing to organize around multiraciality, which may influence identity options in college (Renn, 2000); this can be understood as an interaction between compositional diversity, and the psychological and behavioral dimensions. Again, interest convergence, peer culture fluidity and group boundaries influence how important individual-level characteristics are for racial classifications and subsequent racializations to occur.

**Multiracial microaggressions and quality of experience.** Racial classification can in turn lead directly to multiracial microaggressions or directly to the quality of a student’s experience of climate on campus as meaning is attached to classification (i.e. racialization). The concept of congruity is key here (Renn, 2004a). If racial classification imposed by others is *not* congruent with a multiracial students’ own racial identity, and/or is *not* congruent with monoracial constructions of race, it may lead to multiracial microaggressions—a tangible
manifestation of monoracism that targets a student based on their mixed race status (Johnston & Nadal, 2010). On the other hand, if racial classification is congruent with a students’ own racial identity, and is congruent with monoracial norms, then traditional racisms likely manifest more visibly than monoracism. In such scenarios, racial classification bypasses the production of multiracial microaggressions, and directly informs the quality of students’ experiences on campus as they would for any other monoracially-identifying student. Racial classification may thus also result in (mono) racial microaggressions and/or in white privilege (e.g. Guillermo-Wann, 2010; Nadal et al., 2011). Given the possibility of multiple different classifications, some multiracial students may experience a combination of multiracial microaggressions, (mono) racial microaggressions, monoracial privilege, and/or white privilege; such multiplicity in experience exposes how monoracism and traditional racisms can intersect within the campus racial climate. Experiences will also differ based on additional social identities, demonstrating anti-essentialism within multiraciality.

**Educational outcomes.** Finally, proximal campus climate processes resulting in students’ quality of experience lead to intermediate and final educational outcomes, including multiracial identity. Students’ experiences and perceptions of the campus racial climate have been shown to influence numerous educational outcomes in the literature (Hurtado, Alvarez et al., 2012), which we posit is likely for multiracial students as well. In turn higher education outcomes, especially racial identity as manifested by multiracial students, continually inform racial formation and other aspects of society. In this sense, the model we present creates awareness that higher education institutions, students, and the processes they engage in, in turn impact society in a variety of ways.
In sum, examinations of multiraciality in higher education must challenge the dominant discourse that establishes monoracial constructions of race as a norm, and must be grounded historically to refute rising neo-conservative and liberal racial ideologies that may misappropriate multiraciality to maintain white supremacy. To this end, we offer an integrative model for future research and practice that examines how intersections of monoracism and traditional racisms in the campus climate for diversity may marginalize and/or privilege multiracial students based on different racial classifications. Perspectives from racial formation theory and critical race theory allow us to presume that race is a critical component of lived experience, and thus interrogate social processes that oppress groups of people based on monoracial constructions of race while making explicit social justice objectives. Our aim is that through theorizing this model, scholars may honor unique and non-essentialized multiracial voices to improve the campus climate and educational outcomes for all students, given the ways traditional racisms and monoracism may manifest in higher education contexts.

**Implications for Research and Practice**

The IMM begins to address the theoretical void for multiraciality in higher education scholarship by linking race, racism, and multiraciality in the campus climate for diversity as a context for development and learning, and depicting processes that can be examined to assess and address the climate for mixed race students. It aims to challenge the norm of monoracial constructions of race and simultaneously strengthen alliances with monoracially-constructed communities of color by integrating traditional racisms into a multiracial framework. The IMM has several implications for research and practice aimed to advance social justice education.

The IMM offers implications for three overarching areas of future research. First, higher education research on racial groups must be more intentional theoretically regarding race and
racism in investigations of campus climate and inequitable outcomes across groups (see also S. Harper, 2012). In doing so, it must consider multiraciality within monoracially-constructed groups of students as one aspect of within-group heterogeneity. This will help scholars wrestle with methodological challenges of effectively and transparently operationalizing race in quantitative and qualitative research. Researchers might problematize who is included in a sample, why, and how that might enrich and inform the study. Additionally, campus climate research in particular might benefit from the IMM by examining the influence of interest convergence in efforts to assess and improve the climate for diversity for all students, the extent to which climates are inclusive, and who benefits most. It might also examine the fluidity of peer cultures on campus to assess the inclusiveness of informal peer interactions as indicators of the behavioral dimension of campus climate. Campus climate research should also investigate structural processes that perpetuate traditional racisms and monoracism. Second, higher education scholarship on multiraciality may use the IMM to examine matters other than racial identity, such as campus climate, educational practices, and learning outcomes. Research on multiracial identity, and student development more broadly, might also benefit from conceptualizing educational contexts as contexts with a climate for diversity. Moreover, the IMM underscores the importance of locating multiraciality within its long historical trajectory that extends well into the pre-civil rights era so that multiracial scholarship might help curb anxiety around multiraciality, rather than unintentionally contribute to it. Third, research outside of higher education might also test the IMM’s proximal processes in other contexts for multiracial and other groups, and examine racial formation in larger societal contexts. Moving forward with the IMM’s implications for these three principal areas of research will help align multiracial scholarship with broader social justice aims.
The IMM also proposes four main implications for changing higher education practice in fundamental ways. First, campuses are struggling to define diversity, with legal impetus to do so more broadly (College Board, 2011), but discussions on campus regarding multiraciality are still lacking. The IMM draws attention to how multiraciality has been part of U.S. history and racial formation for a long time, and how monoracism works to maintain monoracial norms that marginalize, obscure, and misuse multiraciality. As institutions define diversity more broadly, integrating multiraciality in a critical way might help campuses expose these norms and move towards greater inclusivity. Second, by integrating the five dimensions of campus climate, the IMM suggests that where campuses begin to educate around multiraciality will differ based on their unique histories, compositional diversity, curriculum, services, organizational cultures, and where interested parties may be located within campus structures. This allows for decentralized approaches to improve campus climate in niches that initially may be more responsive (e.g. staff development), although this does not underscore the importance of presidential leadership in deep organizational change (Kezar, 2007). Third, the IMM draws attention to the importance of how educators talk about racial oppression when colorblindness, race-neutrality, and monoracial constructions of race are the norm. The racial language deployed in practice and policy can be evaluated for the extent to which it reinforces colorblind and monoracial norms. Accordingly, the IMM supports allowing students to self-identify racially. This might also play out in how student affairs practitioners engage monoracially-based student organizations regarding fluidity of peer culture, even if policy requires all groups be open to all students, to reflect upon how welcoming they might be to multiracially-identifying students in practice. Fourth, institutional policy for how racial data is collected, both in admissions and human resources, might be evaluated as aspects of the organizational dimension of campus climate that have significant
impact on racial classification of students and personnel. The U.S. Department of Education’s new reporting of student racial demographics creates a separate group for students who mark two or more races, although some flexibility remains in how data is collected (DOE, 2007). Accordingly, educators can examine how campus data systems are structured to allow for multiple race identification, and subsequently how student organizations, services, and even institutional research utilize that data to identify student populations for various purposes. As practice integrates multiraciality into definitions of diversity, the curriculum and co-curriculum, language around race and racism, and campus data systems as four immediate areas to apply the IMM, it may become more effective in advancing social justice in and through higher education.

Conclusion

In closing, the Integrative Model of Multiraciality (IMM) for campus climate may help improve multiple areas of research and higher education practice in ways that can better align multiracially- and monoracially-framed initiatives toward collective social justice goals in higher education. We have reviewed limitations in the current literature and offer a model that accounts for campus climate as context for student development and learning, and depicts proximal processes of racial classification and racialization in such contexts that influence educational outcomes. In doing so, we explicitly link monoracism targeting multiraciality and traditional racisms targeting monoracially-constructed groups to the campus climate for diversity as a way of exposing racism’s pervasiveness in educational environments, and to re-orient multiracial scholarship to a larger vision of challenging all racial injustice. The IMM is thereby designed to aid research and practice to critically address multiraciality, refute neo-conservative and liberal racial claims of a declining significance of race, and develop alliances with traditional
communities of color to help move American higher education toward creating a more just and equitable society.
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CHAPTER III

HOW YOU COUNT MATTERS: USING MULTIRACIAL STUDENT DATA TO EXAMINE DISCRIMINATION AND BIAS IN COLLEGE

Introduction

Although many Americans may long for a society free of racism in the post-civil rights era, the public must not assume race has become insignificant without critically examining multiraciality, and multiple-race data use in particular within historical and current contexts (Omi, 2001). Recently, liberals have used the American Multiracial Identity Movement, focused on Census 2000 data collection reform (R. Spencer, 2010), to support an ahistorical view of race and racism - that the United States is becoming a “post-racial” society. At the same time, civil rights groups have also viewed the multiracial movement as a threat to such monitoring and enforcement by potentially reducing the numbers of people counted in singular racial categories of color (Morning, 2005; Thornton, 2009). Neo-conservative constituents question why racial data should be collected at all (e.g. California’s 2003 “Racial Privacy Initiative”; Pollock, 2004), advocating a colorblind initiative that would render impossible any monitoring of racial inequity (Omi, 2001). Now that the federal government collects multiple-race data, generational trends in the Census reveal that larger proportions of younger Americans are indicating multiple racial backgrounds (Lopez, 2003). Overall, the Census 2000 allowed people to mark more than one racial category for the first time; 2.4 percent of the population did so in 2000 (Lopez, 2003), and 2.9 percent in 2010 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010). The generational increase is likely to be reflected in the college-going population (Renn, 2009). However, whether or not the trend reflects actual increases in offspring of interracial unions, or simply a growth in acknowledging mixed racial ancestry from recent generations or from the pre-civil rights era remains unclear.
Regardless, the political intersection of civil rights interests in multiple-race data collection and reporting with generationally increasing multiple-race identification raises questions about how to critically utilize multiracial data in college populations when examining discrimination.

Many discriminatory racial incidents continue to be reported in the media and more campuses are responding by initiating climate studies (e.g. the University of California). Research shows that student experiences and perceptions of the climate for diversity are linked to numerous educational outcomes including cognitive and socio-cognitive outcomes, values and attitudes, competencies for citizenship in a diverse democracy, transitions and adjustments to college for underrepresented students, retention, and degree completion (Hurtado, Alvarez, Guillermo-Wann, Cuellar, & Arellano, 2012). However, only one known study to date explicitly examines the campus climate for college students acknowledging mixed racial ancestry (Guillermo-Wann, 2010), while foundational multiracial research importantly explores mixed race “experiences” or identity (e.g. Renn, 2004). In addition, most climate-related studies including multiracial data are either qualitative (e.g. Nishimura, 1998; Sands & Schuh, 2004), or aggregate quantitative multiracial data into a single category for analysis (e.g. Brackett, et al., 2006; Laird & Niskodé-Dossett, 2010). The aggregation of all multiple-race data reflects the U.S. Department of Education’s racial data reporting policy (DOE, 2007), despite concerns raised by educational researchers that multiracial aggregation is highly problematic for civil rights monitoring, among other matters (Lee & Orfield, 2006; Renn & Lunceford, 2004).

Research has also illustrated that the presentation of racial group demographics changes based on how multiracial data is counted, as does the relative strength in relationship of independent variables to an outcome measuring smooth academic transition to college at predominantly white institutions (Inkelas, Soldner, & Szelényi, 2009). Therefore, the purpose of this study is to
examine how different racial classifications of multiple-race data change the picture of racial
discrimination and bias as a measure of campus climate; and more importantly, how the
predictive power of factors that influence the climate changes depending how you count
multiracially-identifying students in more compositionally diverse environments.

Now that institutions can identify students who indicate multiple racial backgrounds, it is
important to use the data to deepen an understanding of their experiences to then build inclusive
 campus communities where ethnic/racial group representation is increasing. Using different
approaches to classify multiracially-identifying students will help educators understand within-
group differences as well as differences between their monoracially-identifying peers in
experiencing discrimination and bias. This in turn can inform research, policy, and practice, to
improve the campus climate for all college students. In addition, the focus on experiencing
discrimination in this study helps establish evidence of the more tangible interpersonal
manifestations of oppression, while important studies of racial group inequities in outcomes (e.g.
incarceration rates, education, health, etc.) reveal the more insidious systemic aspects of racism,
which colorblind perspectives often dismiss as non-racial matters (Bonilla-Silva, 2010).

Using the understanding of race as a social construction as a guide (Omi & Winant,
1994), *multiracial* in this study means referencing, pertaining to, or ascribing a combination of
two or more monoracially-constructed groups, “understood in [one’s] day as … distinct races
regardless of whether this intermixture stemmed from their parents’ generation or farther back”
(Morning, 2005, p. 42). This clarification is crucial because most racial groups in the U.S.
actually have mixed racial ancestry from centuries past, particularly black, Latina/o, Native
American, and white groups (Daniel, 2001; Davis, 1991; Feagin, 2006; Gomez, 2007; Morning,
2000, 2005; Nadal, 2009; Smith, 1999). Therefore, terms like *multiracially-identifying* and
monoracially-constructed are used to avoid reifying race in an essentialist sense. That is, groups are often ascribed race as a matter of categorization and are racialized as a matter of stereotype (Dovidio, Evans, & Tyler, 1986). This study attempts to interrogate the racial categories ascribed, and how different racial classifications of multiple-race data may alter representations of racial groups on college campuses.

**Campus Climate for Diversity**

Higher education research has been a site of investigating issues of race, discrimination, diversity, and equity for several decades. Much of the research examines the campus climate for diversity, which includes an institutions’ history of inclusion or exclusion, the compositional diversity of students, faculty, and staff, individual and group psychological attitudes and values around diversity, informal and formal behavioral interactions including pedagogy (Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pederson, & Allen, 1998, 1999), and organizational structures, policies, and practices that embed privilege and oppression for different racial groups (Milem, Chang, & Antonio, 2005). The climate framework situates the college environment within socio-historical and policy contexts (Hurtado et al., 1998, 1999), and the interactive dynamics between the five dimensions and the broader contexts is essential to understanding the complexity of student experiences and outcomes across multiple social identities (Hurtado, Alvarez et al., 2012).

Despite the expansion of campus climate research, gaps still remain to be filled. For example, researching the behavioral dimension as an outcome often focuses on frequency of cross-racial interactions (e.g. Chang, Astin, & Kim, 2004) or positive quality (e.g. Mayhew, Grunwald, & Dey, 2005; Sáenz, Ngai, & Hurtado, 2007), but the meaning of cross-racial interaction becomes difficult to interpret with multiple-race data (C. Harper, 2007) and is therefore a less useful construct when examining campus climate for multiracial students.
Additionally, longitudinal and multi-campus research has rarely examined hostile interactions of the behavioral dimension as an outcome because climate questions were not included on national surveys before the early 1990s, and very few early climate studies were able to disaggregate multiple racial groups (for a synthesis, see Hurtado et al., 1998, 1999). Now that a new climate instrument is nationally available, and given that few recent studies examine a hostile campus climate as an outcome across multiple groups in compositionally diverse environments, this study focuses on discrimination and bias as a measure of the hostile quality of the behavioral dimension across racial groupings to begin to fill some of these gaps.

In the one known multiracial climate study to date, all fourteen interview participants detail *multiracial microaggressions* across multiple dimension of the climate (Guillermo-Wann, 2010). Multiracial microaggressions are “daily verbal, behavioral, or environmental indignities…[that] involve individuals’ mixed-heritage status and are experienced by multiracial persons of any racial makeup or phenotype” (Johnston & Nadal, 2010, p. 126). These microaggressions are visible manifestations of *monoracism*, “a social system of psychological inequality where individuals who do not fit monoracial categories may be oppressed on systemic and interpersonal levels because of underlying assumptions and beliefs in singular, discrete racial categories” (p. 125). Multiracial microaggressions include exclusion or isolation, exoticization and objectification, assumption of monoracial or mistaken identity, denial of multiracial reality and experiences, and pathologizing of identity or experiences (Johnston & Nadal, 2010). In the climate study (Guillermo-Wann, 2010), multiracial micoraggressions span interactions with peers and faculty, marginalizing pedagogy and curriculum, and frustration with how campus systems maintain singular monoracial designations, among others; it will be important to explore the relationship of practices intended to develop more inclusive environments with these
students’ experiences of discrimination. Many microaggressions exhibit a more subtle nature like the measure of discrimination and bias in the current study, although others are quite blatant.

In a rare example, Hurtado (1994) examines an aspect of the behavioral dimension of the climate by modeling experiences of discrimination for high achieving Latina/o college students. Several items contribute to the explained variance in the dependent measure. The compositional diversity of the campus is important, as having a higher Latina/o population on campus is indicative of experiencing less discrimination, although it is more prevalent at larger institutions. Psychological measures also play a role, including attitudes and values such as having the goal of helping to promote racial understanding and acknowledging that inequalities in society are systemic. As for student behaviors, discussing racial issues is positively related to experiencing discrimination, whereas students who prefer to date non-Hispanic white peers indicate less discrimination. Interestingly, student-centered and inclusive environments also prove significant in Latina/o students’ experiences of the racial climate. Perceptions that faculty do not care about students or the institution, that administration is not open or inclusive, and that most students know little about their culture also predict of higher levels of discrimination. Other aspects of the general climate, such as the extent to which faculty are caring and administration seems open, contribute to lower feelings of hostility in the racial climate (see also Hurtado, Alvarez et al., 2012). Similarly, a relationship between the general climate and the climate for diversity is suggested by studies of multiracial college student experiences around race.

**Multiracial College Student Experiences and Race**

Although most studies of multiracial experiences do not use campus climate frameworks, their findings could be considered illustrative of the behavioral and psychological dimensions of campus climate. Some studies focus on multiracially-identifying students, while others
tangentially include them as an aggregate category for racial group analysis. Literature documents these students’ experiences of prejudice (Brackett, et al., 2006), identity salience and discrimination (Hurtado, Ruiz, & Guillermo-Wann, 2012), low peer, faculty, and institutional support (Laird & Niskodé-Dossett, 2010), and challenges in social integration in informal interactions (Sands & Schuh, 2004). Such findings may have implications for mixed race students’ psychological sense of belonging (Johnson, et al., 2007; King, 2008; Nishimura, 1998; Renn, 2000, 2003, 2004), which can influence considerations of actually leaving an institution (Sands & Schuh, 2004). Extant research challenges assumptions that multiracial persons are better adapted to predominantly white campuses and may not experience discrimination.

Three quantitative studies show that, when analyzed as an aggregate group, multiracially-identifying college students (i.e. marked two or more races) indicate higher levels of prejudice or discrimination than some or all of their monoracially-identifying peer groups (i.e. marked only one race) (Brackett et al., 2006; Hurtado, Ruiz et al., 2012), and lower levels of institutional support and supportive relationships with faculty and peers (Laird & Niskodé-Dossett, 2010). First, in a single-institution study in the south, biracial black/white students report more experience with prejudice in interactions on campus in general, and with peers and faculty specifically, compared to their monoracially-identifying black and white peers (Brackett et al., 2006). Second, in a fourteen-institution study of racial identity salience, multiracially-identifying students thought about their race less often than all other groups of students of color and more than white students, but experienced higher levels of discrimination and bias than Latina/o and white students (Hurtado, Ruiz et al., 2012). This is interesting given that racial centrality, the dimension of salience measured by Hurtado, Ruiz et al. (2012), was predictive of perceived racial discrimination in a study of African American college students (Sellers &
Shelton, 2003). One would therefore expect to find lower levels of experiencing discrimination for multiracially-identifying students given their lower identity centrality, however this was not the case (Hurtado, Ruiz et al., 2012). Third, in a national study of first-year college students and seniors, multiracial first-years and seniors with the lowest levels of interaction across difference also report the lowest perceptions of institutional support of all racial groups (Laird & Niskodé-Dossett, 2010). Unfortunately, the gains for first-year multiracial students who have a high level of interaction across difference still result in the second lowest levels of institutional support, slightly above Asian Americans. In addition, multiracial and African American students who specify lower levels of interaction across difference indicate the least supportive relationships with peers and educators, in which being multiracial is the strongest predictor for seniors, followed by interactions across difference. When analyzed as an aggregate group, multiracially-identifying students indicate high levels of prejudice and discrimination, and low levels of perceived peer, faculty, and institutional support.

