University of Arizona

From the SelectedWorks of Nolan L. Cabrera

2015

The ivory tower is still White: Chicano/Latino college students on race, ethnic organizations, and campus racial segregation

Nolan L Cabrera
Sylvia Hurtado, *University of California - Los Angeles*

Available at: https://works.bepress.com/nolan_l_cabrera/33/

CHAPTER 7

The Ivory Tower Is Still White: Chicana/o-Latina/o College Students' Views on Racism, Ethnic Organizations, and Campus Racial Segregation

NOLAN L. CABRERA AND SYLVIA HURTADO

We have to give up part of ourselves to be with, to hang out with, White people.
DIVERSE DEMOCRACY PROJECT PARTICIPANT FROM THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO

Conversations about college diversity encompass not only which students get into college, but also what happens to them once they enroll. This is an especially salient issue for racial and ethnic minorities, who tend to have dramatically different perceptions of the campus racial climate relative to their racially privileged counterparts (Hurtado, Alvarez, Guillermo-Wann, Cuellar, and Arellano 2012; Rankin and Reason 2005). Few issues are as contentious as race and racism on campus, and perceptions of racial hostility vary across racial lines. This tension is exacerbated, in part, because White students are outwardly skeptical of minority claims of campus racism (Cabrera 2012; Gloria and Castellanos 2003; Johnson 2003; Rankin and Reason 2005). This view has become so entrenched that White people now believe that anti-White bias is more prevalent than anti-Black bias (Norton and Sommers 2011).

The expectation of students of color[1] at a Predominantly White Institution (PWI) is frequently to assimilate and lose native culture (Feagin, Vera, and Imani 1996; Jones, Castellanos, and Cole 2002; Tierney 1992). Studies have indicated that to both preserve culture and carve out a safe space for their development and learning, Chicana/o and other Latina/o[2] students frequently seek out racial/ethnic-specific organizations and centers as a means of support (Cabrera and Padilla 2004; K. P. González 2002; V. Orozco 2003; Patton 2010). "Safe space initiatives" are environments on campus where social identities are validated and supported

(Hurtado, Griffin, Arellano, and Cuellar 2008). Within PWIs, these environments frequently are ethnic-specific centers and programs (Patton 2010), and many are student-initiated and student-run organizations. Education scholars in the Latina/o critical race literature sometimes refer to these ethnic-specific environments as "counterspaces" (Núñez 2011; Yosso, Smith, Ceja, and Solórzano 2009), where students counter the predominantly White racial norms and affirm their ethnic identity.

This chapter explores college experiences with race and racism among a sample of Mexican-origin university students, and their methods of resistance, with a specific focus on their utilization of Latina/o-specific campus organizations. In doing so, we contribute to the literature on ethnic identity and student views of the university racial climate. We also address students' perceptions of campus racial segregation and what this means in terms of debates about campus *balkanization* (i.e., self-segregation). Specifically, some identify these organizations as reinforcing group antagonisms on campus (e.g., D'Souza 1991; Malkin 2003), and Arizona's state superintendent of public instruction equated ethnic studies with sedition (Horne 2010), fueling the misconception that Mexican American Studies creates anti-American sentiment. In contrast to this negative portrayal of culture-specific spaces for learning, recent research has shown how participation in racial/ethnic student organizations and taking ethnic studies classes contribute to a wide range of civic learning outcomes (e.g., social agency, political engagement, and civic engagement in public forums), across all racial groups in college (Hurtado, Ruiz, and Whang 2012).

Background

Most of the campus climate literature refers to Latina/os; only a few studies specifically focus on Mexican-origin students, or identify when these students constitute the majority of their study samples (S. Hurtado 1992; S. Hurtado, Carter, and Spuler 1996). While all of the students were of Mexican origin in this study and most referred to themselves as Mexican American or Hispanic (based on biographic information on participants gathered prior to each focus group and on the participants' narratives), the terms students used in their own narratives varied across the country, including the use of "Mexican," "Chicano," "Latino," and "Hispanic." In this section, however, we review literature using the terminology the authors use to most accurately reflect their studies on Chicana/o-Latina/o

students' perceptions of the campus racial climate and their scholarship on Latina/o-specific campus organizations, dorms, and centers. We specifically focus on how these locations can help students carve out a safe space to develop cultural identity on college campuses. We conclude this background section with a review of the frequently contentious debates regarding campus racial and ethnic segregation.

The Campus Racial Climate

Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pederson, and Allen (1998) define a campus racial climate as composed of four interrelated dimensions based upon their critical review of existing empirical literature: (1) the institution's historical legacy of minority student inclusion/exclusion, (2) the numeric representation of students of color on campus (i.e., structural diversity or compositional diversity), (3) the quantity and quality of interactions across racial groups, and (4) student perceptions of the environment. Colleagues have introduced a fifth dimension to the campus climate that includes the organizational structures and processes that serve to embrace diversity or reinforce exclusivity in higher education (e.g., tenure processes, curriculum, and budget allocation) (Milem, Chang, and antonio 2005).

Scholars extended these previous campus climate models with additional literature, resulting in the Multicontextual Model for Diverse Learning Environments (MMDLE), which includes all these elements of the campus climate, places student identity at the center of practice in the classroom and within co-curricular activity, and links the climate with outcomes for students (S. Hurtado, Alvarez, et al. 2012). Within these features of the college campus, minorities in general, and Latinas/os specifically, tend to experience more hostility and marginality than their White counterparts (S. Hurtado 1992; Johnson 2003; Nora and Cabrera 1996; Rankin and Reason 2005). This is in large part because White space, or those parts of the campus environment where Whiteness is the cultural norm (Harper and Hurtado 2007), can create a tension for students of color whereby they can face cultural isolation and pressure to assimilate, and lose their native culture, or deny their ethnic origins (Feagin, Vera, and Imani 1996; Tierney 1992; Jones, Castellanos, and Cole 2002).

