2011

Using a sequential exploratory mixed-method design to examine racial hyperprivilege in higher education

Nolan L Cabrera

This chapter uses a mixed-method approach to critically examine white male college students' racial ideologies and the experiences that influence racial ideology formation. It highlights both how racial privilege is recreated in higher education and how mixed-methods and intersectionality approaches to institutional research allow more robust analytical possibilities.

Using a Sequential Exploratory Mixed-Method Design to Examine Racial Hyperprivilege in Higher Education

Nolan L. Cabrera

After President Obama's 2010 State of the Union address, MSNBC commentator Chris Matthews offered this reaction, "It's interesting: [President Obama] is postracial, by all appearances. I forgot he was black tonight for an hour." Immediately after the election of a person of color to the presidency, the idea of being "postracial" seeped into the national media, essentially claiming that racism was over. David Horowitz (2009) provided his own version of this sentiment, stating that for someone to argue that racism persists "is impossible to square with the fact that we have an African American president who was elected by mainly non-African American voters."

Despite this popular rhetoric, the United States is far from a "postracial" society (Bonilla-Silva and Ray, 2009). Systemic racism continues to inequitably stratify society in favor of white people at the expense of people of color (Feagin, 2006; Omi and Winant, 1994), and this system of racial inequality is called white supremacy (Bonilla-Silva, 2006). Institutions of higher education within a white supremacist structure are not simply neutral arbiters; rather they serve as means of both reinforcing and sometimes challenging systemic racism (Cabrera, 2009). Racial ideologies are a central component of racial stratification (Bonilla-Silva, 2006); however, both higher education and institutional researchers have spent little time examining how college affects students' racial ideology development. In this chapter, I describe an intersectionality, sequential exploratory, mixed-methods inquiry into racial ideology formation of white male

undergraduates. I also discuss the implications of this inquiry for institutional researchers.

Intersectionality

Intersectionality research is both dynamic and underused in higher education and institutional research. Intersectionality pushes beyond reliance on singular social groupings (e.g., races *or* genders) to richer, more informative analyses that can concurrently account for multiple systems of oppression (Hancock, 2007a). In particular, intersectionality challenges identity politics, where group solidarity, and sometimes group essentialism, is assumed as a foundational component of a social movement (Hancock, 2007b). As Kimberlé Crenshaw (1994) argues, "feminist efforts to politicize experiences of women and antiracist efforts to politicize experiences of people of color have frequently proceeded as though the issues and experiences they each detail occur on mutually exclusive terrains" (p. 94). Focusing on intersectionality complicates such isolated conceptualizations of gender or racial oppression.

From its inception, intersectionality research has focused on critical examination of multiple social identities as they are contextualized within systems of oppression. Within higher education literature, there is a dearth of intersectionality research, which is not surprising since there is little empirical research on intersectionality in general (Hancock, 2007a). There is some research emerging regarding underrepresentation of men of color in higher education (e.g., College Board, 2010; Riegle-Crumb, 2010; Sáenz and Ponjuan, 2009), but this work fails to take account of the power structures that continue to favor men in society, and it tends to be primarily analyses of difference as opposed to illuminating hierarchical relationships. Institutional leaders and researchers may replicate these patterns as they conduct self-studies of their own campuses. Analyses focusing on the experiences of women in STEM or perceptions of climate among lesbian, bisexual, gay, and transgendered (LGBT) students are frequently decontextualized from larger social structures of privilege and marginalization.

Further, when intersectional analyses are conducted, virtually all studies focus on the disadvantaged. Rarely, if at all, does intersectionality research interrogate systemic privilege. This makes sense as intersectionality research was originally meant to carve out safe physical, emotional, and intellectual spaces for marginalized communities. However, there is a dialectical relationship between oppressed and oppressor: there cannot be one without the other. Thus, interrogating racial privilege can be a complimentary effort to empowering antiracist movements. Within this context, an interrogation of whiteness becomes warranted, but is whiteness formation uniform across genders? If white men experience white privilege that is compounded by male privilege (i.e., racial hyperprivilege), could this racial hyperprivilege affect formation of their racial ideology?