In sum, key factors related to a negative behavioral dimension of the campus climate include one’s indicated racial group, compositional diversity, attitudes regarding diversity and equity, racial centrality of identity salience, relationships with peers and educators, and interactions across different social identity groups (Brackett et al., 2006; Hurtado, 1994; Hurtado, Ruiz et al., 2012; Laird & Niskodé-Dossett, 2010; Sellers & Shelton, 2003). Contrary to liberal racial assumptions, aggregating multiracially-identifying college students provides evidence that multiracial students as a group experience a poor campus climate (Brackett et al., 2006; Laird & Niskodé-Dossett, 2010; Hurtado, Ruiz et al., 2012); however, these studies only operationalize race in one way. Additional research examines methods in which collecting and reporting multiple-race data may change results for all groups.
Racial and Ethnic Categories in Data Collection and Reporting

The U.S. Bureau of the Census has been collecting data on race since the 18th century (Renn & Lunceford, 2004), and higher education data collection has generally followed their lead (Renn, 2009); however, racial data collection practices vary from reporting (Inkelas et al., 2009), and concern Latina/o data in particular. Racial data collection categories have transformed over time (Renn & Lunceford, 2004); significant changes in the U.S. Census occurred in the civil rights era, and in 1977 when the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) issued Directive 15 establishing four federally recognized racial categories and the option to ask “Hispanic” heritage as a separate yes/no question or as a fifth racial category. In 1997, the OMB created five racial categories with “Hispanic or Latino” heritage as a sixth racial category or as ethnicity in the two-part question, and allowed for persons to indicate more than one racial category. Despite educational researchers’ advocacy that higher education collect Hispanic/Latino data as an equal sixth category under OMB’s option to do so (Renn & Lunceford, 2004), in 2007, the U.S. Department of Education (DOE) institutionalized the two-part Hispanic/Latino ethnicity question (DOE, 2007). Complicating matters, how multiracial individuals indicate their racial and ethnic backgrounds vary based on the options provided (Johnson et al., 1997). The national survey used for this study collects Latina/o data as one of several racial categories.

Operationalizing (Mixed) Race in Educational Research

Educational research utilizes six primary ways of reporting, or classifying, quantitative multiple-race data, four of which are methodologically sound for this study. They are the OMB multiracial disaggregation, DOE/IPEDS multiracial aggregation, least prevalent monoracial categorization, and racial group status. Two additional approaches are not fit for this analysis -
fractional assignment and multiple group assignment. This study is an improvement to Inkelas et al. (2009) by including the racial group status approach, using data from compositionally diverse institutions in which multiple-race data comprises nearly one fifth of the sample, and focusing on the outcome measure that has implications for improving campus climate. This section describes the four viable approaches to operationalizing race with multiracial data for the present study and evaluates select empirical applications.

**OMB approach: multiracial disaggregation (MD).** The OMB reports at minimum the five categories established in 1997, which are American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, black or African American, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, and white; Hispanic/Latino is an optional group that trumps other categories when reported (Lopez, 2003; Renn & Lunceford, 2004). The OMB additionally reports black/white, American Indian /white, Asian/white, black/American Indian, and any combination that comprises one percent or more of the population, with a total of sixty-three possible combinations (Inkelas et al., 2009; Lopez, 2003; Renn & Lunceford, 2004).

Inkelas et al. (2009) examine how operationalizing race in multiple-race data changes regression coefficients predicting a smooth academic transition at a predominantly white institution. They use survey data from the 2007 National Study of Living-Learning Programs (NSLLP), which collects data for Latina/os as one of six racial categories. Only two percent of the sample marked multiple racial categories. For monoracially-grouped students, multiracial disaggregation seemingly produces similar results to categorizing multiracial students in the least prevalent racial category compared to the combination groups (e.g. black/white); however, statistical testing to verify significance would have violated key assumptions, making that level
of verification untrustworthy. Even so, multiracial disaggregation is viable for the current study, despite that DOE racial data reporting requirements differ.

**DOE/IPEDS approach: multiracial aggregation (MA).** The second approach follows the DOE protocol, which includes the five OMB racial groups, a sixth Hispanic group, and all students who indicate two or more groups, excluding Latina/os, as a seventh aggregate group (DOE, 2007; Inkelas et al., 2009; Lee & Orfield, 2006; Lopez, 2003). Higher education’s Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) follows the DOE reporting guidelines (Renn, 2009; Renn & Lunceford, 2004).

Three known studies examine multiracial aggregation using the DOE/IPEDS approach. Using K-12 and Census data respectively, Lee and Orfield (2006) and Lopez (2003) find that racial group numbers change based on racial classification, region, and whether or not Latina/os are classified into an aggregate multiracial group under the two-part data collection question. Lee and Orfield also find that achievement test scores for monoracially-classified groups in the 4th and 8th grades appear to improve or fall simply by changing who is counted, which is expected of the outcome in the present study. In regression analyses, the multiracial aggregation approach also produces some similar results for multiracial students as the disaggregated combination groups (Inkelas et al., 2009). As the current policy governing higher education racial data reporting, this study compares multiracial aggregation with other approaches.

**Least prevalent monoracial category (LPMC).** The third approach assigns students who mark multiple racial categories to the group that is least prevalent in the data, which in a small sample, produces similar regression results for monoracial categories as multiracial disaggregation and aggregation (Inkelas et al., 2009). An advantage is that it increases the numbers for small groups of color, however it changes monoracially-classified group
characteristics and disregards multiraciality (Inkelas et al., 2009). It is an approach that is often used to count every black or Native American student regardless of multiple identifiers, for example, because their numbers are so low on some campuses. While this approach may be well meaning, some combinations of multiracial students may be more advantaged than those monoracially-constructed groups, which have an embedded assumption of the “one drop rule” in the nation’s exclusionary racial history. I further detail the assumptions underlying each of the approaches in explaining the theoretical model that guides the study.

**Racial group status (RGS).** Because racial groups experience varying levels of dis/advantage and different ascriptions to their social identity, the last approach classifies students with a dominant white or Asian American identity as high social status groups, those with a primarily black or Latina/o identity as low status, and those who identify with multiple groups, as part x/part y, or as multiracial, as having multiracial status (Binning, Unzueta, Huo, & Molina, 2009). However, this poses two major problems. First, Binning et al. (2009) note that combining Asian American and white students may perpetuate the model minority myth, despite a plethora of research countering the myth (Chang, Park, Lin, Poon, & Nakanishi, 2007). Second, students who identify with multiple racial groups are aggregated with those who identify primarily as multiracial, which are distinct identity patterns (Renn, 2004). Despite these problems, Binning et al. (2009) find that the multiracial status group reports equal or higher outcome levels of well-being and social engagement than multiracial students who identify primarily with only one racial group, regardless of its status. Interestingly, outcomes for the high and low racial status groups do not differ significantly, as would have been expected by the theory. Perhaps operationalizing race from a racial group status perspective may be more
insightful in exploring differences within a multiracial population, which the present study examines.

In sum, educational researchers prefer the OMB multiracial disaggregation collecting and reporting options to the DOE/IPEDS aggregation practices, and caution that having the Latina/o category trump all other categories in reporting is a problematic practice (Lee & Orfield, 2007; Lopez, 2003; Renn & Lunceford, 2004; Renn, 2009). Regardless of how data are collected, preserving multiple-race data may be the best compromise to allow it to be used in different ways for different purposes, acknowledging the limitations of each approach (Inkelas et al., 2009; Renn, 2009). Together, these studies demonstrate that race is a malleable social construct, highlighted here by how researchers classify multiracial data in operationalizing race, but that it has real consequences in students’ lived experiences as seen in outcome measures. In short, research suggests that how you count multiracially-identifying students matters.

**Applying the Integrative Model of Multiraciality**

This study uses the Integrative Model of Multiraciality (IMM) for campus climate to interpret different operationalizations of race for understanding the quality of students’ climate experience (Guillermo-Wann & Johnston, Chapter II). The IMM links racial formation theory, theories of multiple racisms, and monoracism to climate processes in assessing multiracial college students’ quality of climate experience. To do so, it also draws upon aspects of multiracial identity development theory (e.g. Renn, 2004) and critical race theory (e.g. Bell, 1980). This study tests part of the IMM regarding how indicated racial ancestry directly informs racial classification, which is hypothesized to paint different pictures of climate (Guillermo-Wann & Johnston, Chapter II). It also offers theoretical implications of the classification approaches, discussed in this section first for monoracial groups (e.g. black), then for multiracial
groups (e.g. black/Arab American). Although utilizing any racial classification scheme may essentialize students’ experiences of the campus climate, focusing on how different approaches reveal within and between group differences affirms the social construction of race while illustrating how discrimination plays out in actual lived experience for all students.

**The IMM’s Theoretical Implications for Monoracially-Constructed Groups**

The IMM offers theoretical interpretations for each of the four racial classification approaches for monoracially-constructed groups. First, when Latina/o data is collected as one of several racial groups as in this study, rather than in the two-part ethnicity question, multiracial disaggregation and aggregation look identical for all of the monoracially-constructed groups, and share many implications. Both may reflect interest convergence (Bell, 1980), in which white parents want their biracial children to be able to be categorized as something other than of Color, particularly not as black (J. Spencer, 1997); however, multiracial aggregation does so in the exact way feared by civil-rights groups (Lee & Orfield, 2006; Renn, 2009). Both approaches may also reflect interest convergence with monoracial group interests that may not want to “dilute” a sample to maintain strict group boundaries, thus excluding multiracial data - a multiracial microaggression (Johnston & Nadal, 2010). Both also reduce monoracial group numbers, resulting in a loss of statistical power in small samples (Inkelas et al., 2009). Second, the least prevalent monoracial category approach can bolster sample sizes, but in doing so, may suggest interest convergence with monoracial interests if groups “need” them for their purposes, or may inclusively reflect less rigid group boundaries (Guillermo-Wann & Johnston, Chapter II). Third, racial group status can test traditional racism that privileges whiteness amongst racial groups (Bonilla-Silva, 2010), but if groups are not combined (e.g. Binning et al., 2009), results will look the same as multiracial disaggregation and multiracial aggregation.
The IMM’s Theoretical Implications for Multiracially-Constructed Groups

The IMM also informs propositions for creating multiracial groups within each racial classification approach. First, multiracial disaggregation and aggregation maintain a false purity of racial groups (Guillermo-Wann & Johnston, Chapter II), and assume all mixed race students are not legitimate members of their respective racial groups (Johnston & Nadal, 2010). Multiracial disaggregation, in a sense, transforms each of the combination groups into another racial group, minimally challenging monoracial constructions of race (Guillermo-Wann & Johnston, Chapter II). Beneficially, it reflects students’ preferred racial identification (if not identity), reveals results for combination groups providing insight into their unique experiences, and delivers the greatest level of clarity in research (Inkelas et al., 2009). Multiracial aggregation, on the other hand, glosses over complexities amongst students marking two or more races (Inkelas et al., 2009). However, at times, a multiracial category may be useful for examining manifestations of monoracism (Johnston & Nadal, 2010), and may be informative in conjunction with approaches that examine heterogeneity within multiraciality. Second, the least prevalent monoracial category approach also masks differences in characteristics within each group (Inkelas et al., 2009), and maintains monoracial norms. Third, a multiracial group status approach in which double minority and minority/white groups are compared can test relative white privilege within multiraciality, however, this severely overlooks the racial group status of students’ minority background(s), so it may be more beneficial to compare with the multiracial disaggregation combinations.

Overall, no classification approach offers a clear theoretical advantage; rather their use depends upon the aims of a study. As the IMM suggests, the incorporation of monoracially-identifying students and consideration of traditional racisms in this study demonstrates a
commitment to social justice for both multiracially- and monoracially-identifying students (Guillermo-Wann & Johnston, Chapter II) by examining a broader range of experiences.

**Methodology**

This study examines undergraduates’ experiences of discrimination and bias in the campus climate, focusing on how classifying multiple-race data in different ways alters representations of all racial groups. The guiding questions are: In college student data accounting for multiple racial backgrounds, how do different racial classification approaches change 1) sample sizes, and 2) mean differences in discrimination and bias between racial groups? 3) What key factors may be related to discrimination and bias across all racial groups and classification approaches, and which may be unique? 4) Does the predictive power of common explanatory variables for discrimination and bias change between racial groups under different classification approaches? If so, how?

**Data Source and Sample**

The data come from the Diverse Learning Environments (DLE) survey 2009-2010 pilot administration conducted by the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) at the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA). Three community colleges, six public four-year, and five private four-year institutions participated, with students in their first through senior years and a small proportion of students indicating other statuses. The final sample size was 4,984, with 912 (18.3 percent) students marking two or more racial backgrounds (see Table 2-1 for racial group proportions based on the approaches). Racial data collection did not strictly follow DOE or IPEDS policy, but rather included the following aggregate groups: American Indian or Alaskan Native, Arab American, Asian American or Pacific Islander (AAPI), black, Latina/o, white, and Other. About half the sample had family incomes below $50,000 per year (51.7 percent, n =
2,558), and 47.7 percent (n = 2,375) did not have a parent who had earned a bachelor’s degree. One-third of students were age 25 or older (n = 1667), with the oldest being age 81. The sample was diverse in many regards, including students at various institutional types.

**Variables**

**Dependent measure: discrimination and bias factor.** The outcome measure, Discrimination and Bias, measured the frequency of students’ experiences with more subtle forms of discrimination, and was validated for its factor structure and reliability using confirmatory factor analysis (Hurtado, Arellano, Cuellar, & Guillermo-Wann, 2010). It was created by weighting items by their loading, and rescaling the factor from 0 to 100 with a mean of 50. The items, loadings, and reliability are listed in Appendix A, and include items such as “witnessed discrimination,” and how often students have experienced different forms of discrimination at their institution. It did not specifically assess racial discrimination, but given the notion of intersectionality in oppressions (Adams et al., 2000; Delgado & Stefancic, 2001; Garner, 2011; Lorde, 1993; Omi & Winant, 1994), employed a more inclusive measure that allowed for any form of discrimination to be measured and analyzed here across racial groups.

**Independent measures.** Several independent measures of the college environment were of particular interest in relation to discrimination and bias (see Appendix A for all variables). Controls for student demographics and compositional diversity were also included, and all factors were previously validated for their structure and reliability in the same fashion as the dependent measure (Hurtado et al., 2010).

Measures of students utilizing institutional-level practices of the organizational dimension of climate warranted examination (Guillermo-Wann, 2010); they were anticipated to be associated with experiences of discrimination, likely by creating awareness of it and/or
providing support, such as taking an ethnic studies class. More generally, a *curriculum of inclusion* ($\alpha = .854$) measured the number of courses a student took that included materials and pedagogy addressing diversity, bias, privilege and oppression along any social identity (Hurtado et al., 2010). Similarly, students’ participation in campus-facilitated *co-curricular diversity activities* ($\alpha = .903$) measured involvement with programs focused on diversity issues (Hurtado et al., 2010).

Several individual-level measures of climate were also examined, along with a general climate indicator. Behaviorally, more frequent in-depth conversations outside of class on issues related to racial or ethnic diversity (Hurtado, 1994; Laird & Niskodé-Dossett, 2010), as well as *negative cross-racial interactions* ($\alpha = .769$) (Laird & Niskodé-Dossett, 2010; Sands & Schuh, 2004), were expected to be associated with greater frequencies of discrimination and bias. Psychological measures included students’ racial identity salience, which was positively correlated with discrimination and bias in Hurtado, Ruiz et al. (2012). However, a negative relationship was hypothesized for perceptions of *institutional commitment to diversity* ($\alpha = .873$) (Hurtado, 1994), as well as a general climate measure (Hurtado, 1994; Laird & Niskodé-Dossett, 2010) of students’ sense of interpersonal validation by faculty and staff (Hurtado, Cuellar, & Guillermo-Wann, 2011; Rendón, 1994). Most independent measures reflect ways educators might pro-actively improve campus climate along all social identities (Hurtado, Alvarez et al., 2012).

**Analysis**

To address the first research question, frequencies of students in each racial group followed the four racial classification approaches - multiracial aggregation (MA), multiracial disaggregation (MD), least prevalent monoracial category (LPMC), and multiracial group status
Monoracial group numbers were observed across the first three classifications. Differences within the multiracial student data were then examined between multiracial aggregation, multiracial disaggregation combination groups, and multiracial group status.

To address the second research question, one-way ANOVAs with Games-Howell post-hoc tests on the discrimination and bias factor compared mean scores between racial groups for each of the classification approaches. The Games-Howell post-hoc test accounted for differences in sample size across groups as well as unequal variances (Games & Howell, 1976; Toothaker, 1993). However, it was not possible to compare mean factor scores of different versions of each racial group to “itself” across the approaches because samples were not independent, nor were they matched pairs; doing so would have violated the statistical assumption of independence (Agresti & Finlay, 1997).

For the third and fourth research questions, forced-entry blocked linear regression was used to examine relationships between independent measures and the discrimination and bias factor across racial groups for each classification approach. To address the third research question, the significance and strength of relationship of independent variables to the outcome were examined to identify common predictors across most groups and approaches. Variables that were uniquely significant were also noted. To address the fourth question, unstandardized coefficients for shared explanatory variables were tested across racial groups within each classification approach to see if the representation of racial groups changed in relation to one another. The equation used was \( \frac{b_1 - b_2}{\sqrt{s_e^1 + s_e^2}} \) (Clogg, Petkova, & Haritou, 1995). Significance tests for unstandardized coefficients across classification approaches could not be conducted because again, doing so would have violated the assumption of independence. For both questions, ideally, hierarchical linear modeling would have accounted for the nested
structure of the data; however, having only fourteen colleges restricted the model to using only one level-two measure, and that variable (percentage of students of color) had no variability within groups at the institutional level, making regression the appropriate method.

**Limitations**

There were several limitations to this study. First, the data were cross-sectional, so analyses were correlational in nature; causal inferences could not be drawn. Second, the nature of the data collection did not capture mixed race students who only marked one racial category, so the analyses only re-classified students who indicated multiple racial backgrounds. Similarly, data did not capture if students had a preferred racial identity, such as multiracial, so differences in ways multiracial students identify was not accounted for (e.g. Binning et al., 2009; Renn, 2004). Third, sample sizes for several racial groups were too small for regression, so were excluded, with the exception of the double minority multiracial group, which had 114 cases (Table 2-1); caution should be used when interpreting those regression results. Fourth, the positioning of multiraciality within diversity practices was not collected by this or any national survey; in addition, who multiracially-identifying students consider racially different when reporting cross-racial interactions is difficult to interpret (C. Harper, 2007). Despite these limitations, the study provides a nuanced analysis of discrimination and bias across racial groups, addresses critical issues in operationalizing race and multiraciality, and informs issues for improving the campus climate for diversity for all students.

**Results**

The ways in which researchers classify multiracial data paint different pictures of racial groups’ climate experiences. Results illustrate changes in sample size, significant differences in mean frequencies of discrimination and bias for some groups, and similarities and differences
across approaches regarding regression coefficients’ relationships to the outcome. Sample size and mean differences are addressed briefly, followed by a discussion of regression results. The study demonstrates that the way researchers racially classify college students who indicate multiple racial backgrounds can modify results and their implications, but that several factors share significant relationships to discrimination and bias despite how multiracially-identifying students are classified, providing overarching guidance for improving the climate for all students.

**Changes in Sample Size**

Ensuring adequate sample sizes when comparing racial groups is a practical concern in quantitative research, and different racial classification approaches provide various levels of nuance. As expected, using the least prevalent monoracial category (LPMC) approach renders the largest groups overall, and multiracial aggregation (MA) and multiracial disaggregation (MD) schemes produce identical samples for monoracially-identifying students (Table 2-1). MA reveals that 912 students marked *two or more* racial groups. Of those, multiracial group status (MGS) shows 87.5 percent (*n* = 798) indicated both white and non-white groups, and 12.5 percent (*n* = 114) marked only categories of color. In its more detailed approach, MD displays racial combination groups similar to OMB’s approach, as well as 250 students indicating “Three or More” racial groups that were not classified into the OMB-like combinations. The approaches provide options for various research conditions and inquiries, and show how classifications can construct racial groups that differ in content and size, if not always by name; communicating how multiracial data is classified can help clarify populations in a sample in any study.