As a function of these White normative environments, Latina/o students are frequently the target of microaggressions (Yosso et al. 2009). Microaggressions are defined as "subtle insults (verbal, nonverbal, and/or visual) directed toward people of color, often automatically or un-

consciously" (Solórzano, Ceja, and Yosso 2000, 60). Within this context, Latina/o students can feel both attacked and isolated (Cabrera and Padilla 2004; Yosso et al. 2009). However, a hostile campus climate and marginalization do not have to manifest themselves as directly as through microaggressions. They can, for example, take the institutional form of representation where only a few Latinas/os in the student body, minimal representation of Latinas/os in the curriculum, or few professors of color on campus (K. P. González 2002). Thus, multiple avenues for student marginalization along racial/ethnic lines exist, and Latina/o students can experience many at the same time.

A hostile racial campus climate has adverse effects on Latina/o student collegiate success. Hurtado, Carter, and Spuler (1996) highlight that Latino perceptions of a hostile campus reduce their cognitive and affective well-being in colleges across institutional types, with Chicano students experiencing more social adjustment difficulty compared to other Latino ethnic groups. In addition, perceptions of a hostile campus racial climate have been shown to adversely affect Latino students' sense of belonging on campus (Hurtado and Carter 1997). This is troubling, because retention theorists argue that students are at increased risk of dropping out of college if they are not both academically and socially integrated into the campus environment (Tinto 1975, 1993; see Nora's 2003 integration model for Hispanic student retention). Identity-based groups that serve as mechanisms of affirmation and social support can contribute to integration into campus environments.

Ethnic-Based Groups and Organizations

Given the marginalization of Mexican American students on college campuses, it is not surprising that many turn to racial/ethnic-specific groups and organizations within the college campus. Joining racial/ethnic-specific groups is frequently a means of finding a safe space on campus (Cabrera and Padilla 2004; Cabrera and Valencia 2012; K. P. González 2002), but it is also controversial. There has been a great deal of negative publicity surrounding racial/ethnic-specific organizations, centers, dorms, and events (see, for example, D'Souza 1991, 1995; Malkin 2003; Thernstrom and Thernstrom 1997). Those attacking race-conscious campus organizations and centers tend to argue that campus administrators would not allow a "White Club," but it is acceptable to have the Chicano organization Movimiento Estudiantil Chicano de Aztlán (MEChA). Yet the long-established White fraternities on campuses that tend to restrict membership and racial/ethnic attendance at social events often go unquestioned because they are part of an exclusive normative environment (Hurtado, Gasiewski, and Alvarez 2014).

MEChA was founded in response to a lack of meaningful inclusion of Chicanas/os in the campus environment (C. Muñoz 1989). It served as an adaptive strategy, as students who are more likely to become involved in ethnic activities are found to have a stronger sense of self through ethnic identity (Saylor and Aries 1999). S. Hurtado (1994b) argues, "Hispanic clubs and organizations, and students who frequently discuss racial issues[,] perceive their campus to be more racially tense. It may be that these behaviors are adaptive strategies used by students to cope with inhospitable climates" (37). That is, greater awareness of one's ethnic identity and unequal status leads to more critiques of the college environment. Other examples of students carving out a niche in higher education include the development of Chicana/o Studies Departments, as well as Latina/o Greek organizations (V. Orozco 2003). Conversely, others claim that high degrees of same-race affiliations in college lead to an increased sense of ethnic victimization for students of all racial backgrounds (Levin, van Laar, and Sidanius 2003). Despite the benefits of these adaptive strategies for Chicana/o Latina/o college students, they are frequently disparaged for promoting campus racial segregation.

"Self-Segregation" on Campus

Self-segregation on campus, or *racial balkanization*, is a key criticism of multicultural education (D'Souza 1991, 1995). Ideally, multiculturalism is supposed to promote racial harmony through interracial interaction; however, this is frequently not the case. Instead, Duster (1993) argued, students at UC Berkeley continued to cluster by race despite the compositional diversity of the campus. What some refer to as campus self-segregation, Villalpando (2003) sees as self-preservation. He argues that racial/ethnic-specific organizations, centers, and dormitories only become necessary when racial/ethnic students are first marginalized on campus. Within this context, they represent an adaptive strategy to increase sense of belonging (Villalpando 2003). Those who label ethnic-specific organizations as self-segregating frequently overlook a simple fact within U.S. higher education: Students of color do not typically have the critical mass to self-segregate. antonio (2001) argued in his study of college students that it is actually White students who have the most racially homogenous friendship groups, "although this result is not surprising, since

White students constitute by far the most numerous of all nine groups on the UCLA campus" (75).

Thus, campus racial segregation is largely a perceptual issue depending on positionality within the context. It is not, as Tatum (2003) asks, "Why are all the black kids sitting together in the cafeteria?" Instead the question should be "Why *don't we notice* when White kids sit together in the cafeteria?" Duster (1993) highlights the frequently ideological nature of critiques of campus racial segregation in a contemporary context by taking a historical perspective: "Over the years, some mild hand wringing occurred about discrimination, but no national campaign was launched against the 'self-segregation' of the all-white, all-Anglo fraternities" (p. 235). Regardless, debates about campus segregation continue, as racial/ethnic-specific campus structures are frequently labeled as promoting campus segregation and ethnic antagonism (e.g., D'Souza 1991; Sabia 2002). This is critically important, because it means that one of the privileges of Whiteness involves seeing White racial segregation as happenstance and not structured. Thus, improving the quality and quantity of cross-racial interactions on campus involves not only pushing students out of their racial comfort zones, but also challenging their perceptions regarding who is actually doing the segregating.