Racial Ideology

The undergraduate years tend to be a time of great cognitive and social development (Evans and others, 2010), which is an area often given a great deal of attention by institutional researchers who aim to learn more about student growth on campus. However, student racial ideology development is virtually unexplored and rarely the subject of research. Like intersectionality, ideology is a term that differs substantially between its colloquial and academic usages. It is commonly used as a synonym for political affiliation, but scholars of racism identify racial ideology as integral to perpetuation of racial inequality. As Bonilla-Silva (2006) argues, "the central components of any dominant racial ideology is [sic] it frames or *sets pathways for interpreting information*" (p. 26, emphasis in original).

Bonilla-Silva (2006) argues that racial ideologies represent more than an individual preference (that is, racial attitudes), and they reveal a collective racial group interest. Within this context, racial ideologies serve as the dominant group's method of justifying their social dominance. Bonilla-Silva (2006) suggests that the dominant racial ideology is one of *color-blind racism*, and it consists of four central frames. First, abstract liberalism is support for equality but opposition to race-conscious policies. Second, naturalization describes segregation as a function of individual choice. Third, cultural racism is inequality as a defect in the culture of racial minorities. Finally, minimization of racism is a belief that racism is no longer a pertinent social issue. Bonilla-Silva and Forman (2000) argue that the dominant college student racial ideology is color-blind racism, but their findings do not demonstrate the role that campus environment plays in the development of these ideologies.

Racial and other ideologies can be either hierarchy-enhancing or hierarchy-attenuating, depending on whether a person's worldview is more in support of inequality (hierarchy-enhancing) or egalitarianism (hierarchy-attenuating; Sidanius and Pratto, 1999). In their work on social dominance orientation, Sidanius and Pratto (1999) demonstrate that those who are in the most privileged social locations (e.g., men, wealthy people, and white people) tend to subscribe to hierarchy-enhancing ideologies, while those who have socially marginalized identities (e.g., women, poor, and nonwhite people) tend to subscribe to hierarchy-attenuating ideologies. Intersectionality and racial ideology provide the context for the mixed-methods inquiry into the impact of campus environments on white male racial ideology described in this chapter.

An Exploratory Mixed-Methods Inquiry into Campus Environments and White Male Racial Ideology

Hancock (2007b) argues that mixed methods are necessary to truly account for both the individual experiences and the systemic realities that

continually recreate social stratification along multiple loci of oppression. Within this context, I discuss a mixed-methods approach to the study of the impact of college environments on white male college students' development of racial ideologies. Specifically, this study was conducted through implementation of a sequential exploratory mixed-methods approach, where the qualitative component precedes the quantitative element (Tashakkori and Teddlie, 2003). This design is ideal for explorations of new phenomena. As there is little empirical understanding of dominant racial ideology, the sequential exploratory mixed-methods approach serves as the ideal design for this inquiry. Here is a step-by-step overview of this process, and the findings resulting from each phase of analysis.

Step 1: Qualitative Instrumentation. I began with Bonilla-Silva's Detroit Area Study interview protocol (2006) as a starting point for investigating white male college student racial ideologies. This protocol included questions about definitions of racism, examples of racism, participants' support for or aversion to race-conscious social policies, and explanations for the persistence of racial inequality. The number of questions was reduced substantially, and they were reframed to focus more directly on issues of race within the college environment. For example, questions asked participants to spend time describing the racial diversity of their collegiate friendship groups, rather than the diversity of their neighborhoods.

Step 2: Site Selection. I selected two large, research, public institutions to serve as sites for the qualitative component of this inquiry: Western University (WU) and Southwestern University (SWU), both pseudonyms. I sought to understand whether institutional structures influenced the formation of racial ideologies. Therefore, I purposefully selected institutions that differ in compositional diversity. SWU is a predominantly white university, while racial minorities make up the majority of students attending WU. They also differ in selectivity, with WU admitting approximately 20 percent of its applicants, while SWU admits more than 80 percent. Finally, SWU practices affirmative action, while WU does not.