**Mean Differences in Discrimination and Bias**

Like sample size, tests for mean differences in discrimination and bias across racial groups also vary by classification approach, displayed in Table 2-2. The point in testing group
differences is to show how group levels of discrimination differ in relationship to one another based on how multiracial data is classified. Not surprisingly, Table 2-2 reveals that most monoracially-designated groups only show significant mean differences between each other when multiple-race data is included in each group using the LPMC approach. Although differences in sample size are taken into account, the fewer number of groups can result in greater sensitivity to significance levels. But interestingly, multiracial AAPI/white students, as well as both aggregate multiracial groups, show significantly higher mean levels of discrimination and bias than some monoracial groups under the MA and MD approaches. In fact, monoracially-classified AAPIs are the only group that shows mean differences across multiple classification approaches, and the mean is consistently higher. Results actually

Table 2-1

*Racial Group Sizes and Sample Proportions by Classification Approach, N = 4984*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Racial Classification</th>
<th>Multiracial Aggregation</th>
<th>Multiracial Disaggregation</th>
<th>Least Prevalent Monoracial</th>
<th>Multiracial Group Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>35 (0.7%)</td>
<td>35 (0.7%)</td>
<td>282 (5.7%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab American</td>
<td>36 (0.7%)</td>
<td>36 (0.7%)</td>
<td>91 (1.8%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAPI</td>
<td>733 (14.7%)</td>
<td>733 (14.7%)</td>
<td>912 (18.3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>218 (4.4%)</td>
<td>218 (4.4%)</td>
<td>299 (6.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latina/o</td>
<td>959 (19.2%)</td>
<td>959 (19.2%)</td>
<td>1213 (24.3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>2056 (41.3%)</td>
<td>2056 (41.3%)</td>
<td>2056 (41.3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>35 (0.7%)</td>
<td>35 (0.7%)</td>
<td>131 (2.6%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More</td>
<td>912 (18.3%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three or More</td>
<td></td>
<td>250 (5.0%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>798 (15.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority/White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>114 (2.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double Minority*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am Indian/White</td>
<td>142 (2.8%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab Am/White</td>
<td>26 (0.5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAPI/White</td>
<td>128 (2.6%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/Am Indian</td>
<td>10 (0.2%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/White</td>
<td>27 (0.5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latina/o/White</td>
<td>233 (4.7%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/White</td>
<td>96 (1.9%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Bold indicates a change in proportion of racial group size across classification approaches.  
* Double Minority denotes students who indicate two or more racial categories of color, and not white.*
Table 2-2

*Dunnett T3 Post-Hoc and T-Tests for Mean Group Differences in Discrimination and Bias, by Racial Grouping and Classification Approach*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Group &amp; Classification</th>
<th>Compared to 2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Group:</th>
<th>Mean Diff. (1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; - 2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least Prevalent Monoracial</td>
<td>Latina/o</td>
<td>2.4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>2.7**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least Prevalent Monoracial</td>
<td>Latina/o</td>
<td>4.1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>4.4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander (AAPI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial Aggregation</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>2.9*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Latina/o</td>
<td>4.3***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>4.2***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial Disaggregation</td>
<td>Latina/o</td>
<td>4.3***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>4.2***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Am Indian/White</td>
<td>3.4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other/White</td>
<td>4.3***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least Prevalent Monoracial</td>
<td>Latina/o</td>
<td>3.7***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>4.0***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3.6***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial Aggregation</td>
<td>AAPI</td>
<td>-2.9*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least Prevalent Monoracial</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>2.5**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latina/o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial Aggregation</td>
<td>AAPI</td>
<td>-4.3***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AAPI/White</td>
<td>-4.4***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two or More</td>
<td>-2.7***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial Disaggregation</td>
<td>AAPI</td>
<td>-4.3***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Three or More</td>
<td>-4.4***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least Prevalent Monoracial</td>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>-2.4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arab American</td>
<td>-4.1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AAPI</td>
<td>-3.7***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial Aggregation</td>
<td>AAPI</td>
<td>-4.3***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two or More</td>
<td>-2.6***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial Disaggregation</td>
<td>AAPI</td>
<td>-4.2***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AAPI/White</td>
<td>-4.3***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Three or More</td>
<td>-4.3***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least Prevalent Monoracial</td>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>-2.7**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arab American</td>
<td>-4.4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AAPI</td>
<td>-4.0***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>-2.5**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
challenge post-racial and model minority myths; similar to Brackett et al.’s (2006) findings for black/white students, that these multiracial groups’ mean scores are higher than some monoracially-classified groups helps counter assumptions that they may be honorary whites with similar experiences to monoracially-white classified students (see also Bonilla-Silva, 2010; Hurtado, Ruiz et al., 2012). Considering the factor measures any type of bias, intersections of race with other social identities in discrimination may be expressly prevalent for AAPI and multiracial students in these diverse environments.

Differences within multiracially-identifying students emerge under the MGS approach. As expected, an independent samples t-test for showed that double minority mixed students have
a higher mean frequency of experiencing discrimination and bias compared to minority/white mixed students, equal variances not assumed \((F = 12.31, t = 2.36, df = 133.16, p < .05, 95\% CI = 0.47, 5.29)\). In addition to any monoracism experienced by both groups, traditional racisms targeting racial groups of color could be registering as higher mean frequencies of discrimination for double minority multiracial students, producing significantly different qualities of experience (Guillermo-Wann & Johnston, Chapter II; see also Guillermo-Wann, 2010, Nadal et al., 2011). That differences do not emerge between the MD combination categories further highlights the more prevalent differences between minority/white and double minority multiracial students, indicating distinct status differences are evident in the quality of their interactions on campus.

**Similarities and Differences in Regression Results**

Regression results reveal that different distinctions arise in the predictive power of some common explanatory variables for discrimination between racial groups, particularly when comparing results from the MA and MD approaches (Table 2-3) to the LPMC approach (Table 2-4). This clarifies previous research that suggested regression models appear to be similar for monoracially-grouped students (Inkelas et al., 2009). But similar to Inkelas et al. (2009), differences in the predictive power of independent variables become more visible within a multiracially-identifying sample. That is, there are notable distinctions within students who mark multiple racial groups in terms of what variables are greater contributors to experiencing discrimination and bias, highlighting the heterogeneity of this group. Regarding the content of the models, measures of the compositional, organizational, psychological, and behavioral dimensions all contribute to explained variance in discrimination and bias in college for most racial groupings. Interestingly, three factors are consistently significant regardless of how the sample is classified: students’ perceptions of institutional commitment to diversity, greater
participation in co-curricular diversity activities, and negative cross-racial interactions. In contrast, compositional diversity, curricular opportunities, and validation play out differently across groups and classification approaches. Demographics are not significant in the final model for most groups. Factors of primary interest are discussed by climate dimension below.

**Compositional diversity.** Findings confirm research on the importance of compositional diversity in reducing discrimination for Latina/o college students (Hurtado, 1994), and add the same result for students who only mark black (Table 2-3), with no significance for any other groups in final models when $\alpha = .05$ (Tables 2-3, 2-4, & 2-5). For students who indicate three or more racial groups under the MD approach, higher compositional diversity is negatively correlated with the outcome but is not significant in the final model, meaning lower discrimination is evident the more diverse the campus, but that other climate dimensions share explained variance with compositional diversity for those groups (Table 2-3). That Latina/o and black students in particular experience lower levels of discrimination in more compositionally diverse environments emphasizes the importance of continuing to enroll larger proportions of students of color to improve campus climate.

**Psychological dimension.** Students’ perceptions of institutional commitment to diversity prove to be negatively related to discrimination and bias for almost all groups across all racial classification approaches (Tables 2-3, 2-4, and 2-5). Exceptions include multiracial AAPI/white students in the MD approach (Table 2-3) and double minority students in the RGS approach (Table 2-5), for whom the measure is not significantly related. In contrast, the effect is stronger for multiracial Latina/o/white students in the MD combination group compared to Latina/o and white groups in the MA and MD approaches, and compared to the MD AAPI/white combination group (Table 2-3). The unique effect is also greater for American Indian students compared to
Table 2-3

Regression Coefficients Predicting Discrimination and Bias, Multiracial Aggregation (MA) and Multiracial Disaggregation (MD)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block/Variable</th>
<th>AAPI MA &amp; MD</th>
<th>Black MA &amp; MD</th>
<th>Latina/o MA &amp; MD</th>
<th>White MA &amp; MD</th>
<th>Two or More MA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( r )</td>
<td>( b ) (SE)</td>
<td>( r )</td>
<td>( b ) (SE)</td>
<td>( r )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demographics</strong></td>
<td>( R^2 = .03 )</td>
<td>( R^2 = .17 )</td>
<td>( R^2 = .02 )</td>
<td>( R^2 = .07 )</td>
<td>( R^2 = .03 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex: Female</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.28 (.75)</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.40 (1.30)</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Group</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.19 (.27)</td>
<td>(-.42 ) **</td>
<td>-.102 (.42)</td>
<td>(-.15 ) **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>(-.33 ) (.10)</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.14 (.18)</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Compositional Diversity</strong></td>
<td>( R^2 = .03 )</td>
<td>( R^2 = .21 )</td>
<td>( R^2 = .06 )</td>
<td>( R^2 = .07 )</td>
<td>( R^2 = .03 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Students of Color</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.01 (.03)</td>
<td>(-.31 ) **</td>
<td>-.07 (.04)</td>
<td>(-.22 ) **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Psychological Dimension</strong></td>
<td>( R^2 = .12 )</td>
<td>( R^2 = .27 )</td>
<td>( R^2 = .16 )</td>
<td>( R^2 = .20 )</td>
<td>( R^2 = .20 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Identity Salience</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>1.10 (.34)</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.48 (.57)</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote Racial Understanding</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.17 (.47)</td>
<td>(.17 )</td>
<td>-.10 (.79)</td>
<td>(.10 ) **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Diversity Commitment (ICD)</td>
<td>(-.16 )</td>
<td>(-.26 ) (.04)</td>
<td>(-.26 ) **</td>
<td>(-.17 ) (.06)</td>
<td>(-.23 ) **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Dimension</strong></td>
<td>( R^2 = .35 )</td>
<td>( R^2 = .40 )</td>
<td>( R^2 = .28 )</td>
<td>( R^2 = .32 )</td>
<td>( R^2 = .32 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Studies: Yes</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.90 (.76)</td>
<td>(.19 )</td>
<td>1.06 (1.39)</td>
<td>(.12 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum of Inclusion</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.08 (.04)</td>
<td>(.06 )</td>
<td>-.11 (.07)</td>
<td>(.10 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Curricular Diversity Activities (CCDA)</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.40 ( _{a,b,c} ) (.04)</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.37 (.06)</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Behavioral Dimension</strong></td>
<td>( R^2 = .42 )</td>
<td>( R^2 = .47 )</td>
<td>( R^2 = .37 )</td>
<td>( R^2 = .38 )</td>
<td>( R^2 = .38 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversations About Race Outside Class</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>2.41 (.61)</td>
<td>(.26 )</td>
<td>.94 (.94)</td>
<td>(.25 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Cross-Racial Interactions (NCRI)</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.29 (.04)</td>
<td>(.48 )</td>
<td>.31 (.06)</td>
<td>(.45 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Climate</strong></td>
<td>( R^2 = .42 )</td>
<td>( R^2 = .49 )</td>
<td>( R^2 = .37 )</td>
<td>( R^2 = .38 )</td>
<td>( R^2 = .39 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Validation</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.04 (.04)</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>(-.17 ) (.07)</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Note:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Headings indicate whether results are for MA, MD, or both classification approaches. Results for the white racial group are also the same under the LPMC approach. Note: Coefficients shown in bold \( p < .05 \). Note: for ICD, CCDA, and NCRI, coefficients sharing a subscript are statistically different at \( \alpha = .05 \); tests were conducted across racial groups within MA; within MD, tests were only conducted across multiracial combination groups and their respective racial groups.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block/Variable</th>
<th>Three or More MD</th>
<th>Am Indian/White MD</th>
<th>AAPI/White MD</th>
<th>Latina/o/White MD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( r = .04 )</td>
<td>( R^2 = .02 )</td>
<td>( R^2 = .04 )</td>
<td>( R^2 = .02 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex: Female</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.09 (.48)</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.35 (.41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Group</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.09 (.16)</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.17 (.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.01 (.04)</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.01 (.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compositional Diversity</td>
<td>( R^2 = .06 )</td>
<td>( R^2 = .02 )</td>
<td>( R^2 = .06 )</td>
<td>( R^2 = .03 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Students of Color</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.01 (.04)</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.01 (.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Dimension</td>
<td>( R^2 = .18 )</td>
<td>( R^2 = .37 )</td>
<td>( R^2 = .17 )</td>
<td>( R^2 = .20 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Identity Salience</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.83 (.56)</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>2.21 (.53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote Racial Understanding</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-1.48 (.82)</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>1.14 (.74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Diversity</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>-.23 (.06)</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>-.29 (.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment (ICD)</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.13 (.08)</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.13 (.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Dimension</td>
<td>( R^2 = .35 )</td>
<td>( R^2 = .41 )</td>
<td>( R^2 = .30 )</td>
<td>( R^2 = .30 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Studies: Yes</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.64 (1.31)</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.03 (1.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum of Inclusion</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.00 (.07)</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.00 (.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Curricular Diversity</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.35_{g} (.06)</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>13_{l} (.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities (CCDA)</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.26 (.06)</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.24 (.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Dimension</td>
<td>( R^2 = .41 )</td>
<td>( R^2 = .45 )</td>
<td>( R^2 = .38 )</td>
<td>( R^2 = .40 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversations About Race Outside Class</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>1.60 (1.02)</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>1.09 (.97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Cross-Racial Interactions (NCRI)</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.26 (.06)</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.24 (.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Climate</td>
<td>( R^2 = .41 )</td>
<td>( R^2 = .45 )</td>
<td>( R^2 = .40 )</td>
<td>( R^2 = .40 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Validation</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.11 (.07)</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.01 (.07)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Headings indicate whether results are for MA, MD, or both classification approaches. Results for the white racial group are also the same under the LPMC approach. Note: Coefficients shown in bold \( p < .05 \). Note: for ICD, CCDA, and NCRI, coefficients sharing a subscript are statistically different at \( \alpha = .05 \); tests were conducted across racial groups within MA; within MD, tests were only conducted across multiracial combination groups and their respective racial groups.
Table 2-4

Regression Coefficients Predicting Discrimination and Bias, Least Prevalent Monoracial Category (LPMC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block/Variable</th>
<th>AAPI</th>
<th>Am. Indian</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Latina/o</th>
<th>White*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$r$</td>
<td>$b$ (SE)</td>
<td>$r$</td>
<td>$b$ (SE)</td>
<td>$r$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographics</td>
<td>$R^2 = .03$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$R^2 = .17$</td>
<td>(R$^2 = .03$)</td>
<td>$R^2 = .07$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex: Female</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.09 (.66)</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.28 (1.14)</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Group</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.31 (.25)</td>
<td>-.42</td>
<td>-1.40 (.35)</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.27 (.08)</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.02 (.14)</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compositional Diversity</td>
<td>$R^2 = .03$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$R^2 = .20$</td>
<td>(R$^2 = .06$)</td>
<td>$R^2 = .07$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Students of Color</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.01 (.02)</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.04 (.03)</td>
<td>-.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Dimension</td>
<td>$R^2 = .12$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$R^2 = .25$</td>
<td>(R$^2 = .16$)</td>
<td>$R^2 = .20$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Identity Salience</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>1.08 (.30)</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>1.75 (.49)</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote Racial Understanding</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.32 (.40)</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.49 (.65)</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Diversity</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.23 (.04)</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>-.28a (.05)</td>
<td>-.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment (ICD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>$R^2 = .33$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$R^2 = .40$</td>
<td>(R$^2 = .28$)</td>
<td>$R^2 = .32$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension</td>
<td>$R^2 = .37$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$R^2 = .40$</td>
<td>(R$^2 = .28$)</td>
<td>$R^2 = .38$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Studies: Yes</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.45 (.66)</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.66 (1.10)</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum of Inclusion</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.08 (.03)</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.03 (.06)</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Curricular Diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities (CCDA)</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.38b,cd (.04)</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.21b, e (.06)</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Dimension</td>
<td>$R^2 = .41$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$R^2 = .48$</td>
<td>(R$^2 = .37$)</td>
<td>$R^2 = .38$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversations About Race Outside Class</td>
<td>31 2.59 (53)</td>
<td>.23 1.19 (.86)</td>
<td>.25 .70 (.82)</td>
<td>.25 .89 (.35)</td>
<td>.26 .93 (.27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Cross-Racial Interactions (NCRI)</td>
<td>.48 .28 (03)</td>
<td>.45 .25 (06)</td>
<td>.54 .33 (05)</td>
<td>.44 .29 (02)</td>
<td>.39 .24 (02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Climate</td>
<td>$R^2 = .41$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$R^2 = .50$</td>
<td>(R$^2 = .37$)</td>
<td>$R^2 = .38$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Validation</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.06 (.04)</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.09 (.05)</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Coefficients are the same for the white racial group under the MA and MD classification approaches, and are shown again here for ease in comparison.
Note: Coefficients shown in bold $p < .05$. Note: for ICD, CCDA, and NCRI, coefficients sharing a subscript are statistically different at $\alpha = .05$. 
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Table 2-5

Unstandardized Regression Coefficients Predicting Discrimination and Bias, Multiracial Group Status (MGS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block/Variable</th>
<th>Double Minority</th>
<th>Minority/White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$R^2 = .12$</td>
<td>$R^2 = .03$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex: Female</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Group</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.95 (2.39)</td>
<td>-.42 (.61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.66 (.79)</td>
<td>-.53 (.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compositional Diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Students of Color</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.09 (.07)</td>
<td>.01 (.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Dimension</td>
<td>$R^2 = .20$</td>
<td>$R^2 = .22$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Identity Salience</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote Racial Understanding</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Diversity Commitment</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ICD)</td>
<td>-.11 (.11)</td>
<td>-.27 (.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.78 (1.08)</td>
<td>1.07 (.26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.66 (1.63)</td>
<td>-.01 (.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Dimension</td>
<td>$R^2 = .35$</td>
<td>$R^2 = .32$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Studies: Yes</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum of Inclusion</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Curricular Diversity Activities</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(CCDA)</td>
<td>.37 (.12)</td>
<td>.24 (.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Dimension</td>
<td>$R^2 = .39$</td>
<td>$R^2 = .40$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversations About Race Outside Class</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Cross-Racial Interactions</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(NCRI)</td>
<td>.59 (1.77)</td>
<td>1.39 (.45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Climate</td>
<td>$R^2 = .39$</td>
<td>$R^2 = .40$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Validation</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.06 (.13)</td>
<td>-.04 (.03)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Coefficients shown in bold $p < .05$. Note: for ICD, CCDA, and NCRI, no coefficients are statistically different at $\alpha = .05$. 
black students under the LPMC approach (Table 2-4). While higher perceptions of institutional commitment to diversity are related to less discrimination and bias for nearly all groups in all classification approaches, it is particularly important for American Indian and multiracial Latina/o/white students.

Regarding other aspects of the psychological dimension, importance given to helping to promote racial understanding was not related to the outcome measure for any groups when $\alpha = 0.05$ (Tables 2-3, 2-4, and 2-5), contrary to previous research (Hurtado, 1994). However, because the Pearson correlation was significant for several groups, and the final p-value neared significance for some, this simply means that the unique explanatory power may be shared by other variables in the model that were not present in Hurtado’s (1994) study. On the other hand, a heightened racial identity salience was positively related to discrimination and bias for many groups (Tables 2-3, 2-4, and 2-5), confirming recent research (Hurtado, Ruiz et al., 2012). Although increasing racial identity salience is important for racial identity development, its positive relationship with discrimination and bias may actually indicate that greater awareness about racial conflict is evident in students at mid stages of development (Hurtado, Ruiz et al., 2012). So in addition to increasing representation of students of color on campus as a method to improve the climate for some groups, certain organizational practices, discussed next, may include positive ways to increase racial identity salience as suggested by Hurtado, Ruiz et al. (2012), and help students recognize, cope with, and challenge discrimination and bias in college.