Fifty Shades of Brown: Latina/o Racial Identity Development

Racial identity is not a static, essentialized feature of a person's being. Rather, it is a developmental process that is continually renegotiated and redefined. College becomes one of the arenas of change in the lives of young adults, when they forge their own identities and renegotiate interdependencies with their families (Chickering and Reisser 1993; Wijeyesinghe and Jackson 2001). One important development that occurs during college is that students frequently explore and redefine their racial identity (Wijeyesinghe and Jackson 2001). However, racial identity tends to be studied along the Black/White dichotomy (e.g., Cross 1971; Hardiman 2001; Helms 1990; Jackson 2001), and there are few explorations into how Latina/o students develop their racial identities.

This lack of research is complicated by the fact that Latinas/os can be from any racial groups, and this can influence their racial identity development. Ferdman and Gallegos (2001), instead of offering a series of progressive stages of identity development, developed a range of orientations that describe how Latinas/os experience their racial selves. The orientations range from internalized racism/preference for Whites ("White-identified") to an extreme preference for the in-group ("Latino-identified, racial/*raza*"). The authors additionally offer: Latinas/os accepting dominant norms without a preference for Whites ("Undifferentiated"), Latinas/os seeing themselves as the other without a clear sense of what this means ("Latino as Other"), Latinas/os identifying with their ethnic subgroup such as Salvadorian ("Subgroup-Identified"), and finally a positive Latina/o self that concurrently does not demean White people ("Latino-integrated") (Ferdman and Gallegos 2001, 49).

While Ferdman and Gallegos (2001) offer a theoretical perspective, Torres (1999) advanced an empirically based model of Latina/o identity that focuses on students' cultural orientations as they navigate between their native Latina/o heritage and the dominant White culture. She posited four Latino identity orientations: Bicultural, Latino/Hispanic, Anglo, and Marginal. Each of the orientations represents the level of comfort Latina/o students experience with the two cultures, ranging from comfort in both (Bicultural) to comfort in neither (Marginal). The two other orientations, Latino/Hispanic and Anglo, represent those students who have stronger ties with either their native/ethnic culture (Latino/Hispanic) or the majority (Anglo).

Some commonalities are observed across these two Latina/o identity models. Both argue that Latina/o students occupy different orientations, as opposed to the stages previously advanced in theories of racial identity development (Cross 1971; Helms 1990). These orientations are based upon levels of conflict between the students' native culture and the dominant White culture. Variation in ethnic identity and cultural orientation is largely a function of the interaction of three factors: (1) how much their family transmits the native culture to them, (2) the diversity of their lived environments, and (3) their awareness of societal racism. Racial identity development is an important, frequently missing, issue when discussing perceptions of the campus racial climate. Depending on a person's orientation in this developmental process, the campus can appear more or less hostile. This is not to say that the campus racial climate is purely perceptual, but rather, how students experience it is related to their racial/ethnic identity and positionality. Conversely, the campus climate can also affect how students develop a sense of their racial/ethnic self.

Method

Data for this project were derived from the qualitative component of the Diverse Democracy Project (S. Hurtado 2003). Within this multi-institutional study of public universities, there were seven focus groups

composed exclusively of students from different Latina/o communities held in the wake of 9/11 in 2001. Timing of data collection on some campuses was delayed to allow a few months to pass before asking questions about diversity and campus climate. Participants were recruited through their university as a result of being identified as active, engaged students and through self-identification as some form of Latina/o (e.g., Chicano, Peruvian, Hispanic, or Puerto Rican). For the purposes of this analysis, we limited the sample to thirty-eight of the forty-seven students in the focus groups who identified as Mexican-origin (e.g., Chicano, Chicana, Mexican, Mexican American, or Hispanic but of Mexican origin). A semistructured protocol was utilized for the focus groups, consisting of eight grand tour questions. A central concern of the study was understanding how and what students from diverse racial/ethnic groups learn from each other on university campuses, but conversations quickly turned to the campus climate and barriers to intergroup relations. Focus groups were conducted at each of the following campuses: the University of Michigan (UM), University of Washington (UW), University of Massachusetts (UMass), Arizona State University (ASU), University of New Mexico (UNM), University of Maryland (UMD), and University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA). Three different Latina/o facilitators conducted the seven focus groups to ensure comfort when discussing issues of race and diversity.

All focus groups were digitally recorded, the record transcribed verbatim by a professional transcription company, and the transcripts checked for accuracy. In order to develop the coding architecture utilized in NVivo, a qualitative data analysis computer software package, each transcript was open coded by examining the raw data and identifying salient themes supported by the text. This constant comparative approach follows an inductive process of narrowing from particular themes (text segments) to larger themes that allows the researcher to attempt to "saturate" the categories—to look for instances that represent the category and to continue looking until the new information does not provide further insight into the category. Once saturation was reached in generating themes, several iterations of coding schemes were developed wherein codes were created, expanded, defined, and refined. Once the coding structure was finalized, the data were coded and stored under the relevant node, and the link to the full transcript was maintained. Commonalities and differences in student experiences were identified across campuses to understand similarity of experience, as well as issues voiced specifically by Mexican-origin students present in focus groups with other Latina/o students. A pattern-matching analytic technique was employed (Yin 1994) to see how major themes from the

interviews reinforced and/or differed from existing literature on campus racial climate, engagement with Latina/o-specific organizations/centers/areas of study, and perceptions of racial segregation in higher education.