Step 3: Participant Recruitment. Because racial ideology and political ideology are highly correlated (Sidanius and Pratto, 1999), I purposefully recruited students from a diversity of political orientations to hear a wide range of voices. Recruiting the participants was difficult for two reasons. First, students tended not to respond to email requests to participate in the interviews. Second, I had no funding to offer an incentive for participation. To address these two issues, I used the WU and SWU websites to find student organizations with either an explicit or implicit political orientation (e.g., campus Democrats, campus Republicans, fraternities, Objectivists, and Students for a Democratic Society). I sent email requests to the leadership of approximately fifteen student organizations at each institution, requesting thirty seconds to recruit in person at their weekly

meetings. The recruitment strategy yielded twenty-eight participants (WU, *n* = 15; SWU, *n* = 13) across the two institutions from a range of political orientations.

Step 4: Interview Procedures. Participants were interviewed in a location of their preference. If they had no preference, interviews were held in offices around campus. I racially self-identified as Chicano, which is my primary racial identity, at the beginning of each interview so that my racial ambiguity did not differentially influence the dialogue. At the end of the interviews, I asked how much participants thought about my racial background during these discussions of race. Almost uniformly, they said they did not. Part of this was a function of my light skin, use of "standard English," and ability to "pass" as white. Interviews lasted approximately forty-five minutes. The interviews were transcribed verbatim and thematically coded using a pattern-matching technique (Yin, 1994) to identify emergent themes in relation to existent literature on racial ideologies.

Step 5: Qualitative Analysis. I analyzed the transcripts of participants' narratives and found four dominant racial ideology frames. These themes suggest participants subscribed to a slightly modified version of Bonilla-Silva's *color-blind racism* ideology. Their four frames were (1) whiteness as normal, (2) racism of minimal importance, (3) the United States as meritocratic, and (4) opposition to race-conscious social policies.

Whiteness as Normal. Participants tended to come from either racially homogeneous neighborhoods or ones where they were consistently in the majority. Of the twenty-eight participants, only five lived in neighborhoods where whites were not the majority; five attended high schools where whites were not the majority. These numbers do not tell the full story because, as Brandon (WU) conveyed, "An interesting thing was AP [advanced placement] classes. Like, there was maybe like one or two black and Latino or Chicano person in those classes . . . and the rest was mostly Asian and whatever white kids were left." Thus high school internal segregation further exacerbated the separation of the races.

Trevor (WU) also asserted that few precollege cross-racial interactions existed, and for very specific purposes. He elaborated, "There were a very few, small number of black people in my school. No one interacted with them except to buy drugs." In Trevor's experience, not only did he have a physical separation from his black peers but also interactions, when they did occur, were primarily functional in nature (as in white students wanting drugs). When asked to report the race of their three best friends in college, 86 percent of participants reported the majority of their friends were white. Again, their "normal" racial experience meant being in the majority. As Duncan (SWU) explained, "People tend to like the company of others that share similar values, similar, I guess, life experiences as them, and it just so happens that people in your same ethnic group or racial category have similar values."

Racism Is of Minimal Importance. Most participants defined racism as some type of overt hatred or inner disdain of racial minorities, which was framed as either a relic of the past or contained within fringe groups. For example, Ryan (WU) offered this: "It's hard because we live in California and California's such a diverse state that, I mean, I'm sure there's people here that could be similar, you know, associate with the KKK. But I mean, in my experience, I've never met anyone."

Martin (SWU) also believed that racism exists but is contained within groups outside his lived experience: "There's plenty of things that white people do that I don't like, like certain groups of people . . . Nazi skinheads, right, OK?" By claiming that he does not like Nazi skinheads, he was able to both condemn racism and frame himself as nonracist.

Some participants expressed a view that racism was a relic of the past, and therefore they bear no responsibility. As Dwight (SWU) explained, "I mean, I had no part in owning slaves, so I've never been that person to be prejudiced towards anybody because of that." Dwight then used this as a way to frame his opposition to affirmative action. According to him, because he feels no ill will toward racial minorities and had no part in owning slaves, he should not be "penalized" via race-conscious programs. The privileges of his whiteness remained invisible to him as he rhetorically practiced what Pierce (2003) refers to as "racing for innocence," where he acknowledges racial inequality exists but has no personal responsibility in creating a solution. Jonathan (WU) articulated a similar sentiment: "But it's almost like [racial minorities] try to pin [racism] on people nowadays, you know, the faults of people in the past."