Organizational dimension. As anticipated, co-curricular practices are positively related to discrimination and bias, likely for their role as counterspaces for coping with and challenging microaggressions (Solórzano, Ceja, & Yosso, 2000); however, curricular practices have little to no effect for most groups after controlling for additional factors that may possibly be developed
within such curricular spaces. For all groups across all racial classifications, except American Indian/white students in the MD approach, participation in campus facilitated co-curricular diversity activities is positively related to experiencing more frequent discrimination (Tables 2-3, 2-4, and 2-5). The effect is more prominent for AAPI students compared to several groups under all approaches (Tables 2-3 and 2-4), and for black students compared to American Indian students only under the LPMC approach (Table 2-4). In addition, the effect for the Latina/o/white combination group is significantly lower in that approach than students in the MD Latina/o, white, and Three or More groups (Table 2-3). As such, participation in co-curricular diversity activities may be particularly helpful for AAPI, black, Latina/o, white, and multiracial students with three or more backgrounds, as further participation in co-curricular diversity activities likely increase as it becomes more publicly evident that students are experiencing discrimination on campus.

As for curricular practices, taking a curriculum of inclusion decreases reports of discrimination for AAPI students in all monoracial classifications once demographics, compositional diversity, and psychological measures enter the models (Tables 2-3 and 2-4). Taking an ethnic studies class is related to experiencing more discrimination only for white students, but is the weakest of predictors (Table 2-3); this may simply reflect raising white students’ awareness of racial oppression, which could easily provoke a sense of defensiveness regarding historical and contemporary racial privilege. However, the lack of effect of curricular diversity on discrimination for most groups, in either direction, implies that some students who experience discrimination and others who do not are equally likely to take such courses, and that a diverse curriculum may be the space in which some desirable predictors are cultivated.
Considering that Hurtado, Ruiz et al. (2012) found that taking a curriculum of inclusion and participating in co-curricular diversity activities are positively related to racial identity salience, and that a heightened racial identity salience is positively related to students’ critical consciousness and action, the current findings may suggest that when students experience discrimination and bias in college, and in turn participate inclusive curriculum and diversity activities, doing so may redirect negative experiences towards developing critical consciousness and action. However, experiencing discrimination is not a prerequisite to increasing identity salience, so positive ways of increasing identity salience must be pursued (Hurtado, Ruiz et al., 2012). Attention to linking curriculum to lived experiences, as in intergroup dialogue (Zúñiga, Nagda, Chesler, & Cytron-Walker, 2009), may result in a clearer relationship between these practices in the organizational and behavioral dimensions of climate. In fact, such practices are critical to preventing racial incidents on campus. Accordingly, formal curricular and co-curricular diversity practices may help create a color-conscious, rather than a colorblind student body, that may more aptly recognize and constructively address discrimination and bias.

**Behavioral dimension.** Regression results also show that informal interactions including college students’ conversations outside of class on topics related to racial and ethnic diversity, as well as negative cross-racial interactions, are positively related to experiencing discrimination and bias for all racial groups across most classification approaches, with few exceptions (Tables 2-3, 2-4, and 2-5). That is, conversing about racial matters outside of class is a requisite exchange in which students can experience discrimination; this measure is significant for all groups except for black students under all classification approaches (Tables 2-3 and 2-4), American Indian students in the LPMC approach (Table 2-4), double minority students in the MGS analysis (Table 2-5), and all MD combination groups (Table 2-3); it may be a function of
sample size. If not, it raises questions as to the content of such conversations with these groups of students – that is, are other students less likely to vocalize discriminatory remarks in their presence (Cabrera, 2009)? As for negative cross-racial interactions, all groups across all classifications indicate they are positively related to discrimination, and the strength of predictive power does not change across groups based on classification approach (Tables 2-3, 2-4, and 2-5). Again, this emphasizes that institutions should offer practices that can develop multicultural competencies (e.g. S. Harper & Hurtado, 2007; Hurtado, Alvarez et al., 2012) to help reduce discrimination and bias as students necessarily engage across difference.

**General climate: validation.** Lastly, this study explores a new quantitative measure of interpersonal validation by faculty and staff (Hurtado et al., 2011) in its relationship to discrimination in the campus climate, as previous research indicates that general climate measures of institutional supportiveness seems to improve the campus climate (Hurtado, 1994; Laird & Niskodé-Dossett, 2010). An inverse relationship is significant throughout only for white students (Tables 2-3 and 2-4), and only for Latina/o students in the MA and MD approaches (Table 2-3); diverse campuses may still perpetuate white privilege registering through validation for white students, but may also be doing a good job validating students who singly identify as Latina/o. However, for black students under MA, MD, and LPMC, and for Latina/o students under LPMC, validation is not significantly related to discrimination in a simple correlation, but undergoes suppressor effects and shows a negative relationship with it in those final models (Tables 2-3 and 2-4). That is, taking into account multiple campus climate dimensions, interpersonal validation by faculty and staff may lower frequencies of discrimination indicated by black and Latina/o students. This attests to the importance of validating students of
color in particular (Hurtado et al., 2011; Rendón, 1994), both in and outside of the classroom, and how doing so may decrease or counter discrimination and bias for these students.

Implications and Conclusion

This study confirms the continuing significance of race. Specifically, it demonstrates that how researchers racially classify multiple-race data in a diverse sample can produce varied results when examining discrimination and bias in the campus climate, even when several factors are consistently significant across groups and approaches. Importantly, multiracially-identifying students appear to be experiencing discrimination and bias more frequently than might commonly be assumed. Students who mark multiple racial categories also seem to make monoracially-constructed group differences more pronounced when included in those groups in the LPMC approach. Accordingly, this study offers implications and future directions for research regarding racial classifications, for practice aimed at improving the campus climate for diversity for all students, and for coalition building between monoracially- and multiracially-framed constituents in the continual struggle to end all forms of oppression.

Research ought to clearly communicate how multiple-race data is classified in analyses, as it may generate different representations of racial groups as seen in this study. For monoracially-based analyses, choosing to include or exclude multiracial data produces small but significant differences between groups in regression models of discrimination in college. In this sense, researchers interested primarily in monoracially-grouped students should note that using the LPMC approach with multiple-race data might generate differences between groups that do not emerge under the MA and MD approaches when multiple-race data is not included in those groups, and when multiple-race data comprises a considerable proportion of the data. When examining differences within multiraciality, the different approaches provide important levels of
nuance for within- and between-group comparisons. For example, the Two or More group in the MA approach shows that those students experience discrimination and bias more frequently than white and Latina/o students, and the regression results indicate significant predictors for this heterogeneous group in general. When broken down further into the MD combination groups, mean differences in discrimination do not arise amongst the multiracial groups, but the predictive power of some explanatory variables is significantly different. On the other hand, the MGS approach shows that double minority multiracial students experiences discrimination more frequently than minority/white multiracial students, but that that there are no differences in the predictive power of explanatory variables. The preservation of multiple-race data allows research on various racial groups to use different classification approaches appropriate to the purpose of inquiry.

Future research examining the behavioral dimension of the campus climate for diversity across racial groups should pursue five issues raised by this study. First, research should explore differences specifically in racial discrimination comparing results across classification approaches. More robust measures might be created to focus in on racial discrimination, and to examine intersectionality of racism across other groupings such as gender, class, and sexual orientation. This may be particularly interesting for AAPI and students in the Two or More group given their higher frequencies of discrimination and bias than white students in this study and in Hurtado, Ruiz et al. (2012). In addition, larger samples of black/white, American Indian/black, and Arab American students should be sought for inclusion in such research, and efforts to collect longitudinal data will help as well. Second, future research on the campus climate for multiraciality should continue to examine intersections of traditional racisms and monoracism (Guillermo-Wann & Johnston, Chapter II), particularly as they play out for double
minority multiracial students and minority/white multiracial students. And despite that mean differences in discrimination between the MD combination groups do not emerge, qualitative research might investigate the content of what discrimination looks like across these groups, as well as the role of whiteness in their experiences with their respective monoracially-defined communities. Third, research must better explore the positive relationship between co-curricular diversity activities and negative experiences in the behavioral dimension of the climate. In these settings, charged topics are often discussed openly as a means of coping (e.g. Solórzano et al., 2000), which may explain the positive relationship. Fourth, future research using hierarchical linear modeling might test for effects of an institution’s mean level of students taking a curriculum of inclusion to see if that might have a significant relationship to measures of the behavioral dimension of the climate. That is, attending an institution where students on average take more classes representative of a curriculum of inclusion might help improve the behavioral dimension of the climate more so than expecting an individual student to experience more or less discrimination based on how many inclusive course she or he takes. Fifth, future research can further tease out relationships between general climate measures, such as validation, and the campus climate for diversity. Research on validation shows it is a crucial component for the success of underrepresented students (e.g. Rendón, 1994). That greater validation is significantly associated with lower levels of discrimination for Latina/o and white students, and only became significant for black students once other climate dimensions were accounted for, raises concerns about who is being validated on campus, and to improve the climate for all students of color. In sum, future research has the potential to help educators better understand what may be related to the behavioral dimension of the racial climate across racial groups, how traditional racisms and
monoracism intersect in a campus climate for multiraciality, and the role co-curricular and curricular practices can play in improving the campus climate for all students.

In practice, campuses interested in reducing discrimination and bias as a component of the behavioral dimension of the climate might pro-actively develop students’ awareness of oppression as well as multicultural competencies through curricular and co-curricular activities; this may help reduce negative cross-racial interactions and discrimination in the long run. Previous research has shown that curriculum matters in creating positive perceptions of campus climate for diversity, but that participation in a diverse curriculum does not straightforwardly lead to positive perceptions, as students may become more critically conscious of institutional practice around diversity (Mayhew et al., 2005). Similarly, the positive relationship between co-curricular diversity activities and experiencing discrimination may simply mean campuses are educating students about diversity at the same time that they are experiencing negative behaviors between groups in college. Given the higher levels of discrimination and bias indicated by monoracially-classified AAPI and aggregated multiracial students, efforts should be made to include these groups in diversity initiatives and interventions where they may traditionally be overlooked (Hurtado, Ruiz et al. 2012; Ozaki & Johnston, 2008). In addition, along with increasing compositional diversity, curricular and co-curricular organizational practices may help improve students’ perceptions of institutional commitment to diversity, which is a key factor identified in this study that appears to decrease the frequency of experiencing discrimination and bias across almost all racial groupings and classification approaches. This confirms previous research that shows institutional commitment to diversity is important in improving perceptions of a positive campus climate for diversity for students (Hurtado, 1992; Mayhew et al, 2005) and staff (Mayhew, Grunwald, & Dey, 2006).
Finally, the inclusion of multiracially- and monoracially-grouped students in a campus climate study provides a more nuanced understanding of similarities and differences across groups, and demonstrates a needed alliance between multiracially- and monoracially-focused research in the continued struggle to end racial and all forms of oppression. The findings challenge both neo-conservative colorblind perspectives and liberal post-racial hopes by demonstrating that race is still significant in the lives of college students, and that there are group differences in how often students experience it. This study also confirms the civil rights concern that multiracial aggregation reduces racial group numbers, but challenges the assumption that the Two or More category is meaningless by highlighting mean differences between that and some monoracial groups as a possible indication of monoracism, as well as differences in the predictive power of explanatory variables. Too often, multiraciality is disconnected from examinations of traditional racisms and discrimination targeting monoracially-constructed groups, and is vulnerable to being co-opted to support neo-conservative and liberal racial ideology (Guillermo-Wann & Johnston, Chapter II). Rather, this study shows that college students of all racial backgrounds continue to experience discrimination and bias, including students who indicate multiple racial groups, and that discrimination can be pro-actively addressed by continuing to collect racial group data, allowing for flexibility in analysis, supporting campus diversity practices, and improving institutional commitment to diversity.
### Appendix A: Variables and Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable/Factor</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Mean (SD)</th>
<th>Factor Reliability / Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEPENDENT MEASURE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>( \alpha = .889 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Discrimination and Bias</em></td>
<td>Rescaled 0-100, Mean of 50.</td>
<td>50.067 (10.059)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Original item scales: 1=Never; 2=Seldom; 3=Sometimes; 4=Often; 5=Very often</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of discrimination: Verbal comments</td>
<td></td>
<td>.792</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of discrimination: Written comments (e.g. emails, texts, writing on walls, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.762</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witnessed discrimination</td>
<td></td>
<td>.750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heard insensitive or disparaging racial remarks from: Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td>.677</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heard insensitive or disparaging racial remarks from: Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td>.664</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heard insensitive or disparaging racial remarks from: Students</td>
<td></td>
<td>.644</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been mistaken as a member of a racial/ethnic group that is not your own</td>
<td></td>
<td>.444</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEMOGRAPHICS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>0 = Male; 1 = Female</td>
<td>1.680 (0.465)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Group</td>
<td>Open ended, rescaled: 1 = 0-20; 2 = 21-24; 3 = 25-29; 4 = 30-39; 5 = 40-45; 6 = 55+</td>
<td>2.330 (1.422)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated total family income last year</td>
<td>1=Less than $10,000; 2=$10,000-14,999; 3=$15,000-19,999; 4=$20,000-24,999; 5=$25,000-29,999; 6=$30,000-39,999; 7=$40,000-49,999; 8=$50,000-59,999; 9=$60,000-74,999; 10=$75,000-99,999; 11=$100,000-149,999; 12=$150,000-199,999; 13=$200,000-249,999; 14=$250,000 or more</td>
<td>6.960 (3.755)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMPOSITIONAL DIVERSITY</strong></td>
<td>Percentage of students of color</td>
<td>Scale 0-100</td>
<td>40.022 (17.919)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PSYCHOLOGICAL DIMENSION</strong></td>
<td>How often do you think about your race/ethnicity?</td>
<td>1=Never; 2=Seldom; 3=Sometimes; 4=Often; 5=Very often</td>
<td>3.030 (1.211)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping to promote inter-</td>
<td>1=Not important; 2 = Somewhat</td>
<td>3.110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Institutional Commitment to Diversity**

Rescaled 0-100, Mean of 50.  
Original item scale: 1=Strongly disagree; 2=Disagree; 3=Agree; 4=Strongly Agree  
\( \alpha = .873 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encourages students to have a public voice and share their ideas openly</td>
<td>.701</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has a long standing commitment to diversity</td>
<td>.733</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accurately reflects the diversity of the student body in publications (e.g. brochures, website, etc.)</td>
<td>.691</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewards staff and faculty for their participation in diversity efforts</td>
<td>.629</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciates differences in sexual orientation</td>
<td>.696</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotes the appreciation of cultural difference</td>
<td>.715</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has campus administrators who regularly speak about the value of diversity</td>
<td>.594</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotes the understanding of gender differences</td>
<td>.606</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Organizational Dimension**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taken an ethnic studies course</td>
<td>.410</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum of Inclusion</td>
<td>.715</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials/readings on gender issues</td>
<td>.775</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials/readings on issues of oppression as a system of power and dominance</td>
<td>.578</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serving communities in need (e.g. service learning)</td>
<td>.824</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials/readings on race and ethnicity issues</td>
<td>.635</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for intensive dialogue between students with different backgrounds and beliefs</td>
<td>.705</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Curricular Diversity Activities (Campus Facilitated)</td>
<td>.649</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended presentations, performances, and art exhibits on diversity</td>
<td>.810</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended debates or panels about diversity issues</td>
<td>.866</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in ongoing campus-organized discussions on racial/ethnic issues (e.g. intergroup dialogue)</td>
<td>.729</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Center activities</td>
<td>.848</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in the Ethnic or Cultural Center activities</td>
<td>.782</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in the Women's/Men's Center activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Behavioral Dimension**


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>α</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-depth conversations outside of class on issues related to racial or ethnic diversity</td>
<td>1=Not at all, 2=Occasionally, 3=Frequently</td>
<td>1.940</td>
<td>(0.694)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative Cross-Racial Interactions</strong></td>
<td>Rescaled 0-100, Mean of 50.</td>
<td>50.050</td>
<td>(10.048)</td>
<td>α = .769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had tense, somewhat hostile interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td>.849</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt insulted or threatened because of your race/ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td>.849</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had guarded interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td>.660</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GENERAL CLIMATE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Interpersonal Validation</td>
<td>Rescaled 0-100, Mean of 50.</td>
<td>49.997</td>
<td>(10.008)</td>
<td>α = .862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty believe in my potential to succeed academically</td>
<td></td>
<td>.830</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least one faculty member has taken an interest in my development</td>
<td></td>
<td>.773</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least one staff member has taken an interest in my development</td>
<td></td>
<td>.764</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff recognize my achievements</td>
<td></td>
<td>.721</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty empower me to learn here</td>
<td></td>
<td>.598</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff encourage me to get involved in campus activities</td>
<td></td>
<td>.564</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CHAPTER IV
MIXED RACE, MULTIPLE RACISMS: STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF THE ORGANIZATIONAL DIMENSION OF CAMPUS CLIMATE

Introduction

Race is in the spotlight in national debates about affirmative action in college admissions, inequitable educational outcomes, data collection and reporting, and incidents across campuses. However, the post-civil rights multiracial population continues to be repositioned to advance neo-conservative agendas and liberal post-racial views, generating anxiety around multiraciality (Daniel & Castañeda-Liles, 2006; Morning, 2005). The ways the public discusses changing categories and meanings of race and racism in relation to multiraciality suggest it is undergoing a rearticulation of meaning in society (Brunsma, 2006; Omi and Winant, 1994); these are part of socio-historical and policy contexts of campus racial climates for college students in the U.S., making this a timely topic of inquiry. However, only two known studies explicitly examine campus climate for multiracial students (Guillermo-Wann, 2010, Chapter III), with a larger literature exploring multiracial experiences (e.g., Brackett et al., 2006; Laird & Niskodé-Dossett, 2010; Nishimura, 1998), and manifestations of racism targeting mixed race status (e.g., Johnston & Nadal, 2010; Nadal et al., 2011). In addition, campus climate research focuses less on the organizational dimension of climate (Hurtado, Alvarez, Guillermo-Wann, Cuellar, & Arellano, 2012). Therefore, this study examines the organizational dimension of campus climate for multiracial college students. Campus climate is a critical context that affects student transitions and numerous outcomes including adjustment to college, values and attitudes, multicultural competencies, retention, and degree attainment (Hurtado et al., 2012).

Cumulatively, recent research on multiracial college students reveals that race is very much a part of their lives on interpersonal and institutional levels, which alone affirms the
continuing significance of race and racism. For example, when analyzed as a group, some mixed race students do not feel accepted by their peers belonging to monoracially-constructed groups (King, 2008; Nishimura, 1998; Renn, 2000, 2003, 2004a; Sands & Schuh, 2004), report more experience with prejudice compared to their black and white peers at one Southern institution (Brackett et al., 2006), and may struggle with social integration in informal peer interactions (Sands & Schuh, 2004). In particular, multiracial students can find navigating campus spaces challenging due to others’ perceptions of them based on their physical appearance, cultural knowledge, and how they act (King, 2008), as these are measured against monoracially-constructed norms. Mixed race students may find that institutional practices such as monoracially-dominant student affairs programs create limiting spaces (Sands & Schuh, 2004) and that the lack of private and public space that is both psychological and physical may even lead to considerations of leaving the institution (Renn, 2000). In a national study, multiracial students indicated the lowest perceptions of institutional support, even after controlling for interactions across difference, and reported the second lowest levels of supportive relationships on campus of all racial groups (Laird & Niskodé-Dossett, 2010). Interestingly, the two known multiracial climate studies begin to indicate differences in experience amongst multiracial college students in addition to established similarities, proposing further exploration of within-group differences (Guillermo-Wann, 2010, Chapter III). Overall, the growing literature on multiracial college students draws attention to the importance of exploring both interpersonal and institutional aspects of campus climate that may render these students invisible and inadequately served (Laird & Niskodé-Dossett, 2010; Ozaki & Johnston, 2008; Renn, 2008; Talbot, 2008), with more focus needed on institutional dimensions of campus climate.

Terms such as this and “multiracially-identifying” are used to disrupt static notions of race being biologically essential or discrete (see also Guillermo-Wann & Johnston, Chapter II; Osei-Kofi, 2011).
Thus, the purpose of this study is to explore multiracial undergraduates’ perceptions of the organizational dimension of campus climate. Specifically, it aims to understand how different forms of racism interact to create nuances in the campus climate for such students. That is, having two or more racial ancestries are conceptualized as potentially separate strains of racial identity with oppressions that can intersect with each other and the concept of multiraciality (Guillermo-Wann & Johnston, Chapter II).