Student Voices on the Campus Climate

Three major themes emerged from the analyses of student narratives, each with several illustrative examples detailed here. Students voiced issues related to the first theme, characterized as an isolating and hostile racial climate, which was largely a function of underrepresentation in predominantly White university environments. However, it is important to note that along with these hostile climates were student strategies and responses that illustrated how they maintained resilience in a second major theme: students tended to rely on Latina/o-specific organizations to find a sense of belonging in what Núñez (2011) refers to as racial counterspaces at PWIs. Along dimensions of the third theme, we captured perceptions of campus racial segregation. Almost all students believed that campus racial segregation was a problem, but some tended to frame it as an issue of minority students clustering together. They almost never mentioned White students as having responsibility for the balkanization (Duster 1993) of their respective campuses. Together, these themes illustrate racial climate dynamics hypothesized in racial climate models in the literature, providing insight into how they work to shape perceptions associated with Chicana/o-Latina/o identity development. Specific illustrations of each of these major themes follow, resulting in a complex portrait of Chicanas/os-Latinas/os with varying forms of identity and awareness of White racial privilege in their campus environments.

Isolating and Hostile Campus Racial Climate

Several components of an isolating and hostile campus racial climate emerged in the students' lived experiences on college campuses. Specifically, students discussed a lack of compositional diversity leading to *racial isolation*, indicating low representation of Mexican American and other Latina/o groups. When they did interact across race, they frequently encountered situations where they were asked to be a type of *racial teacher* to their peers and sometimes professors. Additionally, they encountered *microaggressions* (Yosso et al. 2009) in these cross-racial interactions. There was, however, a heterogeneity of narratives, as the minority of stu-

dents felt that campus racial discrimination actually was directed at them by fellow Latina/o students as opposed to Whites. A related consequence in White normative environments is that some students felt challenged regarding their identity, blaming other "Hispanics," which we coded as *Latina/o versus Latina/o*, or intragroup, conflict regarding identity.

Racial/Ethnic Isolation. The first area many students highlighted about the campus racial climate was the minimal compositional diversity, especially as it pertained to Latinas/os. The students at UMD were generally unhappy with the disconnect between expectations of campus diversity through university advertisements and actual campus diversity. As two female students explained:

> R: Yeah, I was expecting a little more [diversity]. Like, my friends would tell me, you're going to Maryland, you're going to find a Latino everywhere.
> S: Yeah, that's what they told me, but that's not gonna happen, especially in my dorm, which is just like all White or like Asian.
> R: I'm probably the only Hispanic on my floor.

This was a common experience across campuses, and, as one UCLA male student recalled, "I was kind of like in a culture shock almost because I couldn't see any minorities [on campus]. . . . I felt like . . . I was like lost in a way." It is important to note that the proportion of Chicana/o and Latina/o students in California declined dramatically as a result of Proposition 209 in 1996, which banned affirmative action (Santos, Cabrera, and Fosnacht 2010). This is still evident years later, and will remain so as long as the change to the California Constitution remains in effect.

This lack of representation made many students feel marginalized on campus. A female student at UMass related her experience during her first year in campus housing:

> I lived in [dorm name], . . . it's an honors program there and I happened to be living in the one dorm that was like an honors college, like all students that were honors students, predominantly White. I didn't like it.

This academically talented student had difficulty taking full advantage of the campus academic opportunities through being racially isolated.

The social and psychological burden of being a "racial teacher." The difficulty of becoming socially engaged in the campus culture was further enhanced by the demands placed upon her as a minority student having to consistently provide a "minority perspective" in class. Being singled out to be the representative of all Latinas/os occurred for other students as well. As one UMass female student explained, "Like in lecture hall, if you're the one Hispanic within the lecture hall, they'll ask you just to get the Hispanic's view of like what's going on, you know?" In addition, students received demands made by their peers to educate the rest of the campus on their culture. A female student at ASU, recalling a White student at her institution who had never attended school with people of color, stated, "It would be like my job to teach her about people of color."

Being a representative of all Latina/o people and a teacher of White people took a psychological toll on students. A frustrated UM female student explained how she was constantly correcting misperceptions about Latinas/os among her non-Latina/o peers:

> Like the friends I've had and the people I've talked to that aren't used to Latinos or people of color in general. I've told them time and time again and sometimes it's kind of annoying to constantly say, "That's not true."

A Latino male student within this same focus group simply declared, "But I'm tired." The constant, unspoken requirement to educate his peers and even campus administrators about the "Latina/o point of view" caused him to cease his advocacy work and focus exclusively on his studies. Similarly, Griffin and Reddick (2011) refer to "paying the Black tax" among Black professoriate, but in this instance, the students paid the "Brown tax."

Others faced similar psychological drain and frustration from having to constantly educate White people; however, not everyone had an adverse reaction. One female student explained how she worked through the same issue at UNM:

> I'm trying to get to a point where my goal is to eventually get through this stage and get to a point where I can actually feel comfortable sitting in a room with a bunch of White people and educating them.

She was still tired from the extra effort necessary to educate White students but, she was willing to make personal sacrifices in the hopes of both improving campus racial climate and growing as a person.

Microaggressions and Racial Marginalization. Even though students were not asked during the course of the focus groups directly about tense interracial interactions, this issue continually arose when discussing peer inter-

actions. For example, a Chicana female student from ASU recalled this episode in class:

> When it came to me and I said I was from Mexico, like everybody turned around like oh my God. . . . I was leaving and this guy goes over to me and says, "Oh my God, you are so cool." He's like "How did you learn to speak English" and I'm like what? And he's like yeah, he's like "Oh my God, are you illegal here?"