The United States as Meritocratic. Most participants agreed that racial inequality exists, but relied on articulations of the American Dream as their solution to racial inequality. They tended to argue that, if racial minorities want to succeed, they have ample opportunity to do so if they are willing to work hard (meaning, racism is not a structural barrier for racial minorities). Martin (SWU) critiqued a "welfare culture" that he argued is endemic within minority communities:

There's a welfare culture among some black people for example. Not all black people. It exists among some Hispanic people. The idea that you don't . . . lack of accountability for your actions, lack of responsibility, the idea that you don't really have to work very hard to succeed.

Within Martin's understanding, racial inequality is a function of liberal social policies that undercut the minority work ethic. To him, the problem is a lack of responsibility that leads to laziness, and racism is not the issue as he framed the United States to be generally open and meritocratic.

Others viewed work ethic as the pathway toward upward mobility. Andy (WU) succinctly argued, "If people work hard, they will succeed. I believe that. That's what I believe." For Andy, there was no need for

further examination or explanation. He took it as an article of faith that hard work leads to success, and that was as far as he was willing to explore the issue. Derek (WU) was more direct in asserting that the system is open to all willing to work hard, and racism has nothing to do with structuring opportunity:

> I think it's because I personally don't . . . like race is not really an issue in the sense that it's like it doesn't matter what race you are, you can attain anything, you can do whatever you want, you can marry whoever you want.

Many would think that Derek already achieved a great deal in his life by attending an academically selective institution of higher education. Therefore, for him, it was almost a matter of common sense to believe that the American system is truly open and meritocratic to those willing to work.

Opposition to Race-Conscious Social Policies. Finally, the participants tended to strongly oppose race-conscious social policies, which they framed as either racist or, at the least, unfair to white people. For example, Ryan (WU) described his beliefs about affirmative action: "If a company needs to fill a quota, then they'll hire the black guy. And that's not fair. . . . The white guy who worked harder and uh, had a better education, or studied more, or whatever it was that his situation is, just because he's white, he doesn't get the job, or he doesn't get to go to the school he wants to."

Ryan was one of many participants who described affirmative action as a quota system, even though quotas were outlawed in the *Regents of the University of California* v. *Bakke* (1978) decision about thirty years before this research occurred.

The sources of this information tended to come from personal observations that the participants made regarding diversity on their campus or in the workplace. Hoyt (WU) was absolutely opposed to affirmative action because "it's fighting racism with more racism." However, the experiences that led him to this understanding were telling:

> A: That is primarily an opinion of mine derived from observation where I see different . . . businesses, primarily small businesses, or franchises that have probably a majority staff of minority workers.
>
> Q: Could you give me an example?
>
> A: There is a local Burger King, which appears to be primarily staffed by Latinos. I haven't yet seen, to my knowledge, one white person there. But there may be somewhere I can't see.

There is a certain absurdity to Hoyt seeing affirmative action limiting his life chances as evidenced by the racially homogeneous Burger King

environment. However, he did truly feel marginalized by affirmative action, even if these feelings did not represent a tangible reality.

Step 6: Framing the Quantitative Analysis. The narratives of the twenty-eight participants created the exploratory component of the sequential exploratory mixed-methods design. The quantitative analysis of this research was undertaken for two reasons: to (1) examine whether the four frames of participants' racial ideologies are generalizable to a larger population, and (2) explore the role that the college environment plays in shaping racial ideologies. I conducted the quantitative analysis at a single institutional site, SWU.

While the qualitative component of the research was completed, a longitudinal survey research project on undergraduates at SWU was constructed and conducted by a research group of which I was a part. A large number of the constructs on the survey addressed experiences with racism and views on social issues related to race. I was able to identify three of the four central racial ideology frames in the survey constructs, and the fourth (whiteness as normal) had some proxies that were sufficiently similar.