Clarifying Concepts

Multiracial research raises the question of who to consider as part of a multiracial population, given that most racial groups in the U.S. have mixed racial ancestry from centuries past (Daniel, 2001; Davis, 1991; Feagin, 2006; Gomez, 2007; Morning, 2000, 2005; Nadal, 2009; Smith, 1999). To clarify whom this study examines, race is first presented as “a concept which signifies and symbolizes social conflicts and interests by referring to different types of human bodies. Although the concept of race invokes biologically based human characteristics (so-called “phenotypes”), the selection of these particular human features for purposes of racial signification is always and necessarily a social and historical process…. Race is a matter of both social structure and cultural representation” (Omi & Winant, 1994, p. 55-56). Racial formation processes have typically created racial groups as separate and monoracially-defined (Omi & Winant, 1994).

---

3 In particular, the question of whiteness in mixed racial ancestry has overlapped more for some racial groups than others at different points in time. Due to changing conceptions of Spanish heritage, Latina/os have wavered between white and non-white status after the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo in 1848 (Gomez, 2007). Black Americans with white and/or indigenous ancestry have typically been racialized as singularly black (Daniel, 2001; Davis, 1991). On the other hand, indigenous persons must prove their blood quantum to be classified as Native American (Smith, 1999). More recently, persons of diverse Near, Middle, and Far Eastern descent have been racialized as non-white, usually as Arab in light of the 9/11 terrorist attacks, although many are not Arab and all are counted as white in census and federal data collection. The question of whiteness has also affected Asian Americans, based on the myth that this diverse group is a homogeneous model minority. However, they are also subject to being viewed as perpetual foreigners despite fourth or fifth generation status for many (Nakanishi & Nishida, 1995).
In order to avoid reifying race in an essentialist sense (see Renn, 2004b), *multiracial* is defined here as referencing, pertaining to, or ascribing as the combination of two or more monoracially-constructed groups “understood in [one’s] day as … distinct races regardless of whether this intermixture stemmed from their parents’ generation or farther back” (Morning, 2005, p. 42). *Biracial* thus refers to only two racial groups. For study participants, I operationalize multiracial as acknowledging any combination of two or more of these groups in one’s ancestry: Arab American, Asian American, black, Latina/o, Native American, and white. Some of these groups are not federally recognized as “races,” but in social relations, all are racialized in that meaning is attached to each group, which informs social interaction (Omi & Winant, 1994). The terms *multiracial* and *mixed race* are used interchangeably; recognizing their limitations in light of the socially constructed nature of race, phrases such as *multiracially-identifying* are employed when possible. The term *multiraciality* encompasses multiracial identity, persons, groups, or phenomena in a broader sense.

**Relevant Research**

**Campus Racial Climate**

A conceptual framework for the campus racial climate provides a way of assessing the quality of the college environment to improve educational practice through research (Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pederson, & Allen, 1998, 1999). The framework situates the college environment within contemporary socio-historical and policy contexts and has five interacting dimensions. These dimensions include the historical legacy of inclusion and exclusion, the compositional diversity of the institution, the psychological dimension, the behavioral dimension (Hurtado et al., 1998, 1999), and the organizational dimension, which embeds privilege and oppression in institutional processes through curriculum, tenure policies, organizational decision-
making policies, budget allocations, and other policies (Milem, Chang, & Antonio, 2005). The
campus climate framework operates at both institutional and interpersonal levels; the historical,
compositional, and organizational are institutional-level dimensions, while the psychological and
behavioral are more interpersonal-level dimensions (Hurtado et al., 2012).

Campus climate research utilizing monoracially-constructed categories cluster around
students’ differential perceptions of the quality campus climate by racial group, negative reports
of prejudicial treatment and racist campus environments, and benefits associated with positive
campus climates that facilitate cross-racial engagement (Harper & Hurtado, 2007). Key themes
of a poor racial climate include institutional negligence and the pervasiveness of whiteness in
space, curricula, and activities, among others. In contrast, as Harper and Hurtado (2007) note,
when students engage across racial groups as an aspect of the behavioral dimension, some
positive outcomes include decreased interracial anxiety (Levin, van Laar, & Sinanius, 2003) and
less balkanization (Sáenz, Ngai, & Hurtado, 2007), which may decrease segregation trends after
college (Milem, Umbach, & Liang, 2004). Campus climate is also linked to key learning
outcomes for the twenty-first century such as habits of mind for life long learning, multicultural
competencies, and retention and achievement (Hurtado et al., 2012). However, less research
examines institutional-level climate dimensions (Hurtado et al., 2012), and how students with
multiple racial backgrounds are or are not accounted for is often unacknowledged.

Known campus climate studies on multiraciality in college find that students
acknowledging mixed racial ancestry can experience a negative climate (Guillermo-Wann, 2010,
Chapter III), highlighting aspects of the interpersonal-level dimensions. In one study,
multiracially-identifying students discuss negative experiences about being mixed race across
multiple climate dimensions, with some seeming to depict a more hostile climate than others
(Guillermo-Wann, 2010). Additionally, when multiracial quantitative data is aggregated as a group, students indicate higher mean levels of discrimination and bias as an aspect of the behavioral dimension than monoracially-classified Latina/o or white students (Guillermo-Wann, Chapter III; Hurtado, Ruiz, & Guillermo-Wann, 2012), and double minority multiracial students indicate higher levels than their peers indicating minority/white multiracial backgrounds (Guillermo-Wann, Chapter III). However, the campus climate measure in those studies was not singularly about race, and was illustrative of the behavioral dimension only. To address such gaps in emerging research, the current study explores how and why the racial climate might share similarities and also vary amongst multiracially-identifying college students, particularly with regard to elements of the organizational dimension.

**Multiracial Microaggressions and Monoracism**

The campus climate for students with mixed racial ancestry is made visible in Guillermo-Wann’s (2010) study through the manifestation of multiracial microaggressions, which are experiences and perceptions of monoracism that targets multiraciality across racial backgrounds and phenotypes (Johnston & Nadal, 2010). The term microaggression indicates racial aggression on the micro/interpersonal level, and does not signal that an act or interaction is slight or minimal in its degree of aggression; rather, they can have cumulative negative effects on mental health (Pierce, 1995; Solórzano, Ceja, & Yosso, 2000).

Two similar taxonomies detail multiracial microaggressions (Johnston & Nadal, 2010; Museus, Lambe, Robinson, Knepler, & Yee, 2009). Johnston and Nadal (2010) identify five overarching categories, each with sub-themes. The categories include: 1) exclusion or isolation based on having mixed racial ancestry; 2) exoticization and objectification, 3) assumption of monoracial or mistaken identity; 4) denial of multiracial reality in which one is restricted from
choosing their own racial identity; and 5) *pathologizing of identity and experiences*, wherein either is viewed as deviant from the norm. The taxonomy has been empirically validated, and reports of discrimination targeting respective monoracial identities also emerge (Guillermo-Wann, 2010; Nadal et al., 2011).

The nature of multiracial microaggressions suggests theoretically that there is relative privilege in belonging to a monoracially-constructed group, even if that is a category of color (Johnston & Nadal, 2010; Museus, et al., 2009). This unexpected form of privilege illuminates how multiraciality disrupts normalized monoracial notions of race and racism. Consequently, multiraciality challenges racial theory on power, privilege, and oppression while simultaneously highlighting that racism still exists and in the additional form of monoracism (Guillermo-Wann & Johnston, Chapter II; Johnston & Nadal, 2010). Monoracism often plays out around students’ racial identities through multiracial microaggressions. Additionally, some multiracial microaggressions occur on a structural or systemic level and may be invisible to the perpetrator or recipient (Johnston & Nadal, 2010); such *macroaggressions* are a focus of this analysis.

**Multiracial Identity**

Relatively recent multiracial identity theory (Renn, 2000, 2003, 2004a) conceptualizes multiracial identity in the college population from an ecological perspective and recognizes that mixed race college students identify racially in five patterns that are not mutually exclusive. These patterns include one monoracial identity, two or more monoracial identities, a multiracial identity, opting out of racial categorization, and/or identifying situationally (Renn, 2000, 2003, 2004a). Multiracial identity theory also suggests that these students may occupy very different spaces on campus based on the fluidity of peer culture on campus and how they identify.

**Theoretical Approach: An Integrative Model of Multiraciality**
The Integrative Model of Multiraciality (IMM) for campus climate addresses issues of race and racism in higher education contexts (Guillermo-Wann & Johnston, Chapter II). It builds upon perspectives from racial formation theory (Omi & Winant, 1994), critical race theory (e.g., Bell, 1980; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Solórzano, Ceja, & Yosso, 2000), multiracial identity theory (e.g., Renn, 2004a), and campus climate (Hurtado et al., 1998, 1999, 2012; Milem et al., 2005). In augmenting and connecting these theories, it integrates concepts of traditional racisms targeting monoracially-constructed groups with monoracism. The IMM draws upon an understanding of racism as:

A multi-faceted social phenomenon, with different levels and overlapping forms. It involves attitudes, actions, processes, and unequal power relations. It is based on the interpretations of the idea of ‘race,’ hierarchical social relations and the forms of discrimination that flow from this. Racism is not confined to extreme cases, but is present in a whole continuum of social relations. (Garner, 2010, p. 18)

This understanding of racism allows for multiple racisms that can encompass monoracism, and expose possible intersections of such racisms. The IMM contextualizes campus climate within broader socio-historical, policy, and local community contexts, and specifies that the external contexts are where racial formation takes place in which traditional racism and monoracism intertwine and that multiple racisms manifest in the campus climate (Guillermo-Wann & Johnston, Chapter II). In connecting multiple racisms to a multiracial climate, the IMM aims to strengthen alliances with monoracially-constructed communities to work towards the eradication of traditional racisms as well as monoracism.

Specifically, the IMM details processes hypothesized to inform the quality of racial climate for students in light of multiraciality (Guillermo-Wann & Johnston, Chapter II). Key
individual-level factors that influence the quality of campus climate through their role in students’ racial classification include racial ancestry, physical appearance, cultural knowledge and socioeconomic status (Guillermo-Wann & Johnston, Chapter II) – four components that play a crucial role in multiracial identity (Korgen, 2010; Renn, 2004a, 2008). Two additional factors can influence the level of importance of the individual factors in racial classification: interest convergence (Bell, 1980) and the fluidity of peer culture (Renn, 2004a, 2008), or group boundaries. To varying degrees, these components then inform racial classification, which acknowledges that the subsequent meaning attached to the ascribed race of one student may vary from another and across contexts (Guillermo-Wann & Johnston, Chapter II). Students may thus experience multiple and contradictory racial classifications in various circumstances, triggering multiracial microaggressions, monoracially-based microaggressions, monoracial and/or white privilege. Hence, the IMM can expose how multiple racisms can intersect through the campus racial climate for college students with various mixed racial ancestries and racial identities.

**Methodology**

Previous research suggests there is a general campus climate for multiracial college students as a group, and that there are also within-group differences in quality of experience. Therefore, this study asks: How do college students that acknowledge two or more racial backgrounds perceive the organizational dimension of campus racial climate?

**Site and Sample**

Data for this study were collected in 2010 at a public university in the western U.S. that has no racial group comprising a numerical majority. Keeping in mind that local contexts likely influence the campus climate (Hurtado et al., 2012), this region also has a larger multiracially-identifying population, which might create a context where race is not as salient for mixed race
persons (see Lee, 2008), and in which a campus climate may therefore be more neutral or positive for such students. The data consisted of fourteen semi-structured interviews with undergraduate students who affirmed they could “check” two or more of the categories Asian American, Arab American, black, Latina/o, Native American, and white. Given the wide variation of possible multiracial backgrounds, I employed unique case study to define each student as a single, unique case (Yin, 2009). Recruitment included indirect solicitation through email and flyers, as well as snowball sampling (Creswell, 2003), and a ten-dollar gift card incentive. Participants represented all of the solicited racial categories as well as Persian, and all five of Renn’s (2004a) multiracial identity patterns. Participants spanned socioeconomic backgrounds, class standings, choice of major, and included eleven women and three men, ages eighteen to twenty-five (Appendix A). None were involved in the campus’ multiracial student organization. The interview protocol probed students’ pre-college experiences, their articulation of what race is, racial identity, and college experiences around race (Appendix B). Thirteen interviews took place in person, one occurred via phone, and all were audio recorded and transcribed for analysis. Participants chose their own pseudonyms used in the findings.

Data Analysis

Data analysis followed a constant comparative method for both within case and cross case analyses. NVivo software was used to organize codes and themes throughout the analytic process. Within case analysis made use of a pattern of open and axial coding to generate and explore emergent themes (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). These emergent themes were then compared to extant research literature and refined to incorporate key interpretations from the knowledge base. Cross-case analysis revealed unique and common characteristics of students’ experiences (Yin, 2009). Important points of cross-case analysis included whether there were differences in
the racial climate in terms of students’ racial identity patterns (Renn, 2004a), racial ancestry, socioeconomic status, and whether they articulated having a sense of cultural knowledge reflective of the dominant white American culture.

**Validity and Reliability**

I used several approaches for triangulation to ensure internal validity, reliability, and transferability of the findings (Merriam, 2009; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). First, internal validity or credibility can be understood as the extent to which findings are credible in light of the data (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Because this study does not use multiple methods of data collection for triangulation, I used multiple theories to confirm emerging findings (Merriam, 2009) as combined in the IMM (Guillermo-Wann & Johnston, Chapter II). Additionally, previous analysis indicated saturation of the data (Guillermo-Wann, 2010). I continually engaged in reflexivity (Lincoln & Guba, 2000) and will address my positionality momentarily. Second, the reliability of the results, or dependability that the findings are consistent with the data (Lincoln & Guba, 1985), hinged upon these approaches to ensure internal validity throughout the analysis. Furthermore, I created an audit trail, in which I detailed “how the coding categories were derived, and how decisions were made throughout the inquiry” (Merriam, 2009, p. 223). An additional researcher also checked my coding scheme against the data. Third, to increase the external validation, or transferability of the findings to readers’ sites and situations (Lincoln & Guba, 1985), I pursued maximum variation in my sample (Merriam, 2009) by including multiracial participants with a range of racial ancestries and identity patterns, as well as year in school and socioeconomic status. I used rich, thick description (Maxwell, 2005) to paint a clear picture of students’ lives in the college environment.

**Researcher Positionality**
I assume there is a campus racial climate for multiracial students because I identify as multiracial, having Pilipino, Mexican, and white backgrounds. How participants perceive me racially may have impacted what they chose to share with me. My positionality could have influenced data analysis, as I was interested in documenting aspects of a negative racial climate to challenge colorblind and post-racial claims buoyed by multiraciality. I also kept in mind that my experience of racial climates as a student and educator at multiple institutions over the past two decades may have differed from participants’ experiences of their educational environment. In light of my positionality, I additionally sought disconfirming evidence (Patton, 2002).

**Limitations**

Although this study inserts multiracial students’ voices into the literature on campus racial climate, it has limitations. First, this study is a re-analysis of pre-existing data (Guillermo-Wann, 2010), although the development of the IMM warranted a re-analysis guided by the framework (Guillermo-Wann & Johnston, Chapter II). In this sense, this study is an effort toward greater trustworthiness and rigor. Second, none of the participants with Arab, Asian, or Persian ancestry identified strongly with corresponding groups on campus, whereas many black, Latina/o, and Native American participants were highly involved in their respective racial organizations. Implications must be restricted to like students in comparable contexts. Even so, similarities and differences become visible in the campus climate for multiracial students.

**Findings**

Multiracial students’ narratives of the organizational dimension of campus climate at their university converge among common multiracial microaggressions, and diverge along narratives around traditional forms of racism and privilege often associated with monoracially-based experiences. Participants’ accounts are not devoid of race, racism, or monoracism, nor do
they indicate a neutral racial climate as would be expected if race and racism were no longer significant in the U.S. Rather, similarities and differences reveal students’ navigation of a complex environment as it pertains to multiraciality. Within this campus context, individual characteristics such as racial ancestry and identity, socioeconomic status, and white cultural knowledge bear out how the racial climate varies as hypothesized by the IMM (Guillermo-Wann & Johnston, Chapter II).

The findings span three themes, the first two with multiple sub-themes. First, I highlight commonalities of a negative campus climate in the form of multiracial microaggressions. I focus on four of Johnston and Nadal’s (2010) themes that offer prominent examples of the organizational dimension of the racial climate. Second, cross-case analysis begins to show racial climate also differs within this sample along monoracially-based experiences. Half of the participants offer a positive overall evaluation of the campus climate, and half conclude there is a negative racial climate, with a few recognizing both aspects. Third, I draw attention to positive niches within the organizational dimension of campus climate (specifically curriculum, services, and student organizations), regardless of participants’ overall conclusions of the campus climate quality. Together, these three themes illuminate nuances within the organizational dimension of campus climate for multiraciality.

A Converging Campus Climate: Multiracial Microaggressions and Monoracism

“A… I’ve felt marginalized as a Latina person, or woman, before, but literally the past few months I’ve felt more marginalized as a multiracial person.” – Theresa, Latina and white

**Exclusion or isolation: endorsement of a monoracial society and norms.** Mixed race students can be excluded from general conceptions of race, which endorses monoracial norms (Johnston & Nadal, 2010). This often occurs when people are restricted to select only one racial
category in data collection forms (Johnston & Nadal, 2010). While endorsement of monoracial norms can be intentional, it is often unconscious, and reflects the broader social assumption of races as distinct categories of people, and the relative invisibility of multiraciality. Rose, who identifies as mixed, black, and Latina succinctly states, “I haven’t really thought much about Public University in terms of multiracial people. It’s just mostly minorities or not.” Her candid reflection demonstrates the prevalence of monoracial norms on campus, and a division between students of color and white students that presumes membership in a single group.

Theresa, who identifies situationally as biracial, as a student of color, and as Latina, vividly illustrates the endorsement of monoracial norms through curriculum. She recalls,

In interracial dynamics class if we’re talking about race or something, I’ll make a comment about how the course reader has nothing about biracial/multiracial people or history or just like experience or anything … I couldn’t find it, that I don’t … again, it’s not recognized and I just felt uncomfortable with the fact that like … you know, everyone gets a blurb in the history book, right. Sadly it might be only a paragraph on the Civil Rights Movement, but it is there, right, or like the Chicano/Chicana Movement is there, but like the fact that it’s just … it’s absent, it’s not talked about … and just I would say lived experience is just how I get my information because there’s no … I feel like there’s no other way to get it, it doesn’t really exist formalized, right. There’s no multiracial studies at Public University, studies program, right…. I was like, ‘Wait a minute. We don’t have our own like … yeah, we come from these different communities, but we don’t have our own study or department or center or something. That’s not OK.’

That multiraciality is overlooked or excluded from curriculum intended to address racial matters bothers her greatly, as she expresses that she knows that mixed race people have played critical
roles in social movements, and have been subjected to racism and mistreatment. She knows monoracially-constructed communities of color have and are necessarily fighting to include those histories and scholars in the curriculum “canon.” However, in attempts to educate and examine race, multiracial histories are often excluded from the knowledge base, which is part of the organizational dimension of campus climate that can structurally privilege or marginalize groups of people. The exclusion of multiraciality from curriculum in this case has the effect of endorsing a monoracial society and monoracial norms, even in potentially inclusive spaces.

**Exoticization or objectification: the racialized ideal.** In contrast, multiraciality can be exoticized as the racialized ideal of a post-racial society (Johnston & Nadal, 2010); this occurs in a curricular context where it makes a seemingly rare appearance in the curriculum. Nadia illustrates how curricular presentation of multiraciality as a racialized ideal can be unquestioningly internalized, particularly because it rests upon the reality of coming from two different groups; the meaning attached to that, however, is the exoticization. Nadia, who is Guatemalan and Egyptian, identifies situationally as Latina and black, or biracial, says, “I forget where I was learning about this – oh, in my lab class, so I think that it makes sense. It can really be a good thing. I think being mixed race is amazing because it really opens you up to learning about so many different things and you can learn from different perspectives and I really love that about being from different cultures.” Other students talk more unquestioningly about being a bridge between their respective racial groups in class discussions about race as well, because of their ancestry. This is not to negate healthy positive affect regarding mixed race, but essentializing that learning or bridge building is innate to multiraciality exoticizes it.