This type of campus microaggression (Yosso et al. 2009) also occurred within students' living spaces. A male student from UM was cooking, and the following occurred: "Like I'll be making *chorizo con huevos* (sausage and eggs) in the morning and I get a comment from upstairs, 'Why does it smell like Mexico in here?'"

This frustration at racial marginalization was echoed by a male UM student when he said simply, "White is right. White is right." It made facilitating cross-racial interactions increasingly difficult because, as one UNM male stated, "We have to give up part of ourselves to be with, to hang out with, White people." Fostering an inclusive environment frequently meant a one-way street of minority assimilation whereby Latinas/os on campus were the ones expected to lose their culture. Given the numerous examples of campus microaggressions articulated within the focus groups, it is not surprising that many felt rejected by the dominant, White campus racial culture.

This marginalization did not always take the form of direct conflict. As one UNM female student explained, "But we, like African Americans, Hispanics, American Indians, we associate with each other. You know what I mean and it's like I don't know maybe like the White race doesn't really want anything to do with it." The White students frequently did not want anything to do with diversity efforts, thereby locating the onus of improving campus racial climate within communities of color.

Latina/o versus Latina/o: Intragroup Conflict Consequences for Identity. While the sense of campus marginalization was generally present in the focus groups, there were some who, conversely, felt attacked by the Latinas/os on campus. A UW female student explained, "And so I totally feel that if there's any discrimination, it would come from the people being, 'You're half-White,' or 'You're not Mexican.'" Another female participant in this focus group concurred: "So I think that, for the most part, outside of the classroom I face discrimination by Hispanics." As an offshoot of these feelings, one participant went so far as to claim that Latinas/os were "unwilling to work with Whites." These differing attributions make theoretical sense because, in racial identity theory, once individuals realize the unequal status of their racial/ethnic identity group, they can choose to redefine the value of their group or choose to dissociate from being identified with the racial/ethnic group (Cross 1971; Helms 1990; Torres 2003).

Resilient Responses: Participation in Latina/o-Specific Organizations and Sense of Belonging

Given the campus microaggressions and marginalization many students experienced, in redefining and discovering the value of their own ethnic identity group, many turned to Latina/o-themed organizations for support during their college years. Interestingly, few students were associated with MEChA or other political organizations; however, they frequently spent time carving out counterspaces (Núñez 2011) within the university. We found examples of participation in multicultural Greek organizations, academic peer organizations, cultural centers and dorms (when available), artistic collectives, and conferences; self-exploration through academic course work; and co-opting of predominantly White student organizations (e.g., student government). Students spoke about each of these areas.

White Privilege in the Greek System versus Multicultural Greek. One means of creating a counterspace was through the Greek system. On one campus many students were tired of having the Inter-Fraternity Council (IFC) ignore issues pertinent to Latinas/os on campus. As a UM male student remarked, "But the thing is, why am I going to join and pay dues for something that doesn't have anything to do with me or my community?" Another described the IFC's function for minorities as "taxation without representation." Despite encountering a lot of resistance from the largely White members of the IFC, ethnic-specific fraternities broke off to form the Multicultural Greek Council (MGC).

IFC leaders took offense because they considered themselves multicultural even if many students of color did not. As one UM male student explained, "We called [the Council] 'Multicultural' and I heard the argument that was assuming the quote/unquote White Greek wasn't multicultural." The MGC was established as one means of racial minorities establishing a safe space on campus. A similar experience occurred at UCLA, where a male student commented, "Anglo fraternities by far outnumber that of minority fraternities and sororities, and so . . . you go with what you're most comfortable with." The lack of comfort led many to pursue the Latina/o-specific Greek affiliation.

Once the Latina/o-specific Greek organizations were established, cross-racial interactions were difficult to foster, as the primarily White fraternities and sororities did not want to interact with the minority ones. This was also prevalent at ASU, where one student actually worked at Greek Life. She explained, "You know, we have pushed for four years now to try to do . . . to interact with [White sororities and fraternities], to do other things and they just, they're not stupid, they're just . . . okay they're stupid." Another female student from ASU felt marginalized when attending Anglo Greek parties: "I just felt excluded away from the way they party. . . . I can relate more to African-American Greek life than the mainstream sororities." While the primarily White Greek system could not support the needs of these students, minority sororities and fraternities helped foster a sense of comfort on campus.

Other methods of seeking counterspaces. Greek life was the preferred path for many focus group participants; however, there were also a number of other Latina/o-specific campus organizations students gravitated toward. One female engineer found her place in the Society for Hispanic Professional Engineers (SHPE), while concurrently working within the Latino Student Union. One group of students were involved in the Comprehensive Studies Program, which functioned as a campus-wide academic support system. However, it became a de facto Latina/o-focused center, as this student population clustered in this area. Sometimes students were drawn to ethnic-specific dorms or floors within dorms. Students at UMass discussed the draw to the multicultural dorm, and one female student explained:

> It's very diverse, and you know, no one there will make you feel out of place, you know, you go in and a lot of people there, they want to learn more about other cultures. They want to know about where you're from and you know different religions and stuff like that.

This respect for cultural differences did not occur by happenstance, as students wanting to live in this housing arrangement had to sign a contract stating they would try to gain a better understanding of different cultures through the experience. This respect for difference was echoed by others in the group, with one student wanting more: "Why is there only one multicultural dorm?"