The survey was administered to students at SWU before their freshman year and again during the middle of the second semester of the first year. The survey captured constructs related to experiences in the campus environment (such as involvement in campus groups), as well as goals, aspirations, self-assessments, and views on social issues. In alignment with pretest-posttest survey designs, all racial ideology questions were asked in both waves of the survey. The first wave was administered to participants before they began classes ($n = 1,400$ out of 6,966 incoming freshmen). The second wave was administered in the middle of spring semester. Forty-three percent of the students in the first wave responded to the second survey ($n = 593$). All of the dimensions of students' racial ideologies were asked in both surveys. Of these 593 participants who completed both surveys, 104 were self-identified white men.

Step 7: Factor Analysis. Once variables that matched the qualitatively identified racial ideology were identified, I conducted confirmatory factor analyses to determine whether racial ideology factor structures were consistent across a larger population. I also wanted to ensure the racial ideology construct was consistent during both survey administrations. Table 6.1 displays the survey questions that composed the racial ideology construct.

The first four components fall within the tenet of opposition to race-conscious policies, the fifth and sixth components represent America as meritocratic, the next frames whiteness as normal, and the final two fall within the frame of racism being of minimal importance. For both the total sample of entering students and the overall sample of students after their first year of college, the factor held together well, with Cronbach's alphas of .769 and .818, respectively. After I determined the reliability of the racial ideology construct, I also ran separate confirmatory factor

Table 6.1. Racial Ideology Factors, Components, and Measurements

	Time 1 (n = 593); α = .769	Time 2 (n = 593); α = .818
Incorporating writings and research about different ethnic groups and women into courses (reverse-coded)[1]	.562	.631
Establishing center for students from different racial groups (reverse-coded)[1]	.579	.650
Hiring more faculty of color should be a top priority of this university (reverse-coded)[2]	.690	.770
Colleges should aggressively recruit more students of color (reverse-coded)[2]	.709	.784
The system prevents people of color from getting their fair share of good jobs and better pay (reverse-coded)[2]	.692	.723
Many whites lack an understanding of the problems that people from different racial/ethnic groups face (reverse-coded)[2]	.543	.612
Our society has done enough to promote the welfare of different racial/ethnic groups[2]	.628	.551
Racial discrimination is no longer a problem in the US[2]	.509	.525

[1] Scale: 1 = strongly oppose; 4 = strongly support
[2] Scale: 1 = strongly disagree; 4 = strongly agree

analyses for white men, white women, nonwhite men, and nonwhite women to see if it held across these four groups. The racial ideology construct held together across these groups and across both samples; all Cronbach's alphas were higher than 0.700.

Step 8: ANOVA and Scheffe's Test. Once I determined that the racial ideology construct held together as a factor, I wanted to test if white male undergraduates had more hierarchy-enhancing or hierarchy-attenuating racial ideologies than their nonwhite and female peers. To do this, I created four categories of students: white men, white women, nonwhite men, and nonwhite women. Then I ran an analysis of variance (ANOVA) to see if there were significant differences among these four groups in terms of their racial ideologies (see Table 6.2).

The ANOVA confirmed that significant differences existed at both survey administration time points, but it did not permit determination of which groups differed in terms of their racial ideologies (significant at the .001 level). To address this issue, I employed a Scheffe's post hoc test. As I was primarily interested in examining white male racial ideologies, I will present the Scheffe results only in relation to the white male students.

Consistent with Sidanius and Pratto (1999), the most systemically privileged students surveyed in this study (white men) had the most hierarchy-enhancing racial ideologies of the four groups (see Table 6.3).

Table 6.2. ANOVA Results for Racial Ideology

		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Racial ideology, Time 1	Between groups	52.58	3	17.53	21.51	.000***
	Within groups	479.88	589	.82		
	Total	532.46	592			
Racial ideology, Time 2	Between groups	60.12	3	20.04	25.97	.000***
	Within groups	454.52	589	.77		
	Total	514.64	592			

Note: * p <0.05, ** p <0.01, *** p <0.001.