**Assumption of a monoracial or mistaken racial identity.** Unfortunately, assumptions can also be made that multiracial persons are members of only one racial group, or they are
mistaken as a member of a racial group with which they do not identify (Johnston & Nadal, 2010). This often takes the form of racial jokes being made in their presence because they are assumed not to be part of that group (Johnston & Nadal, 2010). Somewhat similarly, a faculty member at Public University insensitively lectures about name changing amongst Iranian Americans, not realizing that Courtney, or possibly anyone else in class, belongs to that group. Courtney, whose Jewish Persian and Chinese heritages are important to her vents,

It kind of bothered me the way he said it…. He was like, ‘This name, ASS-l. Who wants to come here and be named ASS-l, that’s going to suck,’ and I really wanted to raise my hand and say, ‘Actually you know, that name’s not pronounced ASS-l, it’s Ah-SAHL….’ That really bothered me that day … I probably should have said something thinking back because it actually does make me very upset the way … he said it so lightly and almost jokingly…. That really bothered me because he’s almost playing into the whole thing, ‘So you’re saying people should change their name because you’re making fun of the name yourself,’ you know. So that day, oh, that day really bothered me….

Interestingly, Courtney also talks about how other students in class have been tokenized because of their perceived race. That she was not singled out spares her of that experience, but also shows that not only does the professor inaccurately and condescendingly address racial issues in class, he also assumes she is not part of the group he is lecturing about. She is invisible to him as a Persian American; he assumes some other racial identity. That the topic of name changing is in the curriculum could be a positive aspect of the organizational dimension of campus climate, but behaviorally how it is pedagogically approached in class triggers this microaggression of a mistaken identity, showcasing Courtney’s invisibility as a Persian American student in class.
Denial of multiracial reality. Finally, multiracial persons are denied a multiracial reality when others restrict them from choosing their own racial identity, often when they are already aware that the person has mixed racial ancestry (Johnston & Nadal, 2010). An illustration of how this occurs in the organizational dimension of campus climate is seen in the institutionalization of monoracial conceptions of race in campus systems.

Katie reflects on how racial data collection on her application for admission to the university differed from how it is used. The difference between racial identity, ancestry, or classification (see Johnston, Ozaki, Pizzolato, & Chaudhari, 2009) for data collection and usage is not clearly delineated, and likely adds to her frustration. Katie racially identifies as Hapa\(^4\), and demonstrates a positive affect towards that identity. Given that a Hapa identity was not an option on the application forms presumably asking for ancestry, she marked both white and Chinese, only to have the institution re-classify her as Chinese:

> They messed up on my race … they put me down as just one and that kind of bothers me, … I don’t identify with just one…. I checked both boxes for the application process and then somehow it just has me listed as one…. They just put me at Chinese and I don’t think that they should automatically put me as the minority one. I think they should have just put ‘other’ or ‘multiracial’ … I didn’t know how they’d categorize me, but it’s kind of annoying because I don’t see myself in that way, so it’s like just put me as ‘other.’

Organizationally, the psychological conceptualization of race as a singular monoracial construct has been institutionalized in data usage, which denies Katie a multiracial reality. She had already told the university she has more than one racial ancestry when given that option, but is not allowed both designations in campus systems. While singular monoracial identification

\(^4\) Previously a derogatory term for persons of mixed indigenous Hawaiian and white ancestry; now a common term for persons with Asian and any other ancestry (e.g. Fullbeck, 2006). Hapa has been a contested term in its’ mainland use for California Hapas, particularly in college organizing (Taniguchi & Heidenreich, 2005).
would be congruent with some multiracial student’s racial identity, many exhibit other identity patterns (Renn, 2004a). In this case, Katie has developed a multiracial identity, but indicates two monoracial categories on the admission forms given the racial classification options, only for the institution to then reduce that to a single monoracial classification.

Overall, aspects of the organizational dimension of campus climate for multiraciality converge in students’ common experiences of multiracial microaggressions, although the content and severity at times also diverge around respective monoracially-constructed ancestries and racial classifications. In most cases, the relative importance of individual characteristics and group boundaries differs in students’ racial classification, and the microaggression is triggered by a direct or indirect classification that is not congruent with their racial identity as suggested by the IMM. These microaggressions play out in the organizational dimension of the racial climate as exclusion via the endorsement of monoracial norms, exoticization as a racialized ideal, the assumption of a monoracial or mistaken racial identity, and in the denial of a multiracial reality. The findings indicate a negative climate for multiraciality in the organizational dimension.

Divergent Quality of Campus Climate: Traditional Racisms and Privilege

Students’ experiences of campus climate also diverge around traditional racisms and privilege, as they generally offer either positive or negative climate conclusions overall, with three balancing both perspectives. Cross case analysis reveals that students’ quality of campus climate at this site differs not only based on how they identify with their racial ancestries, but also by level of white cultural knowledge alluded to in their interview, and socioeconomic status based on family income, parental education levels, and home ownership. No commonalities emerge along racial identity patterns, despite being a topic of the multiracial microaggressions. Table 3-1 shows the individual characteristics for each participant and their overall assessment of
the campus climate. Generally speaking, students with both Asian American/Pacific Islander (AAPI) and white racial ancestries that do not strongly identify with AAPI groups on campus, have higher socioeconomic status, and high levels of white cultural knowledge, tend to conclude that there is a positive racial climate at Public University. On the other hand, students who attest to a more negative campus climate tend to have and identify publicly with their black, Native, and Latina/o ancestry even if they also have white ancestry, indicate mid to low socioeconomic status, and medium or low white cultural knowledge. These patterns suggest that traditional racisms are also at work, as multiracial students who identify with underrepresented racial groups are more likely to report such experiences. Such differential perceptions by racial group indicate perceptions of a negative racial climate (Harper & Hurtado, 2007).

Table 3-1

Multiracial College Students’ Overall Conclusions about the Quality of Campus Climate, by Individual Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Racial Ancestry</th>
<th>SES</th>
<th>White Cultural Knowledge</th>
<th>Climate Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>Latino/white</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>AAPI/Latina</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtney</td>
<td>AAPI/Persian</td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-Roc</td>
<td>AAPI/Native/white</td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie</td>
<td>AAPI/white</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kara</td>
<td>AAPI/white</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>AAPI/white</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Lynn</td>
<td>AAPI/black</td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>Med</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nadia</td>
<td>Arab/black/Latina</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wi</td>
<td>Arab/Native</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>black/Latina</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Med</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica</td>
<td>black/Latina/white</td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audrey</td>
<td>black/Latina/white</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Med</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theresa</td>
<td>Latina/white</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Med</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A positive campus climate that is diverse and welcoming, despite an abundance of AAPI model minority stereotypes. When asked about their overall impressions of Public
University, half responded that they primarily experience a positive campus climate that is open and safe, particularly in comparison to high school or other regions of the country. Intriguingly, they arrive at positive conclusions despite recounting multiracial microaggressions and monoracial stereotypes. In addition, most of these students also see the campus as compositionally diverse, which factors into their positive evaluation of the university. Michelle, who has Chinese and Guatemalan ancestry, shares, “as a whole I feel like Public University is a very accepting community to be in, just because there's so many of us [college students] and so many walks of life.” Courtney adds,

I think it’s a very welcoming safe space…. Seeing all the races here, it feels very normal…. Here I think it’s very, very welcoming and apparent that there’s different cultures on campus … so I think it’s a very safe space to express your culture.

Interestingly, Michelle and Courtney are the only two students with double minority ancestry and strong cultural attachment to both of their heritages who espouse a positive view of campus climate. However, neither engages publicly in those communities on campus but rather each has predominantly white social circles. That is, having higher levels of white cultural knowledge and socioeconomic statuses seem to be key factors in perceiving a positive racial climate.

The remaining participants with an overall positive perspective are multiracial AAPI/white, with the exception of Sam who is mixed Latino/white and identifies solely as white, and do not identify strongly as AAPI or with such groups on campus. However, that is not to say there is a positive racial climate for monoracially- or multiracially-identifying AAPI students despite their higher representation on campus as Harper and Hurtado (2007) conclude. Rather, most participants mention monoracially-framed AAPI stereotypes that permeate the campus, but with few exceptions, they do not seem to inform these students’ overall campus climate views.
Kara, who has Chinese and white ancestry but situationally identifies only as Hapa or opts out of identifying racially, shows AAPI stereotypes play out in her deliberation of how she may have been racially classified in admissions:

If I had to put down my race on the SAT or something, I probably would have put white because especially going to Public University, it’s very Asian, so I feel like … I don’t know if Asians are discriminated against here or anything because obviously you’re not the minority anymore, but there’s just so much … like I don’t know if they want another Asian that has high scores, you know? I think they look at it differently because they expect different things out of Asians than they do out of whites.

Kara illustrates a very sensitive subject within monoracially-constructed groups regarding multiracial students’ fluidity of identity or selection of racial ancestry based on perceived benefits. How racial classification occurs in the organizational dimension here is similar to Katie’s multiracial microaggression that denies her a multiracial reality, but plays into AAPI stereotypes; surprisingly, neither seems to sway them from drawing positive climate conclusions.

A negative campus climate that “needs a lot of work.” In contrast, seven participants hold critical views of the university as needing “work,” a phrase used by several in their interviews, and in which two sub-themes emerge. Although students are divided as to whether or not the campus is compositionally diverse, they generally paint a picture of 1) institutional negligence of underrepresented racial groups and 2) pervasiveness of whiteness on campus, which are additional markers of a hostile racial climate (Harper & Hurtado, 2007). Many of the students link societal and systemic issues to the problems they observe as well.

Institutional negligence - “we shouldn’t have had to ask for these things.” Much different than an attitude of entitlement, Harper and Hurtado (2007) also identify the theme of
institutional negligence as an indicator of a hostile racial climate; it is the most prominent theme in the data regarding a negative organizational dimension of campus climate. While Harper and Hurtado (2007) find that institutional negligence has more to do with a lack of guidance on how to interact across race about racism, students here describe negligence regarding equity issues that are overlooked until they raise concerns to the administration. Nadia summarizes, “It’s kind of like, ‘Well, we have to work together because there are so few of us. We have to work together because if we don’t do it, who’s going to do it for us?’” Similarly, Wi, who identifies solely as Native American, thinks the administration “react[s] to pressure and they don’t want Public University to look bad at all, so … and I guess we have the power to make it look bad…. I mean, I don’t know, they don’t have any internal want to help us.” Another student more readily details institutional negligence as it relates to a black student organization.

Jennifer Lynn, who identifies as both Asian and black chooses to be active in a black student organization on campus due to comparative underrepresentation on campus. She prefaced her quote “we shouldn’t have had to ask for these things” by talking about ongoing police presence at black student organization events on campus and other concerns their organization communicated to the chancellor:

We find that every [day] that we’re out there there’s a police car in front of the plaza, so that was one of our concerns…. We were kind of … working with [the university police department] because [it] is kind of a separate entity from the administration, so yeah, we’re trying to work with [them] about diversity training and things like that.

Other concerns the black student organization raised include that racial harassment is not emphasized as problematic compared to sexual harassment. Accordingly, they want more emphasis on racial harassment during orientation and better visibility for the racial bias reporting
website, which was instituted as a result of several incidents on other campuses in the same system. The group also desires changes in the orientation tour that in Jennifer Lynn’s words would “include more cultural things and not just about African American students, about all students. Just about the events that happen on this campus, even the recent ones like the protests with the [board of trustees]. I don’t know, anything that can tell more cultural history about the campus.” In addition, the black student organization raised concerns about admissions, budget cuts to critical summer bridge programs serving low-income, first generation students who are primarily students of color, as well as tentative plans the university has entertained about closing the African American studies department. That such racial matters are neglected unless students speak up suggests that the organizational dimension of campus climate is unresponsive and not attuned to diversity.

**Pervasiveness of whiteness.** Another common theme within participants’ negative accounts of the racial climate is the pervasiveness of whiteness on campus (Harper & Hurtado, 2007). Eric’s example highlights the systemic nature of white privilege and how that plays out in the compositional diversity of faculty, as in many universities, which may be indicative of aspects of the organizational dimension such as recruitment, hiring, and tenure policies. That the pervasiveness of whiteness is picked up on by a multiracial AAPI student with white ancestry, high levels of white cultural knowledge, and high socioeconomic status may be surprising to some given common assumptions that multiracial AAPI/white students may be more like honorary whites. Eric reflects,

Is there still racism on campus? Yes. There are still ways in which races have privileges on campus. I mean, one of the things we talked about in my interracial dynamics class was kind of this plantation system and how our universities still represent one white
chancellor supported by white people to train white children supported by minorities who work and the maintenance and stuff like that. I mean, if you look around campus, there are … you know, as far as the racial relations, I think you look at organizations and who’s teaching you and stuff like that to just kind of at least subconsciously see who should … who’s supposed to be in charge. This is a model … if school is supposed to prepare you for life, then this in theory should be a model for what life looks like…. I walk around campus and I look at the boards of who’s the chair of the department. I mean, they put up these signs of who’s the chair of the department … and they had a board of the chairs … of the [science] building and I was looking at it. It was like, ‘Oh, there’s their chair,’ or something like that, and it was a woman and then I kept looking, I was like, ‘Oh, and all seventeen other of them are white men,’ and it’s … as far as ascension into the higher ranking offices around Public University, I don’t know that I would give them a great scorecard on race, but that also has factors reaching down to who’s even getting to college, who’s getting through college, who’s coming back for degrees? I mean, it’s not [as if] Public University has this master plan where only white males will be in the office, but there’s at least societal dynamics that are building it up, that have contributed to that being the case, and as far as if you’re looking for role-models and you’re looking to, ‘Well, maybe I want to be a professor,’ and all your professors have been white males, it’s kind of a little disconcerting.

Although Eric draws overall positive conclusions about his own experience, he offers a mixed review of campus climate in which his observation exemplifies the pervasiveness of whiteness on campus as a negative aspect. Eric credits the presence of such topics in the curriculum as having helped him recognize, articulate, and understand white privilege.
Positive Niches within the Organizational Dimension of Campus Climate

Participants allude to positive organizational practices regardless of their overall perceptions, but that they occur in isolated niches. Students refer to courses, services, and student organizations that pro-actively help them learn about race, oppression, and address equity issues for monoracially-defined groups. Michelle says,

I took a social psychology class, and it was interesting, because we talked about race and how people are more primed towards pleasant stereotypes and associate that with a white race, not necessarily race, but white the word, and that plays into race and ethnicity, as well as it does a color, versus something that's a bad idea and the idea of the word black whether it's color or race, and um so that is very very interesting. We did a [sic] experiment in class and it was quite interesting.

Similarly, Theresa summarizes, “I’ve also learned a lot about my identity as … like my Latino side that I hadn’t explored before college very much. Here, taking Chicano/Chicana Studies, being in MEChA, just embracing it more and having the opportunity to embrace it.” Students who hold opposite perceptions of the campus climate both affirm positive aspects of the organizational dimension such as diverse curriculum and funded programs for underrepresented students that address matters of race, racial identity, and oppression.

Discussion

Amidst a period when the post-civil rights multiracial population has been misused to suggest that race no longer matters, or that racism has ceased to exist, this study of campus climate for multiracial college students provides evidence that race and multiple racisms continue to be significant in the lives of this generation. In particular, the campus climate for multiraciality converges around manifestations of monoracism, or multiracial microaggressions,
and also diverges as students experience traditional forms of privilege as well as racism targeting monoracially-constructed groups. That students experience multiple racisms, and that these lead to variation in the quality of their climate experience, begins to affirm the IMM framework with regard to the intersection of racial oppressions in the campus climate (Guillermo-Wann & Johnston, Chapter II). Specifically, students’ publicly expressed racial identities, socioeconomic status, and levels of white cultural knowledge are key individual-level characteristics that inform how and why the quality of climate diverges within this group of multiracial students as outlined by the IMM. In addition, the focus on the organizational dimension of campus climate provides educators with tangible examples of how institutions can pro-actively improve the campus climate on a structural level; although complex, these include a curriculum inclusive of multiraciality, representation in hiring practices and administration, institutional support for student racial organizations, and allowing for multiple racial categories in campus data systems. This discussion focuses first on multiracial microaggressions, and second on monoracially-based issues. Research must further connect multiracial topics to the broader movement to end all forms of racial oppression in higher education and U.S. society.

First, the purpose of highlighting multiracial microaggressions in this study is to both document a campus climate for multiraciality, and to welcome monoracially-constructed communities into a discussion about how we may partner in improving campus climate for these students in a way that also supports monoracially-identifying peers and groups. For example, Courtney’s case of Iranian American name changing in the curriculum highlights how the assumption of monoracial and mistaken racial identities can marginalize any student with that background. While it may be challenging to identify some mixed race students’ identities based on physical appearance, educators can also take more care to respectfully address all racial issues.
in class without tokenizing students nor exoticizing multiraciality, as in Nadia’s curricular example. Integrating and including multiraciality in curricula, as Theresa desires, must be done critically and inclusively to avoid exclusion via maintaining monoracial norms. In particular, the tenuous legitimization of multiraciality as a racialized ideal through curriculum and discussion, as organizational and behavioral dimensions of the racial climate, uncritically overlooks political origins of such exoticizations. That is, liberal heralding of a post-racial era upholds the present day multiracial population as bridge-builders between racial groups as an end to racism, but multiraciality has also been feared by civil-rights groups because neo-conservative agendas point to interracial mixture as evidence for the irrelevancy of race (Morning, 2005). Both perspectives essentialize race, but their implications differ significantly because they attach very different meanings to multiraciality. It is in this sense that multiraciality is undergoing a contested rearticulation of meaning in the current socio-historical era (Brunsma, 2006). When multiraciality is included in curriculum as a positive aspect of the organizational dimension of campus climate, it must not perpetuate its exoticization or objectification, but rather foster critical thinking about larger racial and societal implications.

Additionally, multiple race data collection taps directly into monoracially-framed concerns about how students will be counted, and may have bearing on civil rights legislation at the federal level (Renn & Lunceford, 2004), or even how resources may be allocated at an institutional level (Spencer, 2010). Katie’s desire for a multiracial box differs from the stance the multiracial movement pursued for the Census 2000 in partnership with monoracial organizations, which advocated for checking more than one box but not having a multiracial box (Spencer, 2010). In Katie’s case, ancestry (Asian and white) indistinguishably conflates with identity (multiracial), but the inability to have at least both designations in campus data systems
results in the denial of multiracial reality. How demographic prompts and questions are worded in data collection and reporting is important for institutions and researchers to consider, and is not an easy topic to address given the political contention around U.S. Census racial data collection and reporting. Renn (2004a) recommends that survey forms first ask racial ancestry, and then racial identity, with both having the option to mark multiple categories and the latter including a multiracial category. In highlighting here shared multiracial microaggressions in the organizational dimension of campus climate, the goal is to bring awareness and develop ally relationships amongst communities to better support all students and racial groups, and to pursue inclusive organizational change.

Second, multiracial college students’ campus climates also diverge around monoracial constructions of race, stressing that these students navigate a complex racial climate. Students’ overall conceptualizations of the racial climate differ according to their racial ancestry and how strongly they identify with underrepresented groups of color on campus, their socioeconomic status, and level of white cultural knowledge. These in turn inform their racial classification, which leads to perceptions of the quality of the racial climate (Guillermo-Wann & Johnston, Chapter II).

Although half of the students conclude that Public University has a positive campus climate overall, they too detail multiracial and monoracial microaggressions. However, that these go unnoticed, are brushed off, or internalized when they encompass positive associations with their racial groups and identities is of concern. In particular, that the majority of AAPI stereotypes reflect the model minority myth, or that students like Kara think Asian Americans might be discriminated against based on such myths, is concerning. Some of the students internalize or perpetuate the positive associations, which seem to bolster their views of a positive
campus overall, even if they are critically conscious of them. Students also recount stereotypes about groups they do not identify with such as Latina/os and African Americans, which do not seem to alter their overall conclusions that the campus is a welcoming safe space. The prevalence of monoracial stereotypes is also a theme resonant in negative campus climates as identified by Harper and Hurtado (2007), but that these students tend not to critique “positive” stereotypes about groups they belong to, or negative stereotypes about groups with which they do not identify, seems to lead to general perceptions of a welcoming campus climate.

Half of the participants conclude that there is a negative racial climate overall, which is informed by their poor quality of experience despite some positive organizational niches. Student concerns regarding admissions policy, institutional financial decisions and priorities, diversity training of campus police, online architecture for bias reporting, orientation curriculum, and re-telling of university history through campus tours signal institutional neglect to racial matters through the organizational dimension of campus climate. These multiracial students’ accounts highlight how they experience race and racism as it targets monoracially-constructed groups. Additionally, their leadership in monoracially-based organizations also attests to their value to their respective communities of color and that multiracial students can be powerful change agents aligned with such concerns that affect them as well.