Focus group participants sometimes had the benefit of a cultural center on campus that functioned as a "safe space." A UNM female student explained:

> I like to be in places where I feel free to express myself in however it is that I need to and whatever I say and so when I hang out like at El Centro which is where I am usually at, I feel like I can voice my opinion on whatever I want at any time.

This was an unexpected statement, given that this university is a Hispanic-Serving Institution (HSI), but even within this context, the participant found a strong need to establish a racially/ethnically safe space to voice opinions. This was not to say that El Centro was an arena free from conflict. "But," she elaborated, "I feel safe that the criticism that is going to come back to me is good-hearted." She valued a dialogic process of learning and personal development, not one that was destructive to her identity and perspectives.

Self-Exploration and Classwork. Students also gravitated toward areas of study and classes that incorporated diversity into the curriculum. This fostered not only an increased sense of belonging, but also the development of self-understanding. As one male UCLA student taking a Latin American music class explained, "I'm learning some of the issues of my culture and at the same time music." One male ASU student made a similar comment about his increasing self-understanding through the university's Chicano Studies program: "But you can't forget that you're still evolving in this country, and I think it helps a lot to learn about [the Chicano] ethnic background, especially with such a good program as this one."

Not all students found sanctuary within Chicano Studies. A UNM woman explained, "Then I took a Chicano Studies class and I figured that it will help me identify myself with the rest of the Hispanic community." It did not have the desired effect, as she never felt part of this campus Latina/o community, although it was not clear from her narrative how the class failed to meet her expectations. Regardless, she expressed her frustration: "I don't know why I decided that's what I needed in order to become more aware of where I'm from." This coincided with her belief that discrimination on campus stemmed from Latina/o students on campus as opposed to Whites.

Agency in creating counterspaces. In addition to finding fulfillment in classes, some students carved out their niche on campus by joining Latina/o-specific artist collectives. One female student worked with an off-campus group called *La Casa de Arte*, where Latina/o artists came together to promote their work. When groups were not established, sometimes students created them. As a female ASU student explained:

> We're trying to start an organization for Chicano artists, and then the organization has Chicano in it, and people ask me well, you know, is this an exclusive just for Chicanos and I say, "No, it's an organization created by conscious Chicanos, conscious about being Chicanos and conscious about other people as well."

Another group even held a Latina/o-specific literature conference. All of these efforts were spawned by students wanting to establish a racial/ethnic comfort zone and opportunity to learn more about their own culture. These Latina/o-specific organizations helped some students gain a sense of belonging on campus. As one male UM student stated, "Because with the Latino, at least you already know you have something in common. . . . You feel a little more comfortable." In addition to this level of comfort, a UCLA male student emphasized, "As far as race and ethnicity, you definitely want to join clubs and organizations that teach you more about your own culture and ethnicity."

Co-opting Traditionally White Organizations. Not all Chicanas/os-Latinas/os had to create separate organizations to create a Latina/o student voice. A UCLA student described how students of color came together to run for office in the student body elections under the banner "Student Empowerment." This slate highlighted how students of color had been excluded previously from university electoral politics, but "Student Empowerment mainly consisted of minority students, and when they read off the results, I was right there, and it's weird cause this whole side was all minorities, this whole side was like basically a couple of minorities." The many victories of the Student Empowerment slate highlighted that through concerted organizing, students of color could have a meaningful voice within existing campus structures.

Rejection of Latina/o-specific organizations. However, not all students had the same perception of Latina/o-specific groups and organizations. These very organizations served to alienate some Chicanas/os-Latinas/os on campus, as there were Latina/o students who proactively avoided Latina/o-specific groups. One female UW student said, "I didn't join the Latino organizations because I felt like I was segregating myself from the other organizations that were not Latino-based." As previously noted, this was also one of the students who felt that most campus discrimination originated from Latinas/os. The framings of campus racial discrimination, interestingly, were apparently independent in students' minds from perceptions of campus racial segregation. Participants failed to make this connection and tended to perceive the races as homogeneous clusters.

Perceptions of Campus Racial Segregation

In a third major theme, we found that students in the study across all campuses generally concurred that racial segregation occurred on campus. As a female student at UMASS declared:

> Latinos sit with Latinos, well Latinos tend to mix in with Blacks a little, but then Whites, mostly they sit together and there's, and then there's the athletes that they all sit together. They don't want to intermingle with anybody else.

These visions of the multicultural, integrated university sometimes turned fatalistic as a UM female student explained, "In the long run, everybody's going to stick to their own people." One male UW participant expressed particular disdain for campus racial segregation. Speaking as an outsider to the campus Latina/o community, he said, "I mean, you do see the mingling of students of different races, but it seems to me with minorities that you end up just kind of sticking with your own." He specifically targeted the minority communities as the ones creating campus racial segregation. This made sense, as he had been able to integrate into the dominant, White campus culture, and if he had the ability to assimilate, he believed, then so should others. To the extent that they did not, it was their choice rather than the racial dynamics of exclusion in relation to White privilege.

The narratives regarding campus racial segregation tended to echo similar experiences, and appear almost nihilistic in tone. As a UCLA male student articulated, "Yes there are like self-segregating groups, but what is the university going to do? You know? Send out the police squad and force us to you know, hold hands and be happy, happy, joy, joy?" Students generally accepted that campus racial segregation existed; it was seen as a natural part of the environment, and it was primarily discussed as a function of racial minorities sticking together. These comments were informative based upon not only what they said, but what they did not say: there was little discussion of White students segregating on campus and more institutionalized versions of normative exclusion (e.g., White fraternities).