Table 6.3. Scheffe Post Hoc Test, White Male Racial Ideology vs. Women and People of Color

			Mean Difference	Standard Error	Sig.
Racial ideology, Time 1	White men	Nonwhite women	.85	.11	.000***
	White men	Nonwhite men	.58	.14	.001**
	White men	White women	.32	.10	.027
Racial ideology, Time 2	White men	Nonwhite women	.87	.11	.000***
	White men	Nonwhite men	.57	.13	.001**
	White men	White women	.25	.10	.110

Note: * p <0.05, ** p <0.01, *** p <0.001.

Specifically, white men had significantly more hierarchy-enhancing racial ideologies than the other three groups at both time points, with the exception of white women during the second survey.

Conversely, the most systemically marginalized students (women of color) had the most hierarchy-attenuating racial ideologies. During the initial survey, there were significant differences between white male racial ideologies and the other three groups, but the differences between white men and white women were significant only at the 0.05 level. The second survey produced similar results. The differences between white men and people of color, regardless of gender, remained significant at the .01 or .001 level, but the difference between white men and white women became nonsignificant ($p = 0.110$).

Step 9: Ordinary Least Squares Regression Analysis. The purpose of this research was not only to identify the central frames of racial ideology but also understand the college experiences that affect their formation. Therefore, the final component of the quantitative analysis involved running two separate ordinary least squares (OLS) regression models: one of exclusively white men and the other of people of color and women. The regression models tested the first-year college experiences that, after controlling for incoming student racial ideology, affected those students' racial ideologies in their first year of college. I was limited in the number of independent variables I could select because of the relatively small number of white men completing both surveys. Moreover, I wanted to see how the college environment affected racial ideology development, so I primarily focused independent variables on college experiences (see Table 6.4). The modeling used the enter method of variable selection.

As there was little change in white male student racial ideologies, it was not surprising that, after controlling for precollege racial ideologies, there was only one measure significantly related to ideology change (see Table 6.4). Specifically, the frequency of discussions on race significantly predicted a more hierarchy-attenuating racial ideology ($\beta = -.18*$). Other diversity-related activities such as in-class discussions of race/ethnicity

Table 6.4. Predictors of First-Year Racial Ideology

	White Men (n = 104)		Nonwhite Men (n = 489)	
	r	β	r	β
Racial ideology, Time 1	.72***	.70***	.65***	.56***
Number of classes taken that had materials or readings on race/ethnicity issues[1]	−.27**	−.08	−.24***	−.14***
Frequency: engaged in discussions about racial/ethnic issues in class[2]	−.26**	−.05	−.12**	.07
Frequency: discussed racial/ethnic issues[2]	−.30**	−.18*	−.26***	−.10*
Frequency: cross-racial interactions[2]	−.05	.16	−.08*	−.00
Frequency: ethnic center participation[2]	−.14	−.06	−.28***	−.05
Frequency: participation in an organization promoting cultural diversity[2]	−.13	.02	−.21***	−.02
Frequency: interactions with Caucasians/whites[3]	−.09	.00	.22***	.07*
Racial/ethnic composition of friendship groups[4]	.11	.11	.32***	.08*
	Adjusted R^2 = .58		Adjusted R^2 = .47	

Notes: * p <0.05, ** p <0.01, *** p <0.001.
[1] Scale: from 0 = None to 4 = three or more.
[2] Scale: from 1 = never to 4 = often.
[3] Scale: from 1 = no interaction to 4 = substantial interaction.
[4] Scale: from 1 = all or nearly all people of color to 5 = all or nearly all white.

and readings on the subject were significantly correlated with the end-of-year racial ideology, but when controlling for precollege racial ideology none of these measures was a significant predictor of ideology change. Perhaps precollege hierarchy-enhancing racial ideology leads students to avoid participation in the multicultural activities that precipitate hierarchy-attenuating racial ideologies.

Conversely, women and people of color had more significant predictors of racial ideology, which was a function of both more substantial changes during the first year in college, as well as having a higher number of survey respondents and therefore more variance to explain. As was the case with their white male counterparts, the frequency of discussions on race predicted a more hierarchy-attenuating racial ideology ($\beta = -.10^*$). In addition, readings and materials on race/ethnicity had a similar impact ($\beta = -.14^{***}$). However, having more white people in students' friendship groups ($\beta = 0.08^*$) as well as an increased frequency of interactions with white students ($\beta = 0.07^*$) both promoted a hierarchy-enhancing racial ideology.

Discussion of Mixed-Method and Intersectionality Approach

The preceding example demonstrates how a mixed-method intersectional analysis helped answer two questions: What is the dominant racial ideology of white male college students? What college experiences affect their development? The intersection of being white and being male was strongly related to subscribing to hierarchy-enhancing racial ideologies, which is in line with existing research (Sidanius and Pratto, 1999) and also makes intuitive sense. White men are the beneficiaries of both white privilege and male privilege (Feagin and O'Brien, 2003), and therefore they are also the ones whose ideological orientations support the hierarchical status quo (Sidanius and Pratto, 1999). They were also a group of students who were generally immune to influence in their racial ideologies during the first year of college. Aside from engaging in discussions about race, no other measures significantly affected racial ideology formation. Thus the college environment generally functioned as a reification of the racial status quo as it left these white male students insufficiently challenged ideologically regarding issues of race.

To the extent that ideology is a central component of the perpetuation of white supremacy (Bonilla-Silva, 2006), this analysis suggests that the collegiate environment served as an arena of racial stratification among the racially hyperprivileged. Within the campus environment specifically, the campus racial climate, or the beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors around issues of racial and ethnic diversity (Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pedersen, and Allen, 1999), cannot be improved without addressing the beliefs of those who perpetuate racist ideologies. Institutional researchers who are

assessing climate often focus primarily on understanding the experiences and outcomes of those who are marginalized on college campuses, but strategies to improve campus environments and foster equity must also consider the ideologies, behaviors, and beliefs of those who are privileged. Institutional researchers can and should add a great deal to these efforts by not only assessing students' racial ideologies but also exploring strategies that appear to be effective in moving students from a hierarchy-enhancing to a more hierarchy-attenuating worldview.

Institutions of higher education have increasingly identified democratic outcomes (voting, civic engagement) and multicultural competence (perspective taking, ability to work in and with diverse groups, openness to new ideas) as necessary for success in today's diverse workforce and society (Engberg, 2007; Hurtado, 2006). To foster these outcomes on college and university campuses, it is important for institutional researchers to help institutional leaders and student affairs educators understand the beliefs that shape students' behaviors as they develop strategies that encourage engagement across difference and cross-cultural learning.

This study also has methodological implications for institutional researchers. Institutional research is frequently defined by large-scale surveys that measure student outcomes, and this is slightly at odds with intersectionality inquiries. As Hancock (2007a) argues, "the conventional wisdom among intersectionality scholars considers multiple methods necessary and sufficient" (p. 251). Thus the strengths of qualitative and quantitative approaches help compensate for the limitations of one another and generate more thorough analyses of structured inequality and individual or group experiences. For example, the interviews, though informative, were not able to resolve three issues: (1) if this construct was consistent across a larger population, (2) how white male racial ideologies related to the perspectives of nonwhite and female peers, and (3) what experiences during the first year of college affected racial ideology formation. The quantitative survey, however, helped address these limitations.

Although the survey instrument was not developed in direct response to data collected from the interviews, the similarity between the qualitative findings and survey constructs created an opportunity to compare students' racial ideologies on a larger scale. This suggests that much could be learned from data collected through a sequential exploratory design. Collecting interview or focus group data to develop theories and emerging patterns in higher education prior to survey can improve the accuracy and precision of quantitative findings, creating opportunities to test the validity of our perceptions about student development and campus experiences that students perceive as most central and salient.

Ultimately, the underlying questions guiding this research are prompted by a commitment to social justice. Institutional research often focuses on student-specific outcomes, with less consideration regarding what these outcomes mean in terms of the larger society. With respect to

systemic racism, this analysis demonstrated that by leaving white male undergraduates insufficiently challenged regarding their racial selves during their first year of college, the institution inadvertently was helping perpetuate and support systemic racism. This analysis, however, can also be hopeful because institutional researchers following the methodology outlined in this research can play an integral role in identifying both how racism is perpetuated and how it can be challenged within colleges and universities.