In sum, this study affirms that race still affects individuals’ and groups’ lived experience of racism in organizational structures in college. That the campus climate converges around multiraciality and diverges around conventional monoracial constructions of race for these students shows the intersection of monoracism with traditional racisms as suggested by the IMM (Guillermo-Wann & Johnston, Chapter II). This research thus informs how educators might consider improving the campus racial climate for all students in light of multiraciality.
Implications and Conclusion

This study offers a number of implications for educational practice and research to improve the campus racial climate for all students. The findings underscore that educators can pro-actively play a role in improving the campus racial climate for these students in addition to monoracially-identified groups, particularly through making change in the organizational dimension of campus climate.

This research suggests three prominent implications for practice. First, given that this study was conducted at a single site, it is important that educators assess the campus racial climate for multiracial students at their own institutions to determine site-specific needs and areas of success. However, because this study verifies and confirms the taxonomy of multiracial microaggressions based in the literature (e.g., Johnston & Nadal, 2010), educators may increase their awareness of multiracial students, identity patterns, and the negative experiences they may have around identity in the form of multiracial microaggressions as a first step towards improving campus climate for these students. This could be accomplished systematically through staff training. Second, as educators, we can evaluate our own conceptualizations of race for potential bias and preference for dominant monoracially-constructed categorizations and incorporate reflection on racial formation into programming and advising for student organizations, orientation programs, curriculum, pedagogy, and other spaces where race is already a topic being explored with students. Student affairs professionals can encourage students to invite peers from perceptibly different racial groups to events open to the campus, and to not exclude mixed race students from events explicitly designed to be safe spaces, should they attend. In doing so, it is important to strengthen allies and memberships within monoracially-constructed communities to support all students, as well as support and better
understand political concerns around multiraciality within such communities. Third, racial identity and critical consciousness of racial matters seem to be important factors in students’ assessments of the racial climate. Rather than avoid racial identity development or consciousness-raising educational activities, which would only perpetuate a hostile racial climate that would go unrecognized, effectively addressing matters of race and racism would improve the campus climate in at both institutional and interpersonal levels. Administrators, student affairs practitioners, and faculty occupy powerful roles to pro-actively improve campus climate for multiracial students, particularly through change in the organizational dimension (e.g. hiring, curriculum, data systems, resource allocation, and rewards).

This study also has two immediate implications for future research, which must continue to explicitly connect broader multiracial research to campus climate. First, further research should seek to explicitly validate campus climate processes hypothesized by the IMM (Guillermo-Wann & Johnston, Chapter II), particularly regarding racial classification and peer group fluidity in the interpersonal dimensions of campus climate. Specifically, it ought to consider how multiraciality plays out within monoracially-constructed communities of color on campus, and how multiracial students are or are not welcome as group members in those spaces, and why. Although difficult, such an analysis would help broach the sensitive topic of racial intermixture and privilege within racial groups. It might also help examine multiracial identity formation within campus climate as context. Second, research on the organizational dimension of campus climate might use document analysis, observation, and site visits including focus groups with staff, faculty, and administration to further expose the various ways race is constructed and deployed through campus policies and practices. Doing so would advance understanding of how educators might improve campus climate for all students, and further show
how these matters affect multiracially-identifying students despite assumptions that they may be exempt from traditional forms of racial oppression.

In closing, as research continues to help improve campus racial climates in college, it is important to keep a sometimes invisible and heterogeneous multiracial population in mind. As posited in the IMM framework (Guillermo-Wann & Johnston, Chapter II), practice and research on multiraciality more broadly must also be intentional about connecting to larger narratives of challenging racial injustice to build alliances with monoracially-focused initiatives, and more clearly rearticulate a meaning of multiraciality as standing in solidarity against all racial oppression.
Appendix A: Student Demographic Data Form

Age: ______ Gender: ______ Major, if decided: _______________________

Class standing at [campus]: (mark one) Freshman Sophomore Junior Senior

Number of Years as a student at [campus]: (mark one) 1 2 3 4 5 6+

How do you identify racially and/or ethnically?

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

Please answer the following regarding your biological parents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent 1</th>
<th>Parent 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender: __________________________</td>
<td>Gender: __________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity: __________________</td>
<td>Race/Ethnicity: __________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Level: (mark one)</td>
<td>Education Level: (mark one)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Grammar school or less</td>
<td>□ Grammar school or less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Some high school</td>
<td>□ Some high school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ High school graduate</td>
<td>□ High school graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Postsecondary school other than college</td>
<td>□ Postsecondary school other than college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Some college</td>
<td>□ Some college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ College degree</td>
<td>□ College degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Some graduate school</td>
<td>□ Some graduate school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Graduate degree</td>
<td>□ Graduate degree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Owns a home: □ yes □ no Owns a home: □ yes □ no

Marital Status: (mark one) Marital Status: (mark one)
| □ Single □ Married | □ Single □ Married |
| □ Divorced □ Remarried | □ Divorced □ Remarried |
| □ Widowed | □ Widowed |

Who comprised your household when growing up? (e.g. both biological parents, step parent, grandparent, split custody, siblings, etc.) ________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

What was the annual income of the household you grew up in: ______________________

Please choose a pseudonym: ____________________________
Appendix B: Interview Protocol

Thank you for participating in this study. The purpose of this study is to understand the experiences of mixed race students in college. Before we begin, I want to make sure you have time to read and sign a consent form to participate in this research, as well as permission to audio-record this interview. You are welcome to ask any questions before doing so. Also, before we begin the interview, please take a moment to fill out this demographic information sheet. At the bottom, please choose a pseudonym that you would like me to use in any writing that may result from this interview to maintain your anonymity. Thank you, and we can now move into some questions.

1. You indicated how you identify racially on the demographic form. Tell me more about why you identify the way you do. How important is your racial identity to you?

2. Can you share more about who raised you and what you learned about race growing up? What does “race” mean to you now? To what extent does race influence your daily life?

3. How would you describe [institution name] in light of race?
   a. How do you feel in different places on campus? Why? Tell me about the racial composition of these places. Probe residence, classrooms, major, social activities, etc.
   b. Are there particular circumstances where your race is brought up? If so, we will talk about that in a moment. (Question 4)
   c. Are you part of any racial or ethnic organizations on campus? Can you tell me about your involvement? Why did you choose to participate or not?
   d. How would you describe racial relations on campus?
   e. What kinds of attitudes do people have about race? About mixed race?

4. Can you think of any experiences you have had that were about race at [institution name]? If so, please describe. Probe own experiences, others experiences, campus media, etc.
   a. How did you feel about it? What about it made it feel that way?
   b. Did this experience tell you something about [institution name]? If so, what?
   c. Have you had any experiences that were different? Can you explain?

5. Have you felt that your physical appearance has affected your experience of race on campus? If yes, how so? If no, can you share with me what makes you think not?

6. Please share with me of one thing you are proud of in terms of your race and/or how you have responded to these experiences.

7. Is there anything else you would like to share or clarify?
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CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

Context and Objective of the Study

Multiracially-identifying Americans are likely to shift the demographics of institutions of higher education (Renn, 2009), as U.S. Census 2000 and 2010 data signal generational increases in the population that now indicate two or more racial categories (Lopez, 2003; Renn & Lunceford, 2004; U.S. Census, 2010). Greater proportions of younger Americans who indicate multiple racial backgrounds, regardless of the generation of such “mixing,”\(^5\) pose challenges to how colleges and universities conceptualize race, define diversity, address racism, and strive towards creating more inclusive campus climates for diversity. As racial incidents and inequitable outcomes persist at college campuses across the nation, research continues to document hostile campus climates as well as the educational benefits of cross-racial interaction (Hurtado, Alvarez, Guillermo-Wann, Cuellar, & Arellano, 2012), with many institutions making serious efforts to improve racial dynamics on interpersonal and structural levels. However, most research on campus racial climate considers monoracially-constructed groups, generally overlooking multiracially-identifying students and how they experience campus climates (e.g. Milem, Change & Antonio, 2005; Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pederson, & Allen, 1998, 1999; for a recent exception, see Hurtado, Alvarez et al., 2012). At the same time that this expanding population has been ignored in campus climate research, neo-conservative and liberal politics have pounced on its perceived growth to support claims about the declining significance of race, triggering much anxiety amongst civil rights constituents in particular (Daniel & Castañeda-

\(^5\) The multiracially-identifying population can encompasses individuals who are not first-generation mixed race, as many monoracially-constructed groups have mixed racial ancestry from periods of colonization and slavery (e.g. black Americans, Native Americans, and Latina/os; Daniel, 2001; Gomez, 2007; Smith, 1999), and the time that has passed since anti-miscegenation laws were overturned in 1967 (Loving v. Virginia) has allowed for multiple generations of racial intermixture in the post-civil rights era.
Liles, 2006; Elam, 2011; Morning, 2005). Subsequently, the lack of campus climate research addressing multiraciality, meaning all multiracial phenomena such as identity, persons, and scholarship (e.g. Morning, 2005), limits the potential valuing of complex racial histories and multiracial students as important agents for improving campus climate and advancing social justice education.

Consequently, the objective of this research was to begin to examine campus climate for diversity for multiracial college students. Three distinct but interrelated studies constitute this dissertation, and start to fill a gap in the campus climate literature on racial theory, racial classification, and multiracial perceptions of racism in college. Specifically, the first study (Chapter II) assessed the adequacy of extant racial theory and frameworks to develop an Integrative Model of Multiraciality (IMM) that connects multiple racisms to campus climate, identifies campus climate as a context for student development and learning, and details proximal climate processes of racial classification and subsequent racialization. It reflects a collaborative effort with my co-author, Marc P. Johnston. The IMM was then applied to two empirical studies in the following chapters. In a quantitative study (Chapter III), I explored how racially classifying college students who mark two-or-more racial categories changes racial groups’ representations of experiencing discrimination and bias at an interpersonal level. This was followed by a qualitative study (Chapter IV) in which I analyzed interview data from fourteen multiracial undergraduates on a single campus to examine their perceptions of racism in institutional-level structures and systems. Each of the three studies on multiraciality explicitly aligns itself to the broader societal struggle to end all racial oppression, and aims to make a contribution through higher education scholarship.

**Contributions of the Research**
This research makes several important contributions at the nexus of multiraciality, racism, and campus climate for diversity in college, extending our knowledge in each direction. First, higher education literature typically lacks an integration of theory on race and racism, demonstrated recently in an empirical study (Harper, 2012), which is a gap this research aimed to fill. Chapter II developed the IMM to examine and address multiraciality and multiple racisms in the campus climate as a context for student development and learning. The IMM builds upon concepts from racial formation theory (Omi & Winant, 1994), multiracial identity theory (e.g., Renn, 2004), critical race theory (e.g., Bell, 1980), campus climate for diversity (Hurtado et al., 1998, 1999, 2012; Milem et al., 2005), and multiple racisms (Garner, 2010) including monoracism (Johnston & Nadal, 2012). The IMM specifies that distal systems surrounding college institutions, such as socio-historical, policy, and local community contexts, are sites of racial formation that generate traditional racisms targeting monoracially-constructed groups and monoracism targeting multiraciality. Inherent in racial formation processes over time has been the perpetuation of monoracial constructions of race that marginalize multiraciality, which plays out in college environments. Understanding these broader contexts as distal systems, the IMM then details more proximal climate processes of racial classifications and subsequent racializations that lead to varying qualities of campus climate for multiracial college students. Key factors influencing racial classification include individual characteristics such as racial ancestry, physical appearance, cultural knowledge (King, 2008; Renn, 2008), and socioeconomic status (Khanna, 2012; Korgen, 2010), as well as interest convergence (Bell, 1980) and the fluidity of peer culture on campus (Renn, 2004; 2008). Racial classification may therefore vary for each multiracial student, allowing for multiple and possibly contradictory racializations in different contexts. The IMM thus fills a unique gap in higher education theory to advance the
critical study of multiraciality in college contexts. By applying the IMM, the empirical research expands our understanding of interpersonal and organizational manifestations of racism in college contexts. Because the IMM recognizes multiple racisms and links them to campus climate, the empirical work conceptually understands discrimination and bias as a form of interpersonal-level oppression, and inequity in organizational structures as a form of institutional-level racism. The examination of both interpersonal- and institutional-levels of multiple racisms illuminates the multifaceted nature of racism, how it targets various groups, and how it manifests in different ways in the campus climate. This work extends theory on race and racism by introducing multiraciality and multiple levels of racism into the research on campus climate.

Second, this research increases our understanding of the complexities around operationalizing race, both quantitatively and qualitatively, and emphasizes how both approaches compliment each other. That is, the question of who to count as multiracial can be addressed differently using both methodologies. Although survey forms rarely distinguish between racial ancestry and racial identity (see Renn, 2004), now that higher education data collection allows for students to mark more than one racial category (e.g. IPEDS), if and when these data are preserved, analysts can choose between a myriad of approaches for racially classifying such data. The quantitative study (Chapter III) compares four common approaches: multiracial disaggregation that reflects the OMB method of reporting as in the U.S. Census (Lopez, 2003; Renn & Lunceford, 2004), multiracial aggregation that mirrors the U.S. Department of Education and the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) (Renn, 2009; Renn & Lunceford, 2004; U.S. Department of Education, 2007), classifying multiple-race data into the least prevalent monoracial category that replicates common research practice to increase sample
sizes (Inkelas, Soldner, & Szelényi, 2009), and a *multiracial group status* approach (modified from Binning, Unzueta, Huo, & Molina, 2009) that compares multiracial students who indicate a white background to those who do not. It builds upon previous research on racial classification (e.g. Inkelas et al., 2009) by including more approaches in a single study, by doing so in a sample in which multiple-race data comprises nearly twenty percent of the sample, compared to only two percent, and by examining an outcome measuring campus climate for diversity. Specifically, it challenges Inkelas et al.’s (2009) suggestion that monoracially-grouped regression analyses do not appear to differ across approach by showing that the least common monoracial category approach renders significantly different results between racial groups when multiracially-identifying students comprise a considerable proportion of the total sample. That is, the representation of monoracially-constructed groups’ experiences of discrimination naturally changes when there are more multiracially-identifying students included in those groups for analysis. It also confirms that there is not one absolute way to best classify multiple-race data, but rather that each classification approach has benefits and limitations, and that the way to count should be determined by the purpose of the analysis. For example, a study that specifically aims to understand collective multiracial experiences would warrant aggregating students who mark two or more racial categories into a single multiracial group, and use it as a starting point for further dissecting a multiracially-identifying sample. Such a study could subsequently use either the multiracial disaggregation and/or multiracial group status approach to uncover nuances within the multiracially-identifying sample, again based on the purpose of the study. Conversely, studies focused on monoracially-constructed groups might ideally use the multiracial disaggregation approach, which provides the greatest level of specificity based on indicated racial background(s) for all students (see also Inkelas et al., 2009). Accordingly,
monoracially-focused studies could also use the least common monoracial category approach, but in doing so, should explicitly state that multiracial students are understood to be part of those groups, and contribute to the heterogeneity of them, rather than ignore the diversity within them. Researchers must keep in mind that including multiracially-identifying persons in monoracially-constructed groups will likely render different results than including students who only mark one racial category, but if multiracial students are truly considered members of those groups, then the representation can be considered accurate. Studies focusing on one monoracially-constructed group (e.g. Asian Americans), might analyze all students who indicate an Asian American background, and then disaggregate the sample to see if and how an outcome varies between students who only mark Asian American and students who indicate they are multiracial Asian American (e.g. Kamimura, 2010), or use the multiracial disaggregation combination groups that pertain to Asian American students in the sample. In these ways, research can more readily problematize the social construction of race and take into account the racial heterogeneity within all racial groups.

However, researchers must keep in mind and should acknowledge that a limitation of quantitative multiple-race data that does not collect racial ancestry separate from racial identity is that multiracial students who only mark one racial category, opt out of racial identification, or do either when the data are collected (Renn, 2004) are not distinguishable as multiracial. Even so, the inability to identify multiracial students who indicate only one racial background or opt out of racial identification should not preclude quantitative analysis given that both patterns are healthy for multiracial students (Renn, 2004). Rather, large-scale quantitative study of multiracial students can be complimented by qualitative inquiry, which has the ability to make visible multiracial students who identify with one monoracial background, multiracially, non-
racially, or situationally in addition to those who identify with two or more monoracial backgrounds (Renn, 2004). This was achieved in the qualitative study (Chapter IV) by soliciting participants who “could” check more than one racial category, rather than if they “do,” and therefore did not limit the sample to only multiracially-identifying students or first-generation mixed race students, as has often been the case in much higher education research on multiracial identity (Renn, 2004). Examining multiracial college students’ experiences of race and racism using quantitative and qualitative methods of inquiry allowed for multiplicity in their experiences to emerge in this research.

Third, each of the three studies integrates analyses of traditional racisms targeting monoracially-constructed groups with monoracism based on mixed race status, which aligns this multiracial scholarship with broader social justice goals, and critically refutes neo-conservative and liberal articulations of multiraciality. Important to this endeavor, the IMM does not engage multiraciality as if it were a new phenomenon in the post-civil rights era, but rather historically contextualizes it within its longer history in the U.S. Acknowledging this history, and more specifically the history of U.S. Census racial data collection practices, the quantitative chapter looks not only at multiracially-identifying students, but also at monoracially-identifying students, and how racially classifying multiple race data changes monoracially-constructed groups’ representations of discrimination. The qualitative chapter takes into account the variety of students’ mixed racial ancestries, showing that although their perceptions of racist organizational structures converge around multiracial microaggressions, they also diverge around monoracially-based stereotypes and oppression, and that racial ancestry is not the primary factor guiding perceptions of campus climate. Together, this multiracial scholarship integrates examinations of traditional racisms that might help curb anxiety around multiraciality, and begins to rearticulate
(Omi & Winant, 1994) the meaning of multiraciality as a phenomenon that joins larger efforts in advancing social justice (see also Brunsma, 2006), here in and through higher education.

**Key Findings Across the Three Studies**

**Theoretically Linking Campus Climate, Multiraciality, and Multiple Racisms**

The development of the IMM coincided with recent research that empirically exposed the theory gap in higher education research on racial groups (Harper, 2012) by making the link between campus climate and racism explicit and doing so in a model that additionally accounted for multiraciality. The theoretical piece (Chapter II) highlighted that higher education research on campus climate has typically overlooked multiracial college students (for a recent exception, see Hurtado, Alvarez et al., 2012), that higher education research on multiracial college students has focused on racial identity, and that both bodies of literature tended to lack an integrated theory of race and racism when examining racial matters in college. The need to include multiraciality in racial theory for campus climate stemmed from the observation that extant theory and frameworks on race, racism, racial identity, and campus climate had been inadequate to model campus climate for multiracial college students. Rather, elements of several theories were useful in developing an integrated model of multiraciality for campus climate (Bell, 1980; Garner, 2010; Hurtado et al., 1998, 1999; Hurtado, Alvarez et al., 2012; Johnston & Nadal, 2012; Milem et al., 2012; Omi & Winant, 1994; Renn, 2004). The IMM modeled the quality of multiracial students’ campus climate for diversity, which may be accounted for through examining individual and institutional factors leading to racial classification and subsequent racializations. In this way, similarities and differences in the campus climate for these students can be understood through research and addressed in practice.