Placing the onus of self-segregation on campus communities of color ignores the basic issue that minorities do not usually have the representational numbers to truly self-segregate at PWIs. This is a key, unquestioned tension within the focus group participant narratives because, on

the one hand, they perceived a lack of compositional diversity, yet there were high levels of same-group activity. One male student expressed it clearly when he said, "You don't have a choice because there are so few Latinos here and so much majority are White, that you really don't have much of a choice but to interact in class." A male UCLA student offered a similar viewpoint: "What we've learned is the ability to interact."

Discussion

The students on these university campuses tended to be, at best, marginalized and, at worst, treated with hostility, and this generally held true across all institutions. We found that the three major themes from students' narratives were interrelated. Experiencing racial/ethnic isolation and a hostile climate may cause students to either reject identity or respond with resilience, seeking counterspaces that reaffirm racial/ethnic identity and allow them to explore it with others in college. Such culturally affirming learning activities lead to widespread notions of campus segregation, but the root of the problem goes unacknowledged—White privilege in the campus climate shapes students' experiences and consequent orientations related to Chicana/o-Latina/o identity.

Returning to the campus racial climate framework (Hurtado, Alvarez, et al. 2012; Hurtado et al. 1998; Milem, Chang, and antonio 2005), one of the first issues students discussed was a lack of representation, or compositional diversity. There tended to be relatively few students of color on campus, even at HSIs. This led to a sense of cultural isolation, whereby students had difficulty constructing a sense of belonging to their campus. The finding supports recent scholarship that highlights how Latinas/os in low-diversity institutions experience the most discrimination and stereotyping compared with moderately or highly diverse institutions (Hurtado and Ruiz 2012).

Within this context, the Chicana/o-Latina/o students had difficulties in intergroup relations for a number of reasons. First, they were consistently required to be "racial teachers" to their White peers and professors. This tended to take a psychological toll on the students, as they were asked to be the representative of their race/ethnicity, providing the "Hispanic point of view" on a subject. Second, students were also racially targeted via microaggressions (Yosso et al. 2009). Their peers would use terms like "illegal," and the truly insidious impact of these racial slights is cumulative. Students can generally deal with one microaggression, but multiple

microaggressions over the course of time are what lead students to feel like second-class citizens of a university, and they also have the potential to adversely affect academic performance and health (Solórzano, Ceja, and Yosso 2000; Yosso et al. 2009).

Within the context of campus racial climate, the participant responses highlighted the organizational context for diversity, which encompasses curricular/pedagogical diversity (Milem, Chang, and antonio 2005). As some of the participants noted, class content can serve as a method of racial inclusion or exclusion. This is consistent with numerous studies citing both the cognitive and affective growth that occurs from taking ethnic studies courses (Sleeter 2011) and the association of such courses with civic learning outcomes (Hurtado, Ruiz, and Whang 2012).

In terms of navigating the hostile campus racial climate, the respondents frequently sought to create organizations, events, and activities where people of their own racial/ethnic background could celebrate their culture without fear of racial persecution. These counterspaces included organizations and centers that were created to be Latina/o-specific, and in some instances, they were de facto Latina/o spaces (Patton 2010). Additionally, students frequently found a sense of belonging by joining Latina/o or multicultural fraternities and sororities, as the traditional Greek system was ostensibly White. Sometimes, the construction of the safe space included co-opting campus structures that were traditionally White, as demonstrated by the takeover of the UCLA student government in 2009. Regardless, the consistent theme throughout the student narratives was the need to find a sense of belonging via counterspaces within PWIs.

There was some heterogeneity in the responses, as there were participants who felt marginalized primarily by fellow Latinas/os on campus for not being "Latina/o enough." For these students, Latinas/os and Latina/o-specific organizations were the ones primarily responsible for campus racial antagonism. Racial/ethnic identity development theory hypothesizes that the early orientation of students is marked by a lack of racial awareness and by White identification, followed by Latina/o self-awareness, which is frequently marked by equating all features of Whiteness with oppression (Ferdman and Gallegos 2001). This functionally alienated those Latina/o students who were not going through the process of racial/ethnic identity formation, especially those who were already questioning "how Latina/o" they were. The involvement in racially specific organizations did not, however, mean the students were able to self-segregate. The students consistently talked about the university being

a space where they had to learn to interact across races and, therefore, develop an orientation as a bridge builder. If they did not interact across races (or "self-segregate"), the potential would not have existed for them to experience the level of microaggressions they did or report having to be cultural educators for their White peers and professors. This is consistent with antonio's findings (2001), where White students were primarily the ones who had the ability to self-segregate on campus. Within this context, it was surprising to learn that some of the students unquestioningly recited the dominant paradigm attributing primary responsibility for campus racial segregation to racial minorities. By blaming the racially isolated communities, they tended to leave the following question unaddressed: How do White students self-segregate? Without this analysis, it locates the onus for campus integration within communities of color. It additionally assumes that majority White areas are welcoming to Chicana/o-Latina/o students, and therefore students not assimilating into the dominant norm are percieved as fueling racial antagonism or, worse, acting racist.

The general consensus among the focus group participants was that self-segregation existed on campus; however, some tended to locate the problem within themselves, thereby internalizing this racist view. Bivens (1995) identifies one part of internalized racism. She argues, "There is a system in place that misnames the problem of racism as a problem of or caused by people of color and blames the disease—emotional, economic, political, etc.—on people of color" (p. 2). Thus, racism does not have to be explicitly enacted upon students of color by majority students in order for it to have power. Students of color themselves—in this case, Chicana/o-Latina/o students—unconsciously forgo their power of definition by unquestioningly accepting the dominant discourse. Many Latina/o students have to work through internalized racism as part of their identity formation process (Ferdman and Gallegos 2001; Torres 1999, 2003). Thus, it was not surprising that even some very racially conscious students failed to make the connection between a lack of representation (compositional diversity) and the numerical improbability that Chicana/o-Latina/o students can self-segregate. They tended to decry the lack of campus compositional diversity, while frequently highlighting microaggressions (Solórzano, Ceja, and Yosso 2000). However, rather than seeing their creation/utilization of safe spaces through Latina/o-themed activities, organizations, and living spaces, the students pejoratively referred to their own activities as self-segregation instead of a self-preserving response to a hostile climate (Villalpando 2003).