References

Bonilla-Silva, E. *Racism Without Racists: Color-Blind Racism and the Persistence of Racial Inequality in the United States* (2nd ed.). Lanham, Md.: Rowman and Littlefield, 2006.

Bonilla-Silva, E., and Forman, T. E. "'I am not a racist but…': Mapping white college students' racial ideology in the USA." *Discourse & Society,* 2000, *11*(1), 50–85.

Bonilla-Silva, E., and Ray, V. "When Whites Love a Black Leader: Race Matters in Obamerica." *Journal of African American Studies,* 2009, *13*(2), 176–183.

Cabrera, N. L. *Invisible Racism: Male, Hegemonic Whiteness in Higher Education.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles, 2009.

College Board. *The Educational Crisis Facing Young Men of Color.* New York: College Board, 2010.

Crenshaw, K. W. "Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence Against Women of Color." In M. A. Fineman and R. Mykitiuk (eds.), *The Public Nature of Private Violence* (pp. 93–118). New York: Routledge, 1994.

Engberg, M. "Educating the Workforce for the 21st Century: A Cross-Disciplinary Analysis of the Impact of the Undergraduate Experience on Students' Development of a Pluralistic Orientation." *Research in Higher Education,* 2007, *48*(3), 283–317.

Evans, N. J., Forney, D. S., Guido, F. M., Renn, K. A., and Patton, L. D. *Student Development in College: Theory, Research, and Practice* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2010.

Feagin, J. *Systemic Racism: A Theory of Oppression.* New York: Routledge, 2006.

Feagin, J., and O'Brien, E. *White Men on Race.* Boston: Beacon Press, 2003.

Hancock, A. M. "Intersectionalities as a Normative and Empirical Paradigm." *Politics and Gender,* 2007a, *3*(2), 248–254.

Hancock, A. M. "When Multiplication Doesn't Equal Quick Addition: Examining Intersectionality as a Research Paradigm." *Perspectives on Politics,* 2007b, *5*(1), 63–79.

Horowitz, D. "Speaker Responds to Wildcat." *Daily Wildcat* (2009, April 9). Retrieved from http://media.wildcat.arizona.edu/media/storage/paper997/news/2009/04/09/Opinions/Mail-Bag-3704213.shtml.

Hurtado, S. "Linking Diversity with the Educational and Civic Missions of Higher Education." *Review of Higher Education*, 2006, *30*(2), 185–196.

Hurtado, S., Milem, J., Clayton-Pedersen, A., and Allen, W. *Enacting Diverse Learning Environments: Improving the Climate for Racial/Ethnic Diversity in Higher Education.* Washington, D.C.: ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, 1999.

Omi, M. and Winant, H. *Racial Formation in the United States* (2nd ed). New York: Routledge, 1994.

Pierce, J. L. "'Racing for Innocence': Whiteness, Corporate Culture, and the Backlash Against Affirmative Action." In A. W. Doane and E. Bonilla-Silva (eds.), *White Out: The Continuing Significance of Racism* (pp. 199–214). New York: Routledge, 2003.

Regents of the University of California v. *Bakke*. 438 U.S. 312. 1978.

Riegle-Crumb, C. "More Girls Go to College: Exploring the Social and Academic Factors Behind the Female Postsecondary Advantage Among Hispanic and White Students." *Research in Higher Education,* 2010, *51*(6), 573–593.

Sáenz, V. B., and Ponjuan, L. "The Vanishing Latino Male in Higher Education." *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education,* 2009, *8*(1), 54–89.

Sidanius, J., and Pratto, F. *Social Dominance: An Intergroup Theory of Social Hierarchy and Oppression*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Tashakkori, A., and Teddlie, C. *Handbook of Mixed-Methods in Social and Behavioral Research*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage, 2003.

Yin, R. K. *Case Study Research: Design and Methods* (2nd ed., vol. 5). Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage, 1994.

NOLAN L. CABRERA is an assistant professor of higher education at the University of Arizona in the Center for the Study of Higher Education.