**Common Multiracially-Based Experiences**
The two empirical applications of the IMM confirmed that multiracial college students shared some common experiences based on their mixed race status, which has been a focus of much multiracial scholarship as synthesized by Johnston and Nadal’s (2010) taxonomy of multiracial microaggressions. The quantitative results in Chapter III built upon this knowledge by confirming that when analyzed as an aggregate group, as expected, multiracially-identifying students indicated a higher mean frequency of discrimination and bias than their monoracially-identifying white peers. That is, in contrast to common assumptions that multiracial students might be “honorary whites” (see Bonilla-Silva, 2010), that chapter showed that there were significant distinctions in experiencing discrimination between those two groups. Although anticipated from previous research (Hurtado, Ruiz et al., 2012a), it was still perplexing that multiracially-identifying students also indicated a significantly higher mean frequency of discrimination than students who only marked Latina/o. When combined with regression results indicating that higher levels of validation were associated with less frequent discrimination for Latina/os, the mean difference in discrimination may have actually suggested that the compositionally diverse institutions in this study were simply doing a good job in creating inclusive campus climates for Latina/o students. In fact, a number of them were broad access or Hispanic Serving Institutions (HSI) in which 25 percent or more of total undergraduate full-time equivalent students must indicate a Latina/o backgrounds, and 50 percent of all students low-income (Santiago, 2006; U.S. Department of Education, 2010), or were moving towards that federal designation. The quantitative analysis thus showed that multiracial aggregation can be useful to make visible distinctions between multiracially-identifying students and monoracially-identifying peers regarding experiencing discrimination.
The results from the quantitative study were illuminated by similarities in the narratives of multiracial college students’ negative perceptions of the organizational dimension of campus climate. That is, the students detailed various multiracial microaggressions, which stem from monoracism targeting their mixed race status (Johnston & Nadal, 2010). That they occurred in the organizational dimension of campus climate may actually suggest they were macro-aggressions, building upon previous research that depicts monoracially-framed student affairs spaces as marginalizing for some multiracial students (Sands & Schuh, 2004). The qualitative study (Chapter IV) focused on four of Johnston and Nadal’s (2010) themes, most of which played out in the curriculum. The first was *Exclusion or isolation: endorsement of a monoracial society and norms*, by which participants drew attention to the absence of multiracial histories and experiences in diversity courses intended to be part of an inclusive curriculum. The second was *Exoticization or objectification: multiracial as the racialized ideal*. Interestingly, this occurred when multiraciality was included in curriculum and class discussion, however it was done so in a way that essentialized the multiracial population and perpetuated this stereotype reflecting liberal post-racial ideology, rather than critically examining the roots of the assumption. The third multiracial microaggression was the *Assumption of a monoracial or mistaken racial identity*, which was exemplified when a professor degraded a racial group in class using course material as a starting point, likely thinking no one of that group was present and candidly exposing his bias. Lastly, the *Denial of a multiracial reality* was exemplified by a students’ observation that campus data systems incongruently collected and reported racial data, and did not seem to inform students how multiple race data would be classified, which resulted in her feeling that she was racially misclassified. The multiracial students in the qualitative study spanned Arab, Asian, black, Latina/o, Native American, Persian, and white backgrounds, lower
though upper socioeconomic classes, and all of Renn’s (2004) five multiracial identity patterns. The samples in both empirical studies confirmed that although the multiracial students were diverse, they also shared negative experiences based upon a mixed race status. The studies built upon previous multiracial research by modeling discrimination in quantitative data from multiple sites across the U.S., and by highlighting that normative structures like curriculum and even teaching have embedded monoracial assumptions (sometimes preferring target groups but also assuming whiteness) that constitute negative climate experiences for multiracial students.

**Different Monoracially-Based Experiences**

This research also built upon previous multiracial scholarship that found multiracial people had monoracially-based experiences (e.g. Renn, 2004, Nadal et al., 2011) in several ways. First, it accounted for such multiplicity in experience by modeling the influence of multiple racisms on the campus climate for multiracial college students in the IMM, which had not yet been done. Second, the quantitative study (Chapter III) not only looked at multiracially-identifying college students as an aggregate group, but also examined heterogeneity within these students, and additionally located them within their respective monoracially-constructed groups by operationalizing race in different ways. In doing so, the study acknowledged that multiracial students live within and between monoracially-constructed communities, and took this reality into account by grouping multiracial students in a variety of ways. Results showed that representations of monoracially-constructed groups changed based on how multiple-race data was racially classified, including the significance of some factors that explained variance in experiencing discrimination and bias in college. Differences within multiracially-identifying students emerged under the multiracial group status approach, which tested the prevalence of relative white privilege within a multiracial sample; as expected, double minority multiracial
students had a higher mean frequency of experiencing discrimination and bias compared to minority/white multiracial students. That differences did not emerge between combination categories (e.g. Latina/o/white) in the multiracial disaggregation approach further highlighted the more prevalent differences between minority/white and double minority multiracial students, indicating that distinct monoracially-framed status differences related to relative whiteness were evident in the quality of their interactions on campus.

Third, the qualitative inquiry (Chapter IV) identified individual-level factors associated with perceiving a more positive or negative campus climate akin to the monoracially-based climate literature. Specifically, within the site’s context, students’ socioeconomic status, white cultural knowledge, and how they publicly identified with their racial ancestries bore out how the racial climate varied. Generally speaking, students who did not strongly identify with racial or ethnic groups on campus reflecting their non-white backgrounds, had higher socioeconomic status, and high levels of white cultural knowledge, typically concluded that there was a positive racial climate. On the other hand, students who attested to a more negative campus climate had and identified publicly with their underrepresented racial group(s) even if they also had white ancestry, indicated mid to low socioeconomic status, and medium or low white cultural knowledge. Interestingly, two double minority multiracial students who evidenced high levels of white cultural knowledge and were from middle or high socioeconomic backgrounds, but did not identify strongly with any monoracially-based group on campus reflecting their respective backgrounds, felt there was a positive campus climate; that they privately expressed their cultural identities and heritages outside of college did not seem to influence how they perceived campus climate. These patterns suggested that traditional racisms were at work, as multiracial students who identified with underrepresented racial groups were more likely to report negative
experiences. In a sense, it may have been students’ socialization that accounted for differences in this outcome, as was found for multiracial black and Asian students’ self-concept in the first year of college (Kamimura, 2010). In sum, the qualitative findings provided greater insight into the quantitative results by suggesting that it was not simply having mixed white ancestry that resulted in less discrimination, but rather that evidencing fluency in white culture and having relative socioeconomic benefits played into positive campus climate perceptions.

Improving Campus Climate for all Racial Groups

This research also furthered our understanding of avenues through which the campus climate may be improved for students of all racial backgrounds. Although many studies focus on one or two monoracially-constructed groups, more campus climate work is incorporating study of multiple racial groups (see Hurtado, Alvarez et al., 2012), which this research did with an additional lens on multiraciality. First, the quantitative study (Chapter III) showed that students’ perceptions of institutional commitment to diversity, greater participation in co-curricular diversity activities, and negative cross-racial interactions were significantly related to experiencing discrimination and bias for nearly all groups across all classification approaches. Given that negative cross-racial interactions were a likely space in which students experienced discrimination, the other two factors presented more interesting results. Students’ perceptions of institutional commitment to diversity proved to be negatively related to discrimination and bias, as anticipated, extending similar findings from previous research into a more compositionally diverse sample (Hurtado, 1992; Mayhew, Grunwald, & Dey, 2005). As also expected, greater participation in co-curricular diversity activities was positively related to discrimination and bias, likely for their role as counterspaces for coping with and challenging racial microaggressions (Solórzano, Ceja, & Yosso, 2000). Previous research also noted that the relationship between
diversity activities and a positive campus climate may not be linear, as one study similarly found they decreased students’ positive perceptions of campus climate (Mayhew et al., 2005). Additionally, the unexpected lack of effect of curricular diversity on discrimination for most groups in this study, in either direction, implied that some students who experienced discrimination and others who did not were equally likely to take such courses.

Subsequently, this research suggested that racial identity salience might play an important role in clarifying the relationship between co-curricular diversity activities, a curriculum of inclusion, and experiencing discrimination. As demonstrated in recent research, a heightened racial identity salience was positively related to discrimination and bias (Hurtado, Ruiz et al., 2012a), and in this study, the relationship held true for many groups under most classification approaches. Qualitative results (Chapter IV) also suggested that racial identity salience was an important factor in the quality of a perceived campus climate, as students who publicly identified with their underrepresented racial backgrounds in co-curricular diversity activities indicated a negative climate, and those who did not perceived a more positive campus climate. In addition, students in the qualitative inquiry denoted that some curricular spaces were inclusive while others were marginalizing, revealing inconsistencies amongst curricula intended to be inclusive. Furthermore, students who drew positive conclusions of the campus also detailed an abundance of stereotypes, particularly about Asian American students, but were uncritical of them. Given that the current studies and Hurtado, Ruiz et al. (2012a) used cross-sectional data, none were able to untangle temporal or causal relationships between racial identity salience, negative dimensions of campus climate, inclusive curricula, and co-curricular diversity activities. However, considering that Hurtado, Ruiz et al. (2012a) found that taking a curriculum of inclusion and participating in co-curricular diversity activities were positively related to racial identity salience,
and that a heightened racial identity salience was positively related to students’ critical consciousness and action, the current studies suggest that when students experience discrimination and bias in college, and in turn participate in inclusive curriculum and diversity activities, doing so might redirect negative experiences towards developing critical consciousness and action.

Second, in addition to identifying factors that are important for improving the campus climate for all racial groups, this research also pointed out that compositional diversity and interpersonal validation were important factors that decreased discrimination, specifically for Latina/o and black students. For those two student populations, the higher the compositional diversity of a campus, the less frequently they experienced discrimination and bias. This confirmed previous research on a hostile campus climate for Latina/o students in predominantly white institutions (Hurtado, 1994), and added the same result for students who only marked black. In addition, interpersonal validation by faculty and staff lowered frequencies of discrimination indicated by black, Latina/o, and white students, drawing further attention to the importance of validation for the success of students of color (Rendón, 1994), and of exposing normative practice that likely ingrained validation and privilege for white students. In sum, this research highlighted avenues for research and practice to better understand and improve campus climate for students from all racial groups.

**Future Research**

This investigation of campus climate for multiraciality offers direction in how considering multiraciality can improve use of theory and methods, as well as content areas for future research. First, higher education research on racial groups must explicitly incorporate theories of race and racism, as it rarely does so (Harper, 2012), missing crucial opportunities to
expose the roots of hostile campus climates and disparities amongst group outcomes. This work also calls monoracially-framed inquiry to theoretically consider multiraciality within monoracially-constructed groups of students as one aspect of within-group heterogeneity. That is, multiracial students are part of monoracially-constructed groups, but are often thought of as distinct from groups of students of color, and are excluded or made invisible in much higher education research on race (Johnston & Guillermo-Wann, 2012). In addition, the IMM is one tool to support multiracially-framed scholarship in making multiple racisms visible, both within and outside of higher education research, which can better align this work with broader social justice aims. Together, these implications for the use of theory also affect how research methodologically engages multiraciality. Research ought to clearly communicate how multiracially-identifying students are classified in analyses (see also Johnston & Guillermo-Wann, 2012), as it may generate different representations of racial groups as seen in the quantitative chapter. This goes hand in hand with conceptually considering multiracial students as members of their monoracially-constructed groups that add to the heterogeneity of such groups, that share some commonalities but also have distinct multiracially-based experiences. Multiracial college students are both distinct from and similar to their respective monoracially-constructed groups; theory and methodology research needs to account for these nuances.

Second, this research on campus climate for multiraciality identifies several content areas for future research. Most broadly, multiracial research outside of higher education might test the IMM’s proximal processes in other contexts for multiracial and other groups, and examine racial formation in larger societal contexts. This will assess the extent to which the IMM might be applicable to multiraciality in broader settings, as the factors identified in the proximal climate processes were drawn from literature that also extends beyond higher education research.
Similarly, multiracial research within higher education, such as multiracial identity and student development in general, might benefit from conceptualizing educational environments as contexts with a climate for diversity. Research may also use the IMM to examine multiracial matters other than racial identity, such as campus climate, educational practices, and learning outcomes.

Studies of campus climate in general, and on multiraciality specifically, should look into a number of matters raised by the current empirical studies. Future quantitative research on the behavioral dimension of campus climate should explore differences between racial groups specifically in racial discrimination, and also comparing results across racial classification approaches. In addition, hierarchical linear modeling might test for effects of an institution’s mean level of students taking a curriculum of inclusion to see if that might have a significant relationship to measures of the behavioral dimension of the climate. Attending an institution where students on average take more classes representative of a curriculum of inclusion might help improve the behavioral dimension of the climate, more so than a students’ individual course taking patterns. This is plausible given that attending an institution where students on average had higher levels of engagement in curricular diversity and positive cross-racial interaction had positive effects on educational outcomes, even when an individual has low levels of engagement with diversity (Denson & Chang, 2009). The current studies also raise questions around the salience of racial identity and its relationship to campus climate for diversity. Future study is needed to model causal relationships using longitudinal data between discrimination, racial identity salience, curricular and co-curricular diversity activities, and critical consciousness and action. Additionally, the quantitative study (Chapter III) suggests research to further tease out relationships between general climate measures, such as validation, and the campus climate for
diversity. This has begun, with a recent study showing that validation mediates the negative effects of discrimination and bias on all students’ sense of belonging in college (Hurtado, Ruiz, & Guillermo-Wann, 2012b). Moreover, research on the organizational dimension of campus climate might also use document analysis, observation, and site visits including focus groups with staff, faculty, and administration to further expose the various ways race is constructed and racism is deployed through campus policies and practices. These constituents often conceive of diversity framed in monoracial terms even though conceptions of diversity, race, and racism are expanding on campus.

Ultimately, research on the campus climate specifically for multiraciality should seek to validate the proximal processes hypothesized by the IMM, particularly regarding racial classification and peer group fluidity in the interpersonal dimensions of campus climate. It should also continue to examine intersections of traditional racisms and monoracism across multiple dimensions of climate, and in specific micro-systems encompassing students’ curricular and co-curricular contexts, including situational differences for the same individuals. In this vein, qualitative research might investigate the content of what discrimination looks like for multiracial students specific to their racial backgrounds, as well as the role of whiteness in their interactions with their respective monoracially-defined communities on campus. Such research would take into account intersectionality of multiple racial identities and other social identities, as nothing is constant, but rather shifting across time and context (Wong, 2012). In sum, this research deepens our understanding of the campus climate for multiracially- and monoracially-identifying students, and provides a number of directions for future research regarding racial theory and methods, and many areas for empirical study.

Policy Implications

184
This research also has implications for policy at national and institutional levels regarding racial data collection and reporting, and enrolling a racially diverse student body. A few recommendations for racial data collection policy should be noted from the qualitative study (Chapter IV) and previous research, with the quantitative inquiry (Chapter III) having implications for racial classification as an aspect of reporting. First, the qualitative study draws attention to the need for institutional policy to critically consider how racial data is collected and classified in college admissions processes as an aspect of the organizational dimension of campus climate, and how that is communicated to students. Racial data collection in human resource systems is an additional area that could be examined for personnel, with policy ideally allowing for multiracially-identifying individuals to maintain multiple-race designations in campus systems. Second, some education scholars suggest that racial data should not be collected in the two-part ethnicity question as is currently practiced in the U.S. Census and by the U.S. Department of Education (Renn & Lunceford, 2004), in which Hispanic ethnicity is asked first, followed by options to mark two or more non-Hispanic racial categories (DOE, 2007). Rather, they suggest that a Hispanic or Latina/o category be included with equal status as one of six racial categories, amongst which students should have the freedom to mark two or more categories (Renn & Lunceford, 2004). Third, Renn (2004) recommends that survey research ask two questions to distinguish between racial ancestry and racial identity. That is, surveys should ask parents’ racial background separately from how students racially identify, with a multiracial box being a conceivable option only in the latter question, and allowing students to mark two or more categories in each question. The current and previous research pinpoint that the way racial data is collected is connected to how it can be reported. Fourth, regarding reporting racial data, quantitative results from Chapter IV suggest that policy preserve multiple-race data to allow
research on various racial groups to use different classification approaches appropriate to the purpose of inquiry. When feasible, multiple reports could ideally be run for various classification approaches if policy required that data be accessible under various racial classification approaches. This could be implemented at the national level with DOE and IPEDS data, survey data (e.g. CIRP, NSSE), and at the institutional level, which would allow for flexibility and nuance in how multiple-race data can be used for research as well as practice. Policy that allows for this level of flexibility could take into account the reporting recommendations by UCLA’s Civil Rights Project, in which Hispanics would not be reported as a racial group, and students marking two or more races would be reported in combination groups as in the U.S. Census (Lee & Orfield, 2006). However, their recommendations assume that Hispanic data is collected in the two-part ethnicity format, bringing the policy issue back to racial data collection.

Results from the quantitative study (Chapter IV) also have direct implications for federal and institutional policy regarding the enrollment of a racially diverse student body. The role of race in college admissions has endured a long trajectory of scrutiny in the U.S. Supreme Court, starting with Bakke v. University of California in 1978, and most recently as seen in Fisher v. University of Texas. The quantitative findings show that having higher proportions of students of color lowers the probability of experiencing discrimination for black and Latina/o students, above and beyond other dimensions of campus climate and validating experiences. Additionally, new research shows that black, Latina/o, and Native American students experience more racial discrimination at low-diversity institutions (Hurtado & Ruiz, 2012). The multiracial study here supports the use of race as one of many factors to be considered in college admissions to help facilitate the enrollment of a diverse student body, reduce racial isolation, and thereby improve
the educational benefits of diversity (Gurin, Dey, Hurtado, & Gurin, 2002; Milem et al., 2005; Hurtado, Alvarez et al., 2012; Hurtado, Dey, Gurin, & Gurin, 2003).

**Institutional Practice**

Institutional practice can be enhanced in a number of ways from this research on campus climate for multiraciality, first for all students, and second, more specifically for multiracial college students. First, increasing the compositional diversity of the student body is an initial, but not sufficient, step towards improving the campus climate in practice (Gurin et al., 2002), particularly for black and Latina/o students based on this study. Importantly, reducing students’ negative cross-racial interactions and improving students’ perceptions of institutional commitment to diversity are next steps, which might be achieved through curricular and co-curricular diversity. Institutional commitment through diversity practices such as intergroup dialogue that links curriculum to lived experiences (Zúñiga, Nagda, Chesler, & Cytron-Walker, 2009), may help create a color-conscious, rather than a colorblind student body, that may more aptly recognize and constructively address discrimination and bias. In fact, such practices are critical to preventing racial incidents on campus because they can develop multicultural competencies (Harper & Hurtado, 2007; Hurtado, Alvarez et al., 2012), which should help reduce discrimination and bias as students necessarily engage across difference.

Second, this research identifies ways that institutional practice might improve campus climate for multiracial college students, as monoracial conceptions of racial realities prevail. As institutions define diversity more broadly, integrating multiraciality critically might help campuses expose monoracial norms and move campuses towards greater inclusivity. For example, the racial language deployed in practice and policy can be evaluated for the extent to which it reinforces colorblind and monoracial norms. Furthermore, both studies suggest that
educators might include critical study of multiraciality into programming and advising for student organizations, orientation programs, curriculum, pedagogy, and other spaces where race is already a topic being explored with students. For example, the qualitative chapter pinpoints positive niches within the organizational dimension of campus climate (specifically curriculum, services, and student organizations) as areas for that specific site to capitalize upon in improving campus climate. Another strategic organizational structure to transform may be faculty and staff development because they occupy and influence various ecological systems identified by Renn (2004). Moreover, the MMDLE has implications for building self-awareness amongst faculty and staff, both of their own social identities and for knowing their students, in order to create more inclusive learning environments (Hurtado, Alvarez et al., 2012). Educators might thus increase their own awareness of multiracial students, identity patterns, and the negative experiences they may have around identity in the form of multiracial microaggressions. Accordingly, this qualitative research supports allowing students to self-identify racially. It follows then, that by integrating the five dimensions of campus climate into the IMM, that where campuses begin to educate around multiraciality will differ based on their unique histories, compositional diversity, curriculum, services, organizational cultures, and where interested parties may be located within campus structures. Institutional practice to improve campus climate for all students, and multiracial students in particular, will play out differently across sites, but this research offers concrete suggestions for where campuses might focus their efforts.

Rearticulating Multiraciality for Public Discourse

In closing, this research on the campus climate for multiraciality confirms the continuing significance of race in a time when it is contested in public discourse. It draws attention to the importance of locating multiraciality within its long historical trajectory that extends well into
the pre-civil rights era so that multiracial scholarship might help curb anxiety around multiraciality, rather than unintentionally contribute to it. It offers practical implications for future research, policy, and institutional practice to improve the campus climate for diversity for students of all racial backgrounds, which according to theory, should in turn increase student development of multicultural competencies for a diverse society and reduce achievement, retention, and graduation gaps across racial groups (Hurtado, Alvarez et al., 2012). By examining racial theory, classification, and campus climate for multiracial college students within and alongside monoracially-constructed groups, this research contributes to rearticulating the meaning of multiraciality as a phenomenon that can truly advance social justice in and through American higher education.
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