Thus, the students' narratives in this study added nuance to the intersection of the campus racial climate and racial/ethnic identity. The more White-identified the students, the more likely they were to mislabel color-consciousness as a form of racism. Conversely, the students who were more Latina/o-identified tended to be the ones who sought out same-race and same-culture connections. Thus, the same components of the campus racial climate that served to signal inclusion to some Chicanas/os-Latinas/os signaled exclusion to others. This highlights a key missing component of climate research. While the current climate framework illustrates the importance of student perceptions of the environment as a central dimension, there is little examination of how these perceptions are informed by a student's individual development. This study chronicled Chicana/o-Latina/o students' lived experiences of inclusion and exclusion in the campus climate, and some students' resilience responses linked with their racial/ethnic identity development and simultaneous growing awareness of racism and White privilege in their environments. Criticism of culturally affirming programs and student organizations will not abate until we acknowledge and respond to exclusionary practices in higher education and the complexity of Chicana/o-Latina/o student responses.

Implications and Conclusions

As a consequence of these findings, a central issue becomes: What can faculty, administrators, policymakers, and practitioners within institutions of higher education learn from these students' narratives? There are many possible lessons. From a policy perspective, minimal compositional diversity can have an isolating effect on students while also subjecting them to the increased likelihood of racial harassment and discrimination (Hurtado and Ruiz 2012). Thus, policymakers and higher education administrators need to be prepared to defend policies such as affirmative action to enhance compositional diversity. In environments where this is not possible (e.g., California due to Proposition 209), there need to be inventive strategies for creating and maintaining a racially diverse student body (e.g., altering administrative policies to include holistic review of students' personal and academic accomplishments). However, compositional diversity by itself is insufficient to promote a healthy and inclusive campus racial climate (Hurtado, Alvarez, et al. 2012; Milem, Chang, and antonio 2005).

Once students enter the university environment, it becomes imperative that faculty and student affairs practitioners understand and offer them

the following. First, there needs to be education regarding the fact that students of color are not responsible for educating White people (students and faculty alike). If White people want to learn about minority cultures, it is their personal obligation to do so. Students of color owe White privileged individuals nothing, and this is a particularly important lesson for professors to learn. There is a power imbalance between professors and students, and therefore, their demands that students "provide a Hispanic perspective" carry more weight than those from peers (i.e., the consequences are greater if a student refuses). How can we expect students to educate others if they are just learning about their own Chicana/o-Latina/o histories in college? This suggests that more faculty and staff should learn more about the backgrounds of their students to transform their course content, pedagogy, programs, and practices so that they become institutional agents who help students succeed and who encourage multicultural competencies among all students (Hurtado, Alvarez, et al. 2012).

Second, there needs to be greater education about the nature and impact of microaggressions and racism. A common misconception is that in order for an act to be racist, it has to be *intentionally* racist (Cabrera 2012). Rather, student affairs practitioners need to reframe racism in terms of impact as opposed to intent. This is especially important in the context of racial joking, which frequently becomes the source of campus racial incidents and is easily framed as "just a joke" and therefore harmless (i.e., *not* racist) (Cabrera 2014; Picca and Feagin 2007). The aggressors cannot accept responsibility for change if they are not aware of what sorts of incidents may affect the climate for Chicana/o-Latina/o students. Climate assessments on campuses should be linked with action to increase awareness on campus and promote discussions of race and racism.

Finally, there needs to be support (both vocally and in terms of resource allocation) for institutionalizing ethnic-specific spaces for exploring Latina/o identity and multicultural education. This can include race-/ethnicity-themed dorms, cultural centers, and diversity course requirements. These are important for a number of reasons. When the institution takes responsibility for educating about diversity, it removes some of the burden on Latina/o students to be "racial teachers" to their White peers. Also, it can signal that the institution sees diversity as a core value. Additionally, the creation of counterspaces can help Latina/o students find refuge when the campus climate becomes hostile, while also offering a place for cultural affirmation.

The support of multicultural programs can be perceived as promoting

campus racial segregation (Duster 1993). When the issue of campus segregation arises, student affairs practitioners and higher education administrators need to be prepared to address it. One possible way of doing this is highlighting areas where de facto segregation already existed in the campus environment (e.g., in traditional Greek organizations), well before the creation of multicultural organizations. This can be the basis for a dialogue on campus racial segregation by interrogating a double standard: When White students segregate, it is invisible and framed as normal. When students of color create counterspaces, it is framed as racial segregation.

This segregation awareness needs to be tempered with an understanding by practitioners and administrators that there is heterogeneity of perspectives within the pan-ethnic Latina/o identity. While there were some general trends in student narratives (e.g., experiencing microaggressions), there was a minority of participants who located issues of racial discrimination among Latinas/os as opposed to White students. Thus, the narratives of the Chicana/o-Latina/o students in this chapter highlight the complexities of engaging diversity in higher education, indicating how piecemeal approaches frequently fail. Until diversity is engaged in a holistic way, the ivory tower will continue to be White in both composition and as a normative culture that shapes daily campus life.