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Introduction

One of the greatest contributions of higher education institutions has been in enhancing individual values, skills, and social mobility that result in a multitude of democratic and economic benefits for society (Bowen 1977; Bowen and Bok 1998). Institutions, and individuals within them, are part of the fabric of the larger social, historical, and political context. Scholars have been able to advance our thinking regarding this link between microlevel contexts, or the individual-, and macrolevel contexts that constitute larger sociohistorical forces (Alexander et al. 1987; Bronfenbrenner 1979), however, few higher education researchers have incorporated this perspective in the study of institutional-level contexts where diversity dynamics play out. This link is important, conceptually and in practice, for achieving higher education’s role in advancing both individual social mobility and greater social equity. In times when our institutions are not advancing social equity, our own students become critics invested in the transformation of our institutions to meet the needs of a changing society. That is, individuals within institutions of higher education are shaped by the broader social contexts and also have social agency to affect change (Bronfenbrenner
1977, 1979; Giddens 1979; Outcalt and Skewes-Cox 2002). Many educators within colleges and universities have been actively engaged in the education of students as citizens that are not only technically skilled but also possess the values, skills, and knowledge to become agents in broader social transformation processes.

As a consequence of the growing demographic of historically underrepresented groups (U.S. Census Bureau 2011), perhaps for the first time in history, we are at a critical crossroad—the success of diverse college students is tied to our collective social and economic success. Years ago, Gándara (1986) called it “the politics of self-interest” when referring to the higher education of a growing Latina/o population that required our attention. Critical race theorists call it interest convergence when ensuing action is taken to improve conditions for marginalized groups because it primarily benefits dominant White interests (Bell 1980; Delgado and Stefancic 2001). Today, the need for educating diverse students is most evident at broad access institutions that admit the majority of their applicants, many of whom have been historically underrepresented in higher education. Broad access institutions understand intuitively that their success and efficacy as institutions is largely dependent on the success of their diverse students. However, all institutions have to be brought to greater awareness about their own role in reproducing inequality. This can be evaluated through guided equity assessments regarding student access and progress (Bensimon 2004; Harris III and Bensimon 2007; Williams et al. 2005), salary equity studies for faculty and staff, or campus climate assessments of students, faculty, and staff experiences (Bauer 1998; Hart and Fellabaum 2008; Harper and Patton 2007; Turner et al. 2008), which are often prompted by highly charged conflict on campus. Whatever the motivation, suffice to say that interests are converging, however, the scholarship on diversity in higher education remains highly varied in approach and focus. Making sense of all of this research is the focus of this new section on diversity in the Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research. In this inaugural chapter, we rely on many published research syntheses, multiple conceptual models in higher education, as well as new and classic areas of scholarship to frame a conception of diverse learning environments. We plan to use these pages to capture a convergence in scholarship that will advance our understanding of research that informs the conditions for student success.

We aim to extend previous conceptualizations of the campus climate for diversity that have been articulated in multicontextual frameworks to develop a more holistic model accounting for climate, educational practices, and student outcomes. First, we offer a critique of existing climate models in higher education, and make a conceptual link with the climate and achieving equitable educational outcomes including competencies for lifelong learning and achievement in a multicultural world. Second, a blueprint for research and practice with concerns for diverse students at the center is presented in light of developments in research and new connections identified in the literature. Third, as part of the model, we locate diversity as embedded in the central tasks of educators—primarily faculty, administrators, and staff—in interaction with increasingly diverse students, all who possess multiple social identities. Fourth, macrolevel forces that influence the institution are presented as a way to integrate a variety of literatures to highlight the multicontextual nature of educating students in a diverse learning environment. We refer to the model as the DLE model. We conclude with implications for research that advance student success and institutional transformation.
The Racial Climate Model and New Developments

Hurtado et al. (1998b, 1999) introduced a multidimensional, multicontextual model for the climate for racial/ethnic diversity. The model was based on a synthesis of nearly 30 years of research on underrepresented populations in higher education. Its main goals were to: (1) transform notions of the campus climate from an intangible concept to one that was tangible (documented and measured) with real consequences for students of color and majority students, (2) highlight the unique experiences of American Indian, Asian American, Black, Latina/o, and Native American students in higher education, although there was great unevenness in research at the time, and (3) provide research-based evidence regarding the multidimensional nature of the climate that clarified what we mean when we talk about diversity in higher education. An additional goal was to put research in the hands of practitioners—academic and student affairs professionals, faculty, chief diversity officers, institutional researchers, and program coordinators—to guide them in improving the climate. Hurtado et al.’s (1998b, 1999) model made several assumptions—the first was that students were educated in distinct racial contexts within institutions that were often influenced by the larger sociohistorical and policy contexts. A second assumption was that the campus climate could be assessed, and indeed, the research synthesis showed how many scholars over the years had undertaken studies to understand the experiences of diverse students and faculty. Perhaps the model’s greatest contribution was indicating how structural diversity (the number/representation of individuals from diverse backgrounds) was a central focus on campuses that lacked diversity, when really most institutions also possessed historical legacies of inclusion and exclusion, as well as a psychological dimension based on different perceptions associated with the positionality of individuals within the institution, and a behavioral dimension based on interactions or intergroup contact experiences on campus. These distinct and measurable dimensions of the climate for diversity occur in an institutional context that is also informed by sociohistorical change and policy contexts that shape diversity dynamics within an institution.

Although it was articulated as a model depicting elements influencing the climate for racial/ethnic diversity, the essential features encouraged broad application for studies of other student groups and professionals on campus (Hurtado and Washington Cade 2001; Mayhew et al. 2006; Williams 2010). For example, although based on a review of the literature on undergraduates from distinct racial groups, it was used to guide a mixed-method assessment of an institutional climate to capture each dimension as it affected undergraduates, graduate students, faculty, and staff, and to capture the experiences of women, lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) students, international students, and religious groups as well as different racial/ethnic groups on a campus (Hurtado and Washington Cade 2001; Hurtado et al. 1998a). Williams (2010) identified potential data indicators in each of the four dimensions and extended its use to examine the climate for diversity at an institution for many other groups—including faculty and staff. In his assessment, the psychological and behavioral dimensions were treated as directly observable regarding the “lived experiences” of diverse groups, which have also been the focus of most climate assess-
ments, although these dimensions are often conflated (Hart and Fellabaum 2008; Hurtado et al. 2008; Rankin and Reason 2005).

As one of the most frequently downloaded articles from the *Review of Higher Education*, the Elements Influencing the Climate for Racial/Ethnic Diversity model (Hurtado et al. 1998b) proved to be extremely useful for subsequent research and practice even though, in hindsight, the model was incomplete. As the manuscript was in the final stages of revision in 1998, several higher education affirmative action cases were winding their way through the courts in various states (Texas, Georgia, Washington, and Michigan) and were likely to be heard by the Supreme Court. As a result, additional research was included in the research synthesis that linked a diverse student body (structural diversity, or compositional diversity in subsequent revisions) and contact with diverse peers (the behavioral dimension) with educational outcomes (Hurtado et al. 1998b, 1999). Evidence based on original studies (Bowen and Bok 1998; Gurin 1999) and research syntheses (Hurtado et al. 1998b; Smith et al. 1997) were included as part of the expert testimony of Patricia Gurin in the University of Michigan affirmative action case and filed by 1999. This left a window in the form of *amicus* briefs to include any new higher education research to be filed before the Supreme Court decision was rendered in 2003. In preparation for the Supreme Court hearing, scholars made explicit the link between the interactions with diverse peers (the behavioral dimension) and educational outcomes, via comprehensive research syntheses and new studies that have been summarized effectively in a body of work now known as the educational benefits of diversity (Chang et al. 2003; Gurin et al. 2002; Hurtado 2005; Hurtado et al. 2003; Milem and Hakuta 2000; Milem et al. 2005).

The educational benefits of diversity research emphasizes that desirable educational outcomes are associated with higher rates of interaction with diverse peers (the behavioral dimension), which is contingent on having a “critical mass” of racially diverse students on a campus (compositional diversity). Therefore, increasing the diversity of the student body is a necessary but not sufficient condition to realize beneficial educational outcomes—campuses need to optimize conditions for interaction that will result in the benefits of diversity (Gurin et al. 2002). Although there was supporting literature, the original campus racial climate model did not specify a link between educational outcomes and student body diversity or interactions in the behavioral dimension of the climate. A subsequent revision of the conceptual model (Milem et al. 2005) based on the educational benefits of diversity research also fails to stipulate this important link, even though the synthesis provides a strong rationale backed by a body of research that supports improvement of the climate to create the conditions for realizing the benefits of diversity on a campus. Today, there is much more scholarship connecting diversity experiences and student outcomes and we now have the capacity to undertake meta-analytic studies (Bowman 2010, 2011; Denson 2009; Engberg 2004), reflecting the next generation of research that empirically supports the value of diversity in higher education. It stands to reason, with existing evidence and increasing emphasis on outcomes assessment at the policy level, that this would be a key area for further development of a Diverse Learning Environments (DLE) model.

A second area that lacked clarity in the original climate model was specificity about how diversity dynamics operated in curricular and cocurricular spheres, and
how climate shapes processes within these spheres. Instead, research on social interaction across race/ethnicity, campus involvements and diversity, and classroom diversity with reference to faculty and peer interactions are embedded in the behavioral dimension of the climate. Moreover, there is a significant omission of the role of staff in advancing diversity and student outcomes. This reflected the dearth of research on staff, and although this latter area is still underdeveloped in the literature, new connections with research and theory can further shape a revision of the climate model (Mayhew et al. 2006; Stanton-Salazar 2004, 2010).

Indicating that the original climate model did not fully elaborate on institutional practices and policies, Milem et al. (2005) introduced a “fifth dimension” to the climate model that is organizational in nature. They renamed the structural dimension of the model “compositional diversity” in order to create clarity and space for the new dimension that represents supportive structures for institutionalizing diversity on a campus. The “organizational dimension represents the organizational and structural aspects of colleges and the ways in which benefits for some groups become embedded into these organizational and structural processes” (p. 18). It includes diversity in the curriculum, tenure processes, organizational decision-making processes, budget allocations, and institutional policies. With the exception of diversity in the curriculum, there is limited research that connects organizational structures with the climate, yet this dimension is a necessary modification because these are often the institutional mechanisms that reproduce inequality and shape diversity dynamics on campus. Many central administrators are interested in focusing strategic diversity initiatives on specific institutional components to drive organizational change, reform institutional support structures, and to create more inclusive institutional decision-making processes. This dimension, in itself, has generated models for institutional change that involve the climate as an essential dimension of organizational life. For example, the Campus Diversity Initiative involving private institutions in California (Clayton-Pedersen et al. 2007), adopted Smith’s (1995; Smith et al. 1997) model of major areas of institutional functioning associated with diversity, including: student access and success, campus climate and intergroup relations, education/training and scholarship, and overall institutional viability and vitality. The model was used to help campuses build and assess diversity initiatives. A subsequent model of organizational change associated with diversity work has also been introduced that includes various dimensions of the organizational environment, including such factors as the external environment, organizational behavior, campus culture, use of a diversity scorecard for assessment, and change strategies (Williams et al. 2005).

Basing their work on Smith et al.’s (1997) meta-analysis of research, Rankin and Reason (2008) developed a Transformational Tapestry Model that aims “to provide higher education administrators with the tools to assess and transform their campus climates” (p. 263). The model assumes a lens of power and privilege in conceptualizing a campus climate for diversity and includes multiple social identities, making its intention to be used with all groups, as it also draws from the work of assessing the climate for LGBT individuals (Rankin 2003). More importantly, the Transformational Tapestry Model is designed to move campuses from their current campus climate toward a transformed campus climate via assessment and interventions. It
is significant for situating the campus climate in relation to six functional areas of practice within an institution, including access and retention, research and scholarship, intergroup and intragroup relations, external relations, curriculum pedagogy, and university policy/service. While conceptualized as distinct from the climate, each of these areas corresponds to structures identified in other models (Hurtado et al. 1998b; Milem et al. 2005; Smith 1995; Williams et al. 2005). Although the Transformational Tapestry Model’s essential purpose is to guide assessment and institutional transformation, the conceptualization of the climate is based primarily on the psychological and behavioral dimensions and institutional norms. The climate is described as “the current attitudes, behaviors, and standards and practices of employees and students of an institution” (p. 264). However, Peterson and Spencer (1990) indicate that the climate includes objective dimensions of organizational life, in addition to the perceived climate (perceptions) and felt or experienced climate, which they deemed the psychological aspects of organizational life. Furthermore, individuals can better understand the climate in their immediate or proximal environments if they can understand how concrete political and sociohistorical developments impact organizational components of the climate, rules and regulations that govern institutional behavior, and ultimately shape individual perceptions and feelings, as well as their interactions (behavioral aspects of the climate) (Hurtado et al. 1998b, 1999; Milem et al. 2005). Institutionally focused models sometimes lack attention to the broader contexts that influence outcomes of higher education. We refer to multicontextual frameworks later in the chapter that illustrate how researchers are now conceiving areas associated with diversity and equity in higher education using micro and macro contexts of influence (Renn 2003, 2004; Perna 2006a; Perna and Thomas 2006). Like the racial climate models (Hurtado et al. 1998b, 1999; Milem et al. 2005), the organizational models also fail to specify the dynamics between actors within the institution.

Perhaps the most compelling reason for revisiting the original racial climate model has to do with its applicability to the many institutions that have highly diverse student bodies, which are typically broad access institutions that admit most applicants. The original race/ethnicity climate model was intended to get campuses to move beyond the numbers (compositional diversity), however, it was also designed to leverage research to bring greater awareness among predominantly White campuses about the experiences of underrepresented groups in order to forge a path toward becoming a Diverse Learning Environment. We turned our attention to a project that would launch a national climate assessment with diverse students at the center and advance a link with outcomes to rearticulate the role of institutions in promoting social equity and democratic pluralism. This was the impetus for a new conceptual model, informed by working directly with broad access institutions using both quantitative and qualitative research. Scholars have much to learn from broad access institutions, at the same time that institutions will learn about themselves through the work of researchers.

The next phase of scholarship on the climate should determine what happens in institutions as they become more diverse, as well as institutions that already have a high level of student body diversity. Have these campuses “taken the steps to create the conditions that maximize learning in diverse student environments, thereby
preparing students for living and working in a society that is ever more complex” (Hurtado et al. 1999, p. 97)? Building on the work of many scholars who have made social justice a central task in their own work, we began to develop a model to guide our research at multiple institutions that resulted in what we present here, called the Multicontextual Model for Diverse Learning Environments (or DLE model). It is a revised model that is a convergence of scholarship that emphasizes the pervasive-ness of the climate (Peterson and Spencer 1990), the contextual nature of the position of institutions (macrolevel), the individual-level dynamics within institutions (mesolevel), and outcomes for individuals and society (combining the micro and macrolevels; Bronfenbrenner 1977; Renn 2003, 2004).

Overview of the DLE Model

We call this new conceptual model multicontextual for diverse learning environments for several reasons (see Fig. 2.1). First, drawing on social identity theory (Tajfel 1974; Tajfel and Turner 1979), its assumption is that diverse students and their multiple social identities are at the center, and also intentionally reflects instructor and staff identity (Marchesani and Adams 1992). More importantly, it focuses on the dynamics within spheres of interaction (with equal emphasis on the classroom and cocurricular dynamics) to include the diverse student bodies at institutions that have yet to achieve equity in student outcomes and maximize the benefits of diversity for educational outcomes. The historical context dictated the development of a race-sensitive model, and post-2003 historical developments dictate a broader model focused on diversity. Specifically, interpretations of the 2003 Supreme Court decision established that an institution’s interest in achieving diversity benefits in the learning environment is most compelling if: (1) institutional definitions of diversity are broad, including both racial/ethnic and nonracial/ethnic diversity, (2) it is evident in the structure, pedagogy, and mission of the institution, and (3) it is supported by evidence that student body diversity enhances desired educational outcomes (Coleman and Palmer 2004). Broader definitions of diversity have been adopted at public institutions in some states (California, Washington, and Michigan), which are currently under race and gender neutral constraints in higher education imposed by state-wide voter propositions initiated by antiaffirmative action advocates. Assessment efforts that link educational outcomes with racial/ethnic diversity remain important, however, institutions must also broaden their definitions of diversity as a compelling educational interest without dismissing distinct social identities altogether. Individual institutions of higher education must also enact inclusive definitions of diversity in an active diversity agenda that is “at once academic, inclusive, and focused on both contemporary and historic issues of diversity” (Williams 2007, p. 14). Furthermore, scholars have chosen to use other models rather than the model depicting elements influencing the climate for racial/ethnic diversity because it failed to refer to gender (Hart and Fellabaum 2008) and multiple social identities (Rankin and Reason 2008), or have modified it to exam-
The new focus is intended to reflect inclusion of the developing scholarship on multiple social identity groups. At the same time we expect that the continuing significance of race, and an evolving body of scholarship on race/ethnicity, will influence how we talk about diversity on campus, we hold an ideal vision of inclusive learning environments—a point we will return to at the end of the chapter.

A second important observation about the DLE model in Fig. 2.1 is that it is much more explicit than previous models about the multiple contexts at work in influencing institutions of higher education and student outcomes for the twenty-first century. Drawing upon Bronfenbrenners’ (1976, 1977, 1979, 1989, 1993) ecological structure of the educational environment, and Renn’s (2003, 2004) adaptation for college student identity development, new conceptions are needed that can emphasize the microsystem that include individuals and roles; mesosystems, or spheres of interaction; as well as the exosystem (e.g., external communities and associative networks) or concrete social structures that influence and constrain what goes on in mesosystems; and how macrosystems (larger policy and sociohistorical change contexts) exert an equally powerful influence over all. The ecological lens has been extended in higher education scholarship (Dey and Hurtado 1995; Dennis et al. 2005; Guardia and Evans 2008; Outcalt and Skewes-Cox 2002; Renn 2003, 2004; Renn and Arnold 2003) to investigate students and institutional contexts, and can be applied to understanding the context of diversity and equity as it applies to students’ multiple social identities. (See Renn 2003, 2004 for a focus on multiracial identity in particular). In addition, students, staff, and faculty are actors within the institution who shape it and are also shaped by it (Bronfenbrenner 1993; Dey and
Hurtado (1995). Bronfenbrenner’s (1977) ecological model of human development encompasses the person, process, context, and time as they relate to development. The development of student educational outcomes is linked with the mesolevel dynamics of teaching and learning (inclusive of cocurricular environments) within institutions, and also with these larger macrolevel constraints and processes.

In conceptualizing multiple contexts that influence and comprise the campus climate for diversity (Hurtado et al. 1998b, 1999), institutions do not exist in a vacuum, but rather are part of communities and individual external commitments and macrosystems or the contextual forces outside the institution. Organizationally speaking, this open-systems perspective frames institutions as entities that shape and are shaped by their environment (Morgan 2006; Perrow 1986), and this interaction is critical for their continual existence as organizations (Scott and Davis 2007). Figure 2.1 shows the macrolevel contexts in the DLE model that can include sociohistorical events or change, policy changes, and the exosystem of local community contexts or external commitments shared by individuals, which together shape the institutional context. Within the institutional context, the central features of the curricular (or classroom) and the cocurricular spheres are drawn from social justice education models detailing how diversity is embedded in who we teach (student identities), who teaches (instructor identities), what is taught (content), and how it is taught (pedagogies/teaching methods; see Jackson 1988; Marchesani and Adams 1992). This teaching and learning model of diversity is adapted to include the parallel role of staff in advancing student development, educating a diverse student body, and enhancing learning outcomes. Too often our models and assessments focus on students and their involvements, neglecting a critical examination of institutional actors and practices (Outcalt and Skewes-Cox 2002). Thus, the focus is on intentional curricular and cocurricular practice for the education of the whole student. Pervading the institution’s curricular and cocurricular contexts, the five dimensions of the campus climate—the historical, compositional, organizational, psychological, and behavioral—shape the dynamics in institutions, and influence faculty, staff, and students. These are all in a dynamic relationship with each other, theorized here to affect the student outcomes for individual success as well as social transformation. Each area of the DLE model is described further, building on many areas of scholarship and updates of research syntheses.

Articulating the Educational Outcomes of Diverse Learning Environments

Student outcomes for success in the twenty-first century represent the various functions that key stakeholders believe higher education performs in society. Syntheses of how student success has been defined in the literature highlight the multiple definitions associated with this concept (Kuh et al. 2007; Perna and Thomas 2006). The most common indicators of student success represent quantifiable measures, such as access to a postsecondary education, academic achievement, persistence, and degree attainment (Perna and Thomas 2006). These achievement-oriented outcomes are
frequently utilized as measures of accountability and are consequently aligned with policymakers’ and practitioners’ interests (Perna and Thomas 2006; U.S. Department of Education 2006). Rather than simply “throughput” outcomes, broader definitions of student success encompass outcomes associated with a quality education, such as cognitive, personal, and civic development (Kuh et al. 2007, Lumina Foundation 2011; U.S. Department of Education 2010). In response to an early accountability movement, Bowen (1977) connected these more expansive conceptualizations of student success with the basic educational task of colleges and universities in educating the “whole student.” An important aspect of Bowen’s view of educational outcomes is that it placed responsibility on the colleges and universities to develop these essential values and skills to reflect individual and societal gains.

There are a number of student outcomes frameworks developed among higher education associations and organizations (AAC&U 2002; see also www.AACU.org; Keeling 2006; Lumina Foundation 2011), as well as others used to summarize results in the higher education literature on college impact (Astin 1993; Pascarella and Terenzini 2005). With due respect to the expansive lists and deliberation taken to develop these outcomes, we focus on three broad categories for student success in a diverse society. We contend that there are three cohesive sets of educational outcome categories that overlap significantly with developing frameworks for a quality higher education (Lumina Foundation 2011), reflect the government’s emphasis on increasing the number of baccalaureate degree holders in the United States (Obama 2009), and are indicators of student success. These outcomes include: habits of mind or skills for lifelong learning, competencies for a multicultural world, and achievement, inclusive of retention and degree attainment. Each of the individual-level outcomes result in collective implications for the promotion of social equity, pluralistic ideals of democratic citizenship, as well as economic outcomes for regions where diverse college graduates reside.

**Habits of Mind/Skills for Lifelong Learning**

As we cannot hope to teach all the content knowledge to keep pace with a veritable explosion of information, educators now focus on preparing students for the flexible, independent, and complex thinking that will allow them to learn throughout their lifetime (AAC&U 2002; Lumina Foundation 2011). Most educators have come to understand that while knowledge in a particular field is essential for specific jobs (specialized and applied learning), the skills from a liberal education once associated with a privileged intellectual and social class must be more equitably distributed to prepare diverse students for the challenges of a twenty-first century workplace (AAC&U 2002). In the sciences, lifelong learning has been described as a necessity for the development of innovative work and is a mindset and habit that all individuals should acquire that fosters self-directed, informal, and organizational learning (Fischer 2001). The habits of mind involve the way students integrate different sources of knowledge. These domain-general habits shape the ways in which
individuals learn and attend to domain-specific expertise (Keating and Crane 1990). In essence, the idea of habits of mind is meant to reflect how individuals merge their ability to think and solve problems, and have the skills to effectively react to new challenges and situations (Matthews and Keating 1995).

Conley (2005) identified the skills and habits of mind that students in high school need to be successful in college. Working with teachers in high school and faculty in universities, he identified the skills and habits of mind of successful college students in six subject areas, specified further in course-related subjects. The dominant theme involved in these discipline-specific discussions of skills and behaviors was that the habits of mind were more important than specific content knowledge. From the time of college entry, students “need a clear sense of the distance they will travel intellectually” (p. 103), and more importantly, learn the behaviors that will result in student success. Implicit in the skills and habits of mind identified is that both student affairs professionals and faculty can encourage student behaviors that will be useful for not only success in college but also for lifelong learning. Some of the important habits of mind include an inquisitive nature and critical thinking, willingness to accept critical feedback and adjust accordingly, ability to handle ambiguous learning tasks, to express oneself orally and in writing, discern the relative importance and credibility of various sources of information, reach conclusions independently, and to use technology as a tool to assist the learning process. (See Conley 2005 for the specific habits of mind that successful students demonstrate in various subject areas).

The specific behaviors and skills that build student success and lifelong learning capacities have implications for achieving social equity at the same time that they have the potential for examining current practices in relation to diversity and learning. Although Conley (2005) does not address the power-knowledge relationship that feminist and inclusive pedagogy scholars have emphasized (Harding 1991; Minnich 1990; Tuitt 2003), the habits of mind are linked to empowering students to use, question, and to take a role in constructing knowledge to make the best use of a college education. Rather than value students who already possess these skills and devalue those who have yet to acquire them, scholars can examine how institutional structures and practices work to undermine the acquisition of skills to achieve this level of independence of thought and action. For example, national studies of college students have reported how asking questions in class declines from high school to college (DeAngelo et al. 2010), no doubt a result of larger classes but also due to instructional practices that treat students as “receivers” of knowledge (Freire 1971). Unfortunately, declines in these behaviors that demonstrate inquisitiveness are more dramatic among women and students of color in the first year of college (DeAngelo et al. 2010).

A review of the literature in lifelong learning developed by the United Kingdom’s Department for Education and Employment (currently the Department for Education & Skills), further emphasizes a link with achieving social equity and the macrolevel contexts posited in the DLE model (Edwards et al. 1998). Five key findings that can be extended to social equity and policy issues include: (1) researchers in the field discuss lifelong learning as a goal but it is not seen as a specific
policy to be implemented, (2) research has been developed in the area of economic globalization that shows lifelong learning is key in developing a competitive, multi-skilled workforce, and can be used as a tool for combating social exclusion, (3) the individual is emphasized and is seen as capable of managing their own learning and skill development, (4) much of the literature highlights the flaws in the market-based approach to learning, where unequal access to learning exists, and (5) notions of lifelong learning are not static and its definition and what influences it are still evolving (Edwards et al. 1998)—this last point remains a place of discussion and contention. In 2002, Edwards et al. published a research synthesis where they argued that not many studies discussed the development of reflexivity (self and social questioning), a practice which the authors theorized is required for an individual to become a lifelong learner. Edwards et al. (2002) further argued that placing emphasis on the accumulation of skills and qualifications by individuals as a way to become lifelong learners is too passive a method and suggest that the key in truly developing lifelong learners that are capable of responding to changing environments is to focus on reflexive lifelong learning.

Adding to this discussion, one quantitative study using 405 undergraduate students enrolled across five selected lifelong learning skills courses; the authors found that orientations for lifelong learning are garnered through instructional strategies such as providing time for reflection, active learning, and perspective-taking, and providing opportunities for positive interaction with diverse peers (Mayhew et al. 2008). Research on habits of mind and skills for lifelong learning aims to further understand the process of acquiring skills, how students learn these essential skills, and the techniques that produce these skills that make the most of diversity in the classroom. This suggests that the habits of mind and skills for lifelong learning are associated with other forms of learning that are of national interest, including broad, integrative knowledge, specialized knowledge, intellectual skills, civic learning, and applied learning (Lumina Foundation 2011). This current direction in research and practice could bring instructors and institutions more information about achieving some of the key outcomes for the next generation of college graduates.

**Competencies for a Multicultural World**

Higher education can also foster a critical consciousness and prepare students in a pluralistic democracy “for their role as democratic citizens, which encompasses the ideal of civic equality” (Gutmann 2004, p. 89). In order for students to become civic equals, educators must employ educational practices that are inclusive and teach deliberation and recognition of differences in nondiscriminatory ways (Gutmann 2004). As society becomes increasingly diverse, colleges and universities are responsible for providing students with an educational environment that will ensure success in a multicultural world. Hurtado et al. (2008) define competencies for a multicultural world as a set of skills and abilities needed to interact with individuals from different social identity groups, and to make ethical decisions in a soci-
ety marked by inequality and conflict. AAC&U (2002) calls this essential learning outcome personal and social responsibility, which has also been referred to as civic learning in the new Degree Qualifications Profile (Lumina Foundation 2011). Competencies for success in a multicultural society include outcomes associated with civic engagement, interest in equity and social justice issues, political involvement, perspective-taking, and pluralistic orientation (Hurtado et al. 2008). Institutions of higher education are especially critical in achieving these outcomes, which can in turn address the persistent societal problems of residential and educational segregation (Orfield and Lee 2005; Orfield et al. 1997). Diverse college environments, for many students, provide a valuable space for learning from other students with different social backgrounds in ways that they would not otherwise experience, as most first-time college students still come from segregated high schools and residential areas (Pryor et al. 2007). Research in higher education provides evidence that diverse learning environments are related to the development of these crucial cross-cultural competencies for civic life.

The literature has also referred to these outcomes as democratic outcomes (Gurin et al. 2002; Hurtado 2003; Zúñiga et al. 2005). Democratic outcomes are the attitudes, knowledge, and skills necessary for participation in a diverse and pluralistic democracy (Gurin et al. 2002; Hurtado et al. 2002). Several aspects of the campus climate for diversity are directly related to the development of these essential democratic outcomes. For example, students who have frequent informal interactions with diverse peers are more likely to feel it is important to influence political structures and social values, help others in difficulty, report involvement in cleaning up the environment, and participate in community action programs (Gurin et al. 2002). Participation in diversity courses (Nelson Laird 2005; Nelson Laird et al. 2005), the frequency of cross-group interaction, and involvement in residential diversity awareness programs strongly influence one’s motivation to reduce one’s own prejudices and take actions to promote inclusion and challenge social injustices (Zúñiga et al. 2005). Furthermore, Bowman’s (2011) rigorous meta-analyses of studies on civic engagement revealed consistent findings across studies regarding the impact of diversity in the curriculum, cocurriculum, and informal interaction with diverse peers.

The development of multicultural competencies during postsecondary education is especially important because they meet workforce needs, which became more prominent as a result of the legal challenges against affirmative action in higher education. During the Grutter v. Gratz case, employers supported the notion that exposure to racial diversity in college has the long-term benefit of preparing students with the requisite skill set to work in a global economy. Some of the skills they noted as most important to work in this new economy included the ability to understand multiple perspectives, to negotiate conflict, openness to having one’s views challenged, and tolerance of different worldviews. All of these skills have been referred to as pluralistic orientation in the higher education literature (Engberg 2007; Engberg and Hurtado 2011; Hurtado 2005; Jayakumar 2007).

Research indicates that several aspects of diversity in higher education leads to the development of this essential workforce competency (Engberg 2007; Jayakumar 2007). First, compositional diversity is important in fostering a stronger pluralistic
orientation during college (Engberg 2007), as well as in post college years (Jayakumar 2007). Students who attend more compositionally diverse institutions are more likely to report positive interracial interactions on campus, which in turn, promote pluralistic orientation (Jayakumar 2007). The development of a pluralistic orientation is observed across both the formal and informal behavioral dimension of the climate. Diversity in the curriculum as well as informal interaction with diverse peers also has positive effects on pluralistic orientation during college (Engberg 2007; Engberg and Hurtado 2011). Participation in diversity cocurricular programs has a positive indirect effect on students’ pluralistic orientation across several majors, including engineering (Engberg 2007) and also across racial/ethnic groups (Engberg and Hurtado 2011). Emerging research also indicates that experiences with diversity in college extend to openness to other social dimensions beyond racial/ethnic diversity. Exposure to diverse learning environments in college also leads to more accepting attitudes toward individuals with different sexual orientations (Jayakumar 2009). This research suggests that fostering a positive campus climate for diversity enhances the development of much-needed multicultural competencies.

Achievement, Retention, and Degree Attainment

Student achievement, retention, and degree attainment are essential outcomes for both individuals and society, as are other key goals of higher education (Bowen 1977). Earning a degree affords an individual the opportunity to earn a higher salary (Leslie and Brinkman 1988; Perna 2003). On the other hand, society benefits from a more educated citizenry when education is considered a public good (Kezar et al. 2005). Public benefits include lower crime rates, higher tax revenues (through earning higher salaries), as well as civic engagement (see Rowley and Hurtado 2003 for a review of the literature). Furthermore, in order for the United States to compete in the global marketplace, it must rely on educated citizens. President Obama has underscored this point by making one of his administration’s goals that this nation, once again, has the highest proportion of college graduates in the world by 2020 (Obama 2009). The fact that this is a national priority indicates the importance to national, economic, and political interests, however, equity in attainments is also an important social justice issue. Higher education studies show detrimental effects of unequal distribution of resources in per student expenditures and state allocations on degree attainment, which contributes to the accumulative disadvantage among the low-income status of students who enter such institutions (Titus 2006a, b).

However, it is important to note that there is a tremendous amount of disagreement among postsecondary institutions on how to define retention. There is also a great amount of variability between how retention is measured at a 2-year college, at a 4-year college or university, and how retention is measured on a system-wide level—whether a student remains enrolled in a higher education institution and the patterns that emerge from that trajectory (Arellano et al. 2010). While a community college typically measures retention within the same semester, 4-year colleges and universities usually measure first- to second-year retention, as well as 4-, 5-, and
6-year graduation rates, due primarily to the external reporting requirements of Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) (http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds).

Hagedorn (2005) critiqued the use of the term “retention” as an overall umbrella label and began to unpack the multifaceted nature of the issue. She outlined the different types of retention: institutional retention, system retention, retention within a major or discipline, and retention within a course. Most importantly, she stated that students who are most often excluded from these measures are transfer students from other colleges, part-time students, enrolled students not working toward a degree or certificate, students who enter at any other time point except with the traditional fall cohort, and other times, students who have not declared a major. These are students who often enroll in diverse and broad access institutions.

A report published by The College Board (2009) considered 275 four-year public and private institutions in five states (California, Georgia, Indiana, New York, and Texas), and concluded that there is a lack of benchmarks for retention practices to compare across similarly situated institutions. While the desire to create a system of retention benchmarks across various types of institutions remains strong, the challenge is in creating a robust enough metric that institutions will adopt. Hagedorn (2005) proposed a new formula for retention in order to better understand an institution’s rate of student success that at a minimum should include: (1) institutional persistence, (2) transfer rates (both of the proportion of students who transfer to other institutions, as well as the proportion that transfer in from other institutions), and (3) course completion ratios. The latter may be helpful in not only tracking student retention but also identifying problem courses within institutions (e.g., introductory classes where large numbers of students withdraw).

While some institutions have achieved a good deal of success with retention in the first year of college, many campuses begin to lose students as they transition into the major (Beggs et al. 2008). Preliminary studies (Ishitani 2006) are beginning to show that different factors have an effect at different time points in a student’s career (time-varying effects), however, much more information is needed about students’ experiences during college, the effect of aid in different years, curricular requirements, and other factors that may impact time to degree. This calls for longitudinal assessment of similar factors to understand their relative importance in getting students through transition points from high school to college, lower division to upper division work, and the transition from college to workplace.

Student enrollment patterns are also posited to affect time to degree, college costs, and the quality of learning experiences (Townsend 2001). Nearly 60% of college students enroll in more than one college or university throughout their educational trajectory (Adelman 2006; Peter and Cataldi 2005). Students enroll in multiple institutions for a variety of hypothesized reasons (McCormick 2003), however, not all enrollment mobility is beneficial to degree attainment (Adelman 2006; DesJardins et al. 2002, 2006; McCormick 2003). At least 8% of students swirl between 2- and 4-year institutions with minimal degree progress (Adelman 2006). In addition, the vertical transfer path from community college to 4-year schools is the path a large proportion of underrepresented students traverse. Fifty-five percent of Native Americans, 45% of Asian/Pacific Islanders, 44% of Blacks, and 52% of Latina/os are enrolled in community colleges across the nation (AACC 2011). However, the
high degree of student mobility that deters degree attainment indicates we must adopt more systemic ways of tracking students and assuring equitable degree attainment across diverse student groups.

Retention Models for Diverse Learning Environments

Braxton et al. (2000) asserted that the previous models of student departure (Bean 1980; Tinto 1993) have reached “near paradigmatic status” in the field of higher education (p. 569). Nearly every academic who has studied retention and student departure employs one of these “classic” models. However, there are some scholars in the field who acknowledge the weaknesses of these theories and call for the incorporation of diverse student experiences in examining and testing assumptions underlying student departure models (Hurtado and Carter 1997; Museus et al. 2008; Nora and Cabrera 1996; Tierney 1992). In the development of the earlier models, the sample populations used to create them was very homogenous, and some would argue exclusively White (Rendón et al. 2000). Given the demographic shifts in society and higher education, researchers need to employ theories and models that account for an ever-increasing diverse student population.

Research on first generation, low-income, and specific racial/ethnic populations has generated several studies that now contribute to a new theoretical integration model (a modified version of Tinto’s model) that can be tested in an integrated way (Hurtado et al. 2007; Nora 2003; Nora et al. 2005). Building on the research focused on underrepresented groups, the Nora (2003) and Nora et al. (2005) model provides greater emphasis on external push/pull factors outside of college (e.g., family), student finances, validating experiences with both faculty and peers, peer contexts, sense of belonging, and campus climate issues in relation to reenrollment in an institution—significant omissions from the original Tinto model. These factors, along with participation in formal structures, inform both social and academic integration and ultimately persistence toward a degree. Further tests are needed of this relatively new model and the generation of other new models based on diverse populations to more accurately reflect their experiences. As Rendón et al. (2000) stated: “While traditional theories of student retention and involvement have been useful in providing a foundation for the study of persistence, they need to be taken further, as much more work needs to be done to uncover race, class, and gender issues (among others) that impact retention for diverse students in diverse institutions” (p. 151). New developments have since occurred in reconceptualizing retention models to incorporate social identity development (see section on Social Identity and Outcomes).

Linking Campus Climate and Retention

The campus climate as a factor affecting student achievement, retention, and degree attainment is one contribution the DLE model reflects, as empirical work has
begun to establish this link. The campus climate has been found to have a considerable impact on students’ postsecondary experiences, particularly students of color. (Hurtado et al. 1996, 2008; Solórzano et al. 2000) yet it is not often incorporated into research on persistence, degree attainment, or student departure. Only a handful of studies were identified that link campus climate to degree attainment using national data (Museus et al. 2008; Oseguera and Rhee 2009; Rhee 2008; Titus 2006a. See Museus et al. 2008 for a review of earlier studies linking perceptions of the climate with adjustment to college.) Part of the problem is that, until recently, national databases failed to include comprehensive measures of the campus climate to test in relation to degree attainment. Recent research explores the relationship between the campus climate for diversity and degree completion. Some research indicates that the structural dimension and organizational dimensions of the campus climate for diversity are related to elements of retention, particularly student departure (Rhee 2008) and degree attainment (Titus 2006a, b). Controlling for a host of factors using a multicontextual model, Titus (2006a) found that individual satisfaction with the racial climate, the average SES of students on campus, and expenditures per student (budget allocations in the organizational dimension) have a significant effect on student degree completion. Using Hurtado et al.’s (1999) framework on campus climate for diversity and Tinto’s (1993) theory of student departure, Rhee (2008) found that institutions with a more diverse student population and higher commitments to diversity are both related to a higher likelihood of a student stopping out, however, not dropping out or transferring from an institution. In this sense, institutional commitment to diversity at a compositionally diverse institution may help diverse students reenroll after a departure, rather than depart permanently. Oseguera and Rhee (2009) found that compositional diversity does not significantly hinder degree completion, despite the fact that the most diverse institutions also tend to be those enrolling large proportions of underprepared students in higher education. However, in the same study, socioeconomic status and expressed financial concerns are related to a student’s persistence.

Museus et al. (2008) found that satisfaction with the campus climate for diversity influence persistence and degree completion differently for Latina/o, White, Asian, and African American students. Direct effects of the campus climate for diversity on degree completion were not found in the case of every group. Instead, satisfaction with the campus climate for diversity had significant indirect effects on degree completion through academic involvement, normative peer academic involvement, and institutional commitment. The relationship between these variables and persistence were different for each racial group. Museus et al.’s (2008) findings indicate that the campus climate for diversity is linked with student degree attainment and retention, largely indirectly through interactions with others in the campus environment and that this is conditional on race. However, further research is necessary to investigate these relationships given that the measures in this study only employed a one-item measure of the campus climate in relation to retention. Overall, the emerging research begins to identify a relationship between the campus climate for diversity and retention.
With the external pressures on institutions to increase retention and graduation rates (given the recent increase in accountability and decreased funding), a more nuanced understanding of how the multiple dimensions of the campus climate for diversity are related to student success and retention is of utmost importance. All of the elements of the campus climate for diversity, through a dynamic relationship, influence achievement, retention, and degree attainment. The three DLE outcomes areas—habits of mind/skills for lifelong learning, competencies for a multicultural world, and achievement and retention—are necessary for successfully navigating and contributing to a complex, multicultural world. Although achieving these outcomes is influenced by the various components of an institution—as well as its surrounding contexts—it is essential to keep in mind that the campus climate permeates the institution and student experiences, and therefore shapes the learning environment and these outcomes. The following section will outline the core of the DLE model, beginning with the institutional context followed by the individual-level aspects of the campus climate dimensions (Hurtado et al. 1999; Milem et al. 2005).

Dimensions of the Campus Climate for Diversity

While external contexts are featured in the DLE model, we begin with a focus on the institution as an educational environment enveloped in a climate that reflects the institutional- and also individual-level lived experiences of organizational life (Peterson and Spencer 1990). The campus climate is a multidimensional concept that is comprised of institutional-level dimensions such as the institution’s historical legacy of inclusion or exclusion; its compositional diversity of students, faculty and staff; and organizational structures (institutional policies, curriculum, processes; Milem et al. 2005). The individual level of the climate includes the psychological perceptions of individuals and the behavioral dimension that encompasses individual actions and intergroup contact experiences. Several scholars have analyzed the literature on the campus climate over the last 15 years across many of these dimensions (Hart and Fellabuam 2008; Harper and Hurtado 2007; Hurtado et al. 2008). The following sections will highlight some findings from these syntheses but more importantly, will discuss key areas where further research is necessary to gain a more comprehensive understanding of all the dimensions of the campus climate and how they influence success for students from multiple social identities and across different institutional contexts.

Institutional-Level Dimensions of the Climate

The Historical Dimension

This dimension emphasizes how the historical vestiges of exclusion affect the current campus climate and practices (Hurtado 1992; Hurtado et al. 1998b, 1999) that,
indeed, were part of a larger sociohistorical and policy context of race and gender segregation. Some colleges and universities began with a more inclusive mission to serve diverse groups of students, however, the majority of traditionally White institutions (TWIs) have always been an exclusive club (Horowitz 1987; Solomon 1985), historically limiting access for women, Jews, Blacks, Latina/os, and Native Americans and other groups over the years. Moreover, institutions in 18 southern states have spent decades attempting to racially desegregate since the Brown decision in 1954 (Williams 1988). Understanding the influence of the historical legacy of an institution’s campus climate for diversity involves a more in-depth examination of an institution’s norms, campus culture, traditions, policies, and historical mission (Hurtado et al. 2008). Qualitative methodologies, such as case studies, are therefore commonly employed to assess the historical context of an institution’s exclusionary policies and subsequent changes that influence the multiple dimensions of the campus climate for diversity (Harper and Hurtado 2007; Peterson et al. 1978; Richardson and Skinner 1991). Future research on the historical context could be expanded on a broader array of postsecondary institutions like those that began with an inclusive mission, such as minority-serving institutions (MSIs) (Gasman et al. 2008), or campuses that have experienced demographic shifts over time without any intentional efforts to diversify the student body. Hart and Fellabaum (2008) reviewed gender-focused, faculty climate studies found on the National Academy of Sciences clearinghouse database. They concluded that “a stronger model will emerge on which all those engaged in campus climate research can build” by incorporating the historical legacy of inclusion or exclusion, in addition to objective organizational and psychological aspects of the climate identified by Peterson and Spencer (1990).

The historical dimension is rarely assessed and as a consequence, there are minimal links established to educational outcomes (Hurtado et al. 2008). Despite the inherent challenges in assessing the historical dimension with quantitative approaches, there are benefits to employing multiple methods in an effort to triangulate findings on the campus climate for diversity and its influence on student experiences and success over time. In a study conducted at a southern flagship university, survey research was employed to understand how the campus climate for diversity had changed over the span of three decades from the perspective of African American graduate students (Johnson-Bailey et al. 2009). The institution enacted desegregation policies during the 1960s; however, symbols from the segregationist past, such as the display of confederate flags on fraternity houses and cars, were still visibly present. The cohort of students differed but the historical context of the institution and region appeared to still influence the campus climate for diversity in different ways. Certain negative elements of the campus climate for diversity decreased over time while others remained the same or worsened. Improvements in the campus climate for African Americans were evidenced by the fact that less students perceived discrimination from faculty, and were less likely to have others underestimate their academic abilities over time, as student cohorts changed. Yet, response trends over time indicate that graduate students were more likely to feel like they were forced to represent their racial group in class, to socially isolate themselves from peers, and report discrimination from their White peers. These changes across time pro-
vide evidence of the continued legacy of the historical context on student academic and social experiences. Future research could examine how institutional histories continue to influence student success and provide more nuanced understanding of changes within the campus climate for underrepresented groups.

The Organizational/Structural Dimension

The organizational dimension of the campus climate identifies structures and processes that embed group-based privilege and oppression or confer resources that often go unquestioned, such as tenure processes, decision-making processes regarding recruitment and hiring, budget allocations, curriculum, and other institutional practices and policies (Milem et al. 2005). These often are based on agreed upon procedures implemented by dominant groups of faculty and administrators. On the surface, they may have neutral facades but work to maintain inequity among groups (see Morfin et al. 2006 for a critique of race-neutral institutional policy and practices). For example, the organizational dimension of the climate can be understood as reflecting the pervasive, systemic, and ordinary nature of racism in American institutions (Delgado and Stefancic 2001), and perpetuate inequity through status quo processes in education. Scholars have also long identified these organizational structures and processes as the key source of barriers to representation and inclusion of women and minorities in the academy (Minnich 1990; Smith 1996). Theory and research on or around the organizational dimension of the climate generally approaches the topic from three angles: that of the broader context for institutional policies and practices, specific policies or practices that structure the environment, and processes to improve the climate for diversity on an organizational level.

The Context for Institutional Policy and Practice

Institutions of higher education are conceptualized as open systems that interact with their surrounding environment (Williams et al. 2005). Shifting demographics, political and legal dynamics, societal inequities, and workforce needs all influence organizational behavior, and are forces that influence the policies and practices within the organizational dimension of the climate. External contexts and relations are key factors in creating transformational change to improve the campus climate for diversity, as Rankin and Reason (2008) identified elements of exosystem and macrosystem levels that influence organizational decision-making, including: state financial aid policies, local, state, and national agendas, trustee decisions with regard to access, and the influence of alumni. The focus on contexts external to the institution mirrors the sociohistorical, policy, and local community contexts in the DLE model described later, however, we offer one research example to illustrate how internal campus decision-making processes are influenced by external contexts.
Smith (1996) interviewed 299 competitive doctoral fellowship recipients (Ford, Mellon, and Spencer Fellows) about their experiences with recruitment and hiring in academe to address institutional difficulty in diversifying faculty. External factors such as availability pools in specific disciplines (and the production of graduates from acceptable institutions) and external associative networks of faculty influence institutional-level recruitment and hiring practices. They documented concrete experiences among fellows that debunked myths about hiring and retention, including the myth about high demand and limited pools for minority candidates. Despite their prestigious fellowships, only 9% were highly sought after candidates. There were more diverse candidates than institutions considered, the search and hiring process remains unchanged, and a lack of diversity on search committees results in little change in the evaluation of candidates for hire. The study showed how legitimizing myths and external relations operate in recruitment and hiring practices, which in turn, work to reinforce a process that results in low compositional diversity in the faculty.

Critical Aspects of Institutional Policy and Practice

Institutional commitment to diversity, or lack thereof, is readily identified as an aspect of the organizational dimension of the climate. Such a commitment must be articulated in an institutional mission (Clayton-Pedersen et al. 2007), and may be well-regarded by students, in particular through transparency and the development of trust (Pepper et al. 2010). Symbolic action may help build perceptions of institutional commitment to diversity, so long as symbols align with political, financial, and structural resources (Williams et al. 2005). Too often, institutions are characterized by administrative nonresponse to climate issues (Yosso et al. 2009), perhaps reflecting an artificial commitment to diversity or misalignment between resources and symbolic action. Institutional policy on the other hand, concretely reflects the level of institutional commitment to diversity (Milem et al. 2005; Rankin and Reason 2008). This is readily seen in university policies, programs and services (Rankin and Reason 2008), which must be tied to institutional mission (Clayton-Pedersen et al. 2007). Institutional policies and processes have the potential to create more equitable conditions and outcomes for diverse students and can be assessed for equity and diversity.

Diversity in the curriculum is one aspect of the organizational dimension of the climate (Milem et al. 2005; Williams et al. 2005) that has been studied and addressed in scholarship. One of the most consistent empirical findings in reviews of many studies is that diversity in the curriculum has the transformative capacity to enlighten and change the perspectives of individuals, especially in the reduction of prejudice (Engberg 2004; Engberg et al. 2007; Denson 2009). Engberg (2004), for example, reviews studies that include a diversity course as a requirement or nonrequirement, as well as taking ethnic and women studies courses. He concluded, “the majority of studies support the conclusion that multicultural interventions are effective in the context of the higher education curriculum” (p. 489), but also indi-
cates the effects for different gender, race, disciplinary, and class-level groupings are still unclear. Much more research is needed to understand when it might be more appropriate for student preparation and development as an intervention for particular groups (Rankin and Reason 2008), or as part of the education for all students.

Theoretically, diversity in the curriculum and scholarship reflects the values of what an institution considers to be legitimate knowledge. Both feminist and critical race theorists have focused on this institutional feature. Minnich (1990) states we must “rethink what we thought we knew, recognizing now that the knowledge established by the dominant tradition is indeed partial in both senses of the term. It makes the part the whole, and that whole is partial to the interests of those thus enshrined at the defining, controlling center” (p. 148). In TWIs, there is likely to be “the expectation that all individuals conform to one ‘scholarly’ worldview, which stems from the aforementioned beliefs in the superiority and normalcy of White culture” (Gusa 2010, p. 474–475). Monocultural institutions may be less likely to value lived experience or non-Western ways of knowing as a legitimate form of knowledge, which are ways of knowing within various communities of color (e.g., Brayboy 2005; Delgado Bernal 2002; Solórzano et al. 2000). Thus, the curriculum becomes an enduring social structure with persistent intrinsic opposition to efforts to redefine it as more inclusive.

The lack of faculty of color (Yosso et al. 2009), as well as the lag in diversifying staff, administration, and trustees (Clayton-Pedersen et al. 2007) is not only related to recruitment strategies, but also to retention and promotion procedures of key personnel (Smith 1996). The tenure and promotion process (Antonio 2002; Milem et al. 2005) and salary inequities (Hart and Fellabaum 2008) are located within the organizational dimension of the climate, and may be justified as fair, however, are likely to embed privilege for some groups and systematically disadvantage others. Administrators’ initiatives to develop mentoring structures within and across departments may help recruit and retain faculty of color, redistribute privilege that comes from informal sponsorship networks, as well as to empower them to engage in transforming the climate for diversity (Kezar et al. 2008).

Each of these aspects of the organizational dimension may be considered within a larger umbrella of the pervasiveness of dominant norms as a marker of a hostile climate (Harper and Hurtado 2007), and particularly the norms of White middle-class culture (Yosso et al. 2009). Gusa (2010) details the concept of White institutional presence (WIP) in four ways. The first, White ascendancy is “thinking and behavior that arise from White mainstream authority and advantage… a sense of superiority, a sense of entitlement, domination over racial discourse, and White victimization” (p. 472). Monoculturalism may particularly be embedded in pedagogy and curriculum. White blindness is “a racial ideology that obscures and protects White identity and White privilege” (p. 477), and is pervasive in curriculum decisions. Lastly, White estrangement is the “distancing of Whites physically and socially from People of Color” (p. 478), and occurs through social and institutional policies that segregate groups, often through nonracial means, such as housing policy. The notion of the pervasiveness of any privileged cultural norm (e.g., Whiteness, hetero-
sexuality) is a crucial lens to apply when examining the organizational dimension of the climate, in order to question if the process is inclusive and if outcomes are equitable. That is, rather than engaging in restrictive views of equality that focus on equality in process (e.g., treating students the same from a colorblind perspective), an expansive view of equality is needed that focuses on equity of outcomes (Crenshaw 1988).

The organizational dimension of the campus racial climate is not often examined empirically across campuses because it requires a good deal of information about various structures and practices within institutions and across a large number of institutions to understand impact on outcomes for diverse students (e.g., faculty reward structures). Nonetheless, the organizational dimension of the campus climate for diversity is important to consider in future examinations of student success because it frames actions that reflect an institution’s commitment to diversity. Rowley et al. (2002) found that despite an institution’s indication that its mission statement addressed diversity, this rhetoric was not aligned with two institutional actions: valuation and rewards for diversity on campus and innovation in creating a diverse learning environment in comparison to peer institutions. The only practice that predicted a diverse student body was lower selectivity in the admission processes (rhetoric and priorities were not significant). The study was based on responses of 744 Chief Academic Officers on a survey related to diversity and resources provided across academic and administrative units on campus to achieve institutional diversity goals. Support from core leadership and a strong articulation of diversity priorities were the most important factors in predicting institutional action in terms of predicting diversity of the faculty and innovation in practices relative to peer institutions. These organizational behaviors are particularly important when taking into account that students, especially students of color, believe that administrators do not place enough emphasis on addressing underrepresentation; the campus climate can be improved through the enactment of institutional practices that promote diversity (Rankin and Reason 2005).

Processes that Improve the Climate for Diversity

The literature can be understood through four overarching themes that help improve the climate for diversity, specifically in the organizational dimension. These include having a clear definition of diversity that influences practice (Clayton-Pedersen et al. 2007), working with multiple elements of organizational culture (Williams et al. 2005), creating shared responsibility for assessing, planning, and improving the climate (Clayton-Pedersen et al. 2007; Kezar et al. 2008; Rankin and Reason 2008; Williams et al. 2005), and having comprehensive evaluation and assessment systems (Clayton-Pedersen et al. 2007; Rankin and Reason 2008; Williams et al. 2005). The location of these processes in the organizational dimension for the DLE model is strategic in that most of them deal directly with institutional actors that are intimately involved in decision-making processes that affect assessment, planning, and leading change initiatives.
First, there must be shared responsibility throughout the college or university for diversity work in its design, implementation, and success (Clayton-Pedersen et al. 2007). A crucial early step in climate transformation is to prepare the campus community for shared ownership of the entire process of self-assessment (Rankin and Reason 2008). Throughout the process, leaders need to create shared understandings of the new values and processes (Kezar and Eckel 2002), and share results with the campus community (Rankin and Reason 2008). One empirical study found that nonlinear deployment strategies by presidents are particularly effective, as they create networks of individuals that facilitate the process (Kezar et al. 2008). Specific processes that have been effective for presidents include developing an internal network, hiring strategic personnel, mentoring faculty of color, developing faculty partnerships in revising curriculum, supporting student affairs staff, engaging with students, and developing networks external to the institution (Kezar et al. 2008). In addition, using a human resources frame that focuses on relationships and developing individuals was cited as the most helpful approach to transformative diversity work in that study. Additional models support a collegial approach that involves and empowers faculty to engage in the change, and that committees must include campus-wide representation and provide training for all leaders charged with disseminating the vision and implementing the diversity plan (Williams et al. 2005).

Throughout change processes, campus leaders must also keep in mind the political nature of the work, effectively manage resource allocation, and acknowledge related power, interests, and conflicts that arise (Williams et al. 2005).

The Compositional Dimension

The compositional dimension of the campus climate has been well-documented and is an initial step in the creation of a diverse learning environment (Hurtado et al. 2008). The compositional dimension refers to the numerical representation of individuals from diverse social identities among students, faculty, staff, and administrators (Hurtado et al. 1999; Milem et al. 2005). Foundational theories assert that the influence of a compositionally diverse representation within an organization is grounded in contact theory (Allport 1954) and the notion that environmental change occurs when significant demographic shifts take place within an organization (Kanter 1977). Severely underrepresented groups are subject to stereotyping, but as homogeneous groups become increasingly diverse, the experiences of minority and dominant members will perceptually change and shape the interactions that occur between these members (Kanter 1977; Thompson and Sekaquaptewa 2002). In the earliest studies of higher education, scholars found a relationship between a critical mass of Black students (absolute numbers not percentages) and incidents of campus protest (Astin and Bayer 1971; Astin et al. 1975). Racially related protests were associated with attaining a critical mass of minorities who could collectively present demands for institutional change. Thus, this review finds that low numbers are detrimental to underrepresented groups (Thompson and Sekaquaptewa 2002), a critical mass is es-
sentential to bring about institutional change (Astin and Bayer 1971; Astin et al. 1975), and substantially greater numbers bring opportunities to increase intergroup contact (Chang et al. 2004; Pike and Kuh 2006; Sáenz et al. 2007), which consequently reduces prejudice (Denson 2009; Engberg 2004), resulting in cognitive change, and civic-minded students (Bowman 2010; 2011). More research is needed on what constitutes a critical mass, and optimal levels for representation. For example, one study found that medium levels of heterogeneity (33–38% of students as racial numerical minorities) in classrooms have positive effects on all students’ problem solving skills and group skills (Terenzini et al. 2001). This seems to support other social science research (Thompson and Sekaquaptewa 2002), the more balanced representation of a diverse set of individuals within a college or university can lead to more inclusive experiences for members of all groups because no group is tokenized and there will be greater opportunities for interactions across difference for all.

Greater compositional diversity is also positively related to satisfaction with the college experience (Hinrichs 2011), as well as ethnic identity development. It is also associated with satisfaction with the racial/ethnic diversity of the student body for students from all racial/ethnic groups, especially White and Latina/o students (Park 2009). Park (2009) argued that student satisfaction with racial/ethnic diversity of the student body and faculty is an important factor to consider in their overall perceptions about campus racial dynamics. More studies are needed on the composition of a campus in relation to ethnic identity development, as it may be that low diversity can heighten racial salience due to discrimination (Hurtado et al. 2011b), however, higher numbers also result in greater identity awareness. In a study of Latino fraternity brothers at a Hispanic Serving Institution in the Southeast (Guardia and Evans 2008), participants talked about how the high proportion of Latinos heightened their ethnic identity. A higher compositional diversity for these students seems to provide a more positive climate that affirms and helps students develop their ethnic identity. The compositional dimension, therefore, is a critical component of student experiences and outcomes, and based on Thompson and Sekaquaptewa’s (2002) review, appears to be equally important for performance in the work environment for staff, faculty, and administrators.

Thompson and Sekaquaptewa’s (2002) synthesis of a growing body of experimental and field research indicated that “being the only member of one’s race or gender in educational or work settings is more detrimental to the performance of women and racial minorities than Whites and males” (p. 199), signaling the great importance for campuses to continue to diversify their student bodies, staff, faculty, and administration. In their experimental study of women and African Americans in contrast to men and White students, respectively, the authors found that being different, that is visibly being a numerical minority, has negative effects on performance for women and African Americans. When “solo status,” stereotype threat, and fear of group representativeness are removed from the environment, these group members can perform at the same level as men and White students. The authors suggest that maintaining solo status for lower-status groups by the way of a relatively homogeneous student body, staff, or faculty, may constitute a subtle form of institutional oppression, as it leads to lower performance levels for those in the solo
status. Thompson and Sekaquaptewa (2002) recommend that institutions maintain clear performance-evaluation criteria in order to reduce reliance upon stereotypes for evaluation, make use of private/written performance evaluation over public performance evaluation, downplay stereotypes, publicly legitimize lower-status solo persons by higher-status persons, assign equally needed information to master for group success, and seek superordinate identities to be shared across diverse groups while also acknowledging individual group-based identities.

New directions in the work on the student compositional diversity of institutions indicates that although absolute numbers may determine diversity on a campus, this does not assure equity in outcomes (Bensimon 2004). Several scholars have used equity index methods to understand issues such as access, policy changes, and outcomes (Bensimon et al. 2006; Contreras 2005; Contreras et al. 2008; Hao 2005; Harris III and Bensimon 2007; Perna et al. 2005; Santos et al. 2010). Despite the high numbers of Latina/o student enrollments, for example, the latter study used an equity index to reveal how Latina/os are below equity in degree attainments (relative to their undergraduate enrollments and in comparison with other groups) in most 2-year and 4-year Hispanic Serving Institutions (HSIs). Thus, highly diverse institutions may still be far from the goal of achieving equity in outcomes relative to their undergraduate enrollments. The use of an equity scorecard has been integrated into assessments of institutions to raise awareness about how practices result in unequal opportunity and outcomes in an effort to promote institutional change (Bensimon 2004; Harris III and Bensimon 2007; Williams et al. 2005).

**Individual-Level Dimensions of the Climate**

**The Behavioral Dimension**

The behavioral dimension of the campus climate refers to the context, frequency, and quality of interactions on campus between social identity groups and their members (Hurtado 2005; Hurtado et al. 2008). Categorizing interactions into formal and informal interactions helps educators to understand those interactions they may have control over, as opposed to chance encounters. Formal interactions are often referred to as campus-facilitated interactions that may occur in the classroom or cocurricular settings and are the result of intentional educational practice (see, for example, Gurin et al. 2002; Hurtado 2005). Informal interactions occur in the everyday interactions between individuals outside of campus-designed educational activities. Both informal and formal interactions have been captured by assessments of individual behavior in relation to developing student outcomes. In some cases, however, it is difficult to determine whether interaction measures were assessed as part of a program, practice, or students’ informal activities.

In a review of climate assessments, Hurtado et al. (2008) find that climate instruments focus on student informal interactions with different identity groups, and reports of positive and negative interactions with different groups (e.g., harassment).
In almost all cases, the focus has been on assessing and improving intergroup relations, however, in studies associated with the educational benefits of diversity, interactions are linked with student educational outcomes. The most common formal interactions in the literature are diversity initiatives that include the curriculum (integrated course content, diversity requirements, or ethnic or women’s studies), cocurricular programs like intergroup dialogue, involvement in student activities, and integrative learning such as service learning or learning communities (Hurtado et al. 2008). Many of these practices are described in a later section on curricular and cocurricular contexts.

Hurtado et al. (2008) also show several major trends in the research literature assessing the informal aspect of the behavioral dimension of the climate. These include an increasing focus on the quality of interactions (positive and negative) among diverse students (Gurin et al. 2002; Hurtado 2005; Sáenz et al. 2007); that precollege interactions determine the quality of cross-racial interactions in college (Sáenz et al. 2007); and that students experience unique interactions based on their racial group membership (Chang et al. 2004). In addition to a continuing focus on frequency of interaction, researchers are identifying aggregate levels of interaction among diverse peers (Denson and Chang 2009), measured as an institutional-level variable.

Provided that many of the formal interactions are considered as part of intentional practice in curricular and cocurricular spheres, what follows is a synthesis of climate literature that builds upon these previous bases to document further developments in understanding the behavioral dimension of the campus climate for diversity with a focus on students’ informal interactions around race and ethnicity, gender, socioeconomic class, and sexual orientation. It is important to note that several systematic, meta-analytic studies have confirmed informal contact experiences were stronger in effect than formal types of diversity experiences (curricular or cocurricular diversity experiences) in relation to cognitive (Bowman 2010) and civic outcomes (Bowman 2011). Further, these synthetic studies found that racial interactions had more impact than nonracial forms of interactions on these outcomes. An even stronger effect of informal racial interactions was evident in the meta-analytic study on the reduction of group prejudice (Denson 2009). Research on college students’ informal interactions with diverse others in recent years appears to be centered around major themes: effects on educational outcomes, perceptions of the campus climate, sense of belonging, transition to college (Denson and Chang 2009; Locks et al. 2008; Nuñez 2009a; Singley and Sedlacek 2009), and students’ ongoing experiences of a hostile climate (Shammas 2009b; Suarez-Balcazar et al. 2003). The literature builds upon the previously established understanding that all students benefit educationally from a compositionally diverse learning environment (Gurin et al. 2002). What is particular about recent research is that rather than measuring student engagement in general, it focuses specifically in diversity-related forms of engagement. For example, Denson and Chang (2009) find that campuses whose students are more engaged in diversity (at an aggregate level) improve learning benefits for all students, even for those who are less engaged with diversity as individuals. This implies that student norms can change.
with diverse peer engagement and that this is a powerful form of peer-to-peer learning that affects student outcomes.

Interaction with faculty is another behavior that is associated with diverse student interactions and impacts student perceptions of the campus climate and subsequent outcomes (Cole 2007; Cress 2008). Cress (2008) found that students who have positive interpersonal relationships with faculty are less likely to report observations and experiences of prejudice. The strength of this relationship increased after controlling for individual and institutional variables related to diversity. Cole (2007) found that interracial peer interactions were positively associated with various forms of student involvement with faculty, which is in turn, associated with changes in students’ intellectual self-concept. Simply stated, informal interactions with various actors within college environments may contribute to a positive climate on campus.

In a longitudinal study of Latina/o college students in 4-year public research universities, Nuñez (2009b) reported that students with greater familiarity with diversity issues, social and intercultural capital, and higher social and academic engagement have a higher sense of belonging, even in a hostile climate. A report from the University of California (Chatman 2008) documented that students in that system are interacting across multiple social identity groups and reported that most students indicate a sense of belonging to the university. Perhaps surprisingly, given the political and religious conflicts in the Middle East and the post-9/11 racialization of Arab Muslim students, Muslim students in general had the highest percentages of students feeling like they belong followed by Jewish students. While one cannot assume that there is a positive or negative climate for these groups, those with a higher proportion of students who feel like they belong at the very least have a more positive experience on campus. In addition, in their study of White students and students of color in their second year at public universities, Locks et al. (2008) found that positive interactions with diverse peers is associated with all students’ sense of belonging in the campus community, indicating that a positive behavioral climate is likely one of many factors related to ease in students’ transition to college and possibly retention beyond the first year.

Research on social and racial justice allies has shown that members of privileged groups usually describe their initial engagement in such social justice activities as by chance or personal invitation—very rarely did a student seek out the opportunity on her or his own (Broido 2000; Broido and Reason 2005). The concept of privilege, and White racial privilege in particular, is crucial to address when considering how to improve the climate for diversity with regard to interactions. Regarding the behavioral dimension of the climate and informal interactions, this is seen primarily in what Gusa calls White estrangement, which is the “distancing of Whites physically and socially from People of Color” (p. 478). Monoculturalism also plays out in the behavioral dimension, particularly through pedagogy. It is “the expectation that all individuals conform to one ‘scholarly’ worldview, which stems from the aforementioned beliefs in the superiority and normalcy of White culture” (p. 474–475). Harper and Hurtado (2007) found that the pervasiveness of Whiteness is one of nine themes that indicate a racially hostile campus. Campuses’ efforts to intentionally in-
clude privileged students in diversity efforts relieves the burden on targeted groups for improving the climate for diversity, and espouses a collaborative effort between all groups to work together toward this common and mutually beneficial goal.

A Hostile Climate—Merging the Behavioral and Psychological Dimensions

Studies that reveal a hostile climate on campus are sometimes based on measures that reflect reports of hostile incidents or perceptions of a hostile climate based on interpersonal encounters. That is, earlier work categorized hostile encounters in the behavioral dimension of the climate (Hurtado et al. 1999) when much of this work can also be categorized in the psychological climate, as there is a fine line between perception and reality. “Reality is not something objective or external to participants. Instead, participant reality is defined through a process of social interchange in which perceptions are reaffirmed, modified, and replaced according to their apparent congruence with the perceptions of others” (Tierney 1987, p. 64). However, the impact is real: students who reported negative or hostile encounters with members of other racial groups scored lower on the majority of outcomes (Hurtado 2005). Further, studies often combine behavioral measures with other measures of the climate in the same statistical models, or even use combined measures. For example, Chang et al. (2009) combined perceptions and behaviors in their measure of negative racial experiences to show a significant negative interaction effect on retention in science majors for underrepresented students who entered college with initially strong science identities. The studies presented in this section represent both behavioral and psychological dimensions of the campus climate (studies clearly based on perceptions alone are discussed in the subsequent section of the psychological climate).

Many of the recent studies of the campus climate for diversity focus on students’ experiences of a hostile climate. Despite the dominant belief that group-based discrimination no longer exists in the United States, the relative abundance of research in this area continues to document students’ experiences of discrimination on campus and draws attention to the need for intervention and proactive steps to improve the climate for diverse students. Most studies confirmed that students of color are more likely to experience a hostile climate (Harper and Hurtado 2007; Hurtado et al. 2008), however, other groups also report a hostile climate. In a multi-institution mixed-methods study, Shammas (2009b) found that both Arab and Muslim community college students experience a hostile climate, but are hesitant to report various forms of discrimination whether based on race or religion. However, their diverse friendships are associated with a higher sense of belonging, which is consistent with previous research on other ethnic groups. The intersection of religion, race, and ethnicity as it relates to perceptions of the campus climate is an important area for future research.

Additional studies show that students are experiencing a hostile climate based on gender, sexual orientation, and socioeconomic status. Despite years of progress, women are still reporting a ‘chilly campus climate’ and express concern for
their safety on campus regardless of race (Kelly and Torres 2006). Similarly, the campus climate regarding students’ and faculty’s sexuality reflects hostility and discrimination (Bilimoria and Stewart 2009; Rankin 2004). LGBT students, described as the “invisible population” (Sanlo 2004), experience a hostile climate as well (D’Augelli 1992; Little and Marx 2002; Rankin 2004), which may prevent them from becoming fully participating members of their campus community (Rankin 2004; Sanlo 2004). Not surprisingly, another study at a midsize state research university in the Midwest documents the presence of different climates in different campus subcontexts (Brown et al. 2004). That is to say, while there may be a generally hostile campus climate for LGBT students, subcontexts within the organizational structure of the campus may be welcoming for these students, serving as safe-spaces. These studies imply that while it is important to improve the overall climate for LGBT students, it may be important to target analyses of different spaces on campus for intervention. Comparing subcontexts within an institution as well as cross-institutional comparisons are needed as this research continues. Additionally, students report discrimination in college based on socioeconomic status. Institutionalized and interpersonal classism was prevalent at a highly selective, wealthy liberal arts college (Langhout et al. 2007), despite this institutions’ identity as a college that is committed to social justice. In addition, students had different levels of marginalization within racial groups based on their socioeconomic status.

This brief review of research on the campus climate for gender, sexuality, and socioeconomic status documents students’ experiences of a hostile climate. Most studies examined these experiences on campuses where the identity group of interest is the numerical minority. It will be important in future research to compare and contrast students’ experiences in diverse learning environments where targeted groups constitute a numerical majority, and where campuses are intentionally facilitating interventions across diverse groups to improve intergroup relations.

The Psychological Dimension

The psychological dimension involves individuals’ perceptions of the environment, views of intergroup relations, and perceptions of discrimination or racial conflict within the institutional context (Hurtado et al. 1998b, 1999). Some have argued that the scholarship on the educational benefits of diversity that focuses on interaction with diverse peers (the behavioral dimension) in relation to outcomes has neglected the psychological effects of the climate (perceptions and felt discrimination) as part of the continuing legacy of exclusion (see Hurtado 2004, 2007). We contend that these two bodies of work are not exclusive. Climate research based on the psychological dimension remains vital to understanding the experiences of multiple social identity groups in order to improve the conditions for success of diverse faculty, students, and staff. A significant portion of the campus climate for diversity literature focuses on the psychological dimension (Hurtado et al. 2008), and this is revisited in institutional assessment circles when campuses experience intergroup conflict.
Central findings from these research syntheses indicate that students of color perceive and experience their educational environments differently than their White peers and that these perceptions can impact student outcomes (Harper and Hurtado 2007; Hurtado et al. 2008; Museus and Maramba 2011; Museus et al. 2008). Specifically, students of color experience discrimination and perceive their campus environments as more hostile, and this is particularly true for African American students. More recently, scholars have expanded research on Latina/os (Nuñez 2009b; Yosso et al. 2009), Arabs and Muslims (Shammas 2009a), and disaggregated ethnic groups among Asian Americans (Maramba 2008; Museus and Truong 2009) to provide a broader understanding of the campus climate for diversity for these previously understudied racial/ethnic groups.

Some studies have examined minority group perceptions of other targeted social identity group’s experience of the campus climate. For example, female students and students of color perceived the climate for LGB students to be more hostile (Waldo 1998), supporting the notion that forms of oppression intersect along students’ different social identities (e.g. Adams et al. 2000; Delgado and Stefancic 2001). In contrast, similar to studies of racial differences, students from the dominant group (heterosexuals), perceived the campus to be more hospitable to homosexual and bisexual students in comparison to the LGB students’ perceptions (Waldo 1998).

Much like other targeted social identity populations, LGBT students also perceive their institution’s climate as negative. LGBT students often worry about being in an unsupportive institution and stress about facing discrimination and harassment, all of which leads to their inability to focus on their academics and/or leaving the institution (Hunter and Schaecher 1990; Lucozzi 1998; Remafedi 1987; Rotheram-Borus et al. 1991). A qualitative study on lesbian and bisexual women’s experiences in residence halls (Evans and Broido 2002) confirmed this space as having a hostile climate; specifically, these students often felt uncomfortable and threatened because of their sexual identity, which created an unwelcoming atmosphere. In addition, these students felt it unwise to open up about their sexual identity for fear of emotional retaliation and hostility from their peers (Evans and Broido 2002). Evans and Broido (2002) urge campuses to address heterosexism and homophobia to improve the climate. In a review of existing LGBT and queer research in higher education, Renn (2010) notes that studies on the perceptions and experiences of LGBT people make up one of the three foci of campus climate research. Despite describing the important role research on campus climate for LGBT students has played in making institutions increasingly accountable for the experience of LGBT students, perhaps as a sign of progress, Renn (2010) states that it is no longer a mainstay in research on LGBT issues in higher education. Despite this conclusion, efforts to assess the campus climate for LGBT students have continued and culminated in the 2010 launch of the National LGBT College Climate Survey (See http://www.campus-pride.org/research/qrihe.htm for additional information).

It is important to also acknowledge the relationship between the campus climate for diversity and literature on general perceptions of the campus climate (Navarro et al. 2009; Reid and Radhakrishnan 2003; Worthington et al. 2008). The findings from this literature further show that students of color perceive a more unwelcom-
ing campus climate and report having observed discrimination at their institutions at higher levels than their White counterparts (Navarro et al. 2009; Reid and Radhakrishnan 2003; Worthington et al. 2008). Worthington et al. (2008) and Navarro et al. (2009) both differentiated between perceptions of the general campus climate and racial/ethnic campus climate in their studies at a single institution. The general campus climate measure was represented by a semantic differential scale that described the campus climate in bipolar dimensions, for example, as friendly or hostile and respectful or disrespectful. In contrast, the racial/ethnic campus climate measure was comprised of student responses to perceptions of the campus climate specific to underrepresented student groups. Results indicate that experiences with racial/ethnic harassment on campus significantly predict less positive perceptions of both the general campus climate and racial/ethnic campus climate. This latter study also highlights that more studies are beginning to examine behaviors and perceptions of both the general and the climate for diversity on campuses.

Student Identities at the Center: Knowing More About Students, Contexts, and Processes

Knowing more about students is critical to the process of inclusion in both curricular and cocurricular spheres of college. Two aspects of college student identity theory are of particular interest in the DLE model: social identity theory and social identity development. On the one hand, students and people in general are ascribed socially constructed identities such as race, class, and gender (Adams et al. 2000). On the other, students also develop personal and social identities along these socially constructed groupings, as well as unique personal identities (Jones and McEwen 2000). This section will first provide an overview of social identity theory and its applicability in college environments, followed by an overview of college student identity development theory. Finally, key research will be discussed that links social identity theory and development related to learning outcomes.

Social Identity Theory

Social identity theory (Tajfel 1981) distinguishes between personal identities and social or group-based identities, such as race, class, and gender (see Jones and McEwen 2000). Social identity theory posits that as people define in-group characteristics, out-groups are formed, and people look more favorably toward in-group members. As social identity group members consider how their respective groups are viewed or their social status, individuals will always try to find a way to be viewed positively, whether as part of that group or by distancing from it (Tajfel 1981). In addition, social identities that are negatively valued by society are the most powerful, psychologically accessible, and are more salient, acting as social scripts (Hurtado et al. 1994).
Social scientists have come to understand that social identity groups are formed through economic and political processes that attach meaning to bodily markers, as in the case of racial formation, and that groups are constructed against one another in social contexts (Haney Lopez 1994; Omi and Winant 1994). That is to say, Whiteness was constructed in relation to Blackness, and vice versa; without one there was no need for the other as a social category (Haney Lopez 1994). As educators consider how social identities are created, recreated, and manifested in diverse college environments, it is important to be critically conscious of the real power and privilege attached to these socially constructed identities such as race, class, gender, ability, and sexual orientation, and how they intersect with one another (e.g., Frable 1997; Jones 2009; Jones and McEwen 2000). Hart and Fellabaum (2008) point out in their review of gender-based climate studies that nearly half concentrate on one identity characteristic (gender or race) and that most studies fail to “take into account the interlocking nature of identity and how these mutually shaping identities may contribute to differing experiences and perceptions of the climate” (p. 230).

Social identity theory has important implications for the development of outcomes regarding retention and achievement equity, as well as multicultural competencies. Considering that students are ascribed social identities such as race through processes like racialization, educators often necessarily examine educational gaps between students based on these socially constructed groups. Although race is socially constructed, racism and additional group-based oppression is real based on these group ascriptions (Adams et al. 2000; Omi and Winant 1994). A critical race theory perspective posits that racism is pervasive throughout social and educational systems (Delgado and Stefancic 2001), and therefore structurally manifests by reproducing inequities between racial groups in nonracial or seemingly race-neutral matters (e.g., Morfin et al. 2006). One example would be educational attainment gaps between racial groups (Astin and Oseguera 2005) in addition to interpersonal bias or prejudice (Dovidio et al. 2010). In this sense, understanding social identity theory and utilizing it in relation to creating learning environments that produce equitable achievement outcomes for all college students is paramount. In developing multicultural competencies, as is the case for transformational resistance, students must become critically conscious of social oppression and be motivated by social justice (Solórzano and Delgado Bernal 2001). This would include how social identities are constructed (e.g., Omi and Winant 1994), and the relative power and oppression attached to group memberships (Adams et al. 2000; Johnson 2005; Tatum 2000). Ideally, institutions of higher education should facilitate the development of this critical consciousness in students. Only through this awareness does it seem plausible that students will move away from perspectives that perpetuate inequity, toward developing competencies that will allow them to contribute to creating equity throughout college and their lifetime.

Social Identity Development

Foundational college student identity development theories did not originally consider social identities (Chickering 1969; Erikson 1968; Marcia 1966), and have been
critiqued for not being inclusive of nondominant groups (McEwen et al. 1990). Chickering and Reisser (1993) have since modified Chickering’s original vector model, one of which is establishing identity, to include social identities such as race/ethnicity, gender, and sexual orientation. Frable (1997) synthesizes additional identity development models focused on social identities, including racial and ethnic identity (e.g., Cross 1995; Ferdman and Gallegos 2001; Hardiman 2001; Kim 2001; Phinney 1992; Renn 2004; Sue and Sue 1990), gender identity (e.g., Ashmore 1990; Gurin and Markus 1989; Gurin and Townsend 1986; Katz 1986; Kohlberg 1966), sexual identity (e.g., Abes et al. 2007; Cass 1979; D’Augelli 1994), and class identity (see Frable 1997).

Jones and McEwen (2000) proposed a developmental model accounting for the intersection of multiple social identities in considering the whole person, and the multiple contexts that make different identities salient. It has since been re-conceptualized to account for meaning-making in the process of multiple social identity development (Abes et al. 2007). While scholars agree that the intersectionality of social identities inform the construction of each identity, competing perspectives include feminist and postmodern conceptualizations (see Abes et al. 2007). As students negotiate tensions between their multiple privileged and oppressed social identities, they also demonstrate a process of self-authorship (Jones 2009). However, a meta-analysis of studies on identity status change in adolescents through young adulthood from 1966 to 2005 found that large proportions were not identity achieved by young adulthood (Kroger et al. 2010). Although that study looked broadly at ego identity development, and not social identity development, it raises questions about similar processes in social identity development in college, and highlights that for identity development in general, individuals’ contexts must contain a balance of challenge and support (Sanford 1966) to facilitate identity development. The importance of context in increasing the salience of multiple social identities speaks to the ability of educators to shape DLE to facilitate social identity salience and development in college, and support the development of related outcomes.

Renn (2003, 2004) pioneered the use of ecological models to understand the complexities of racial identity development for multiracial college students. Drawing upon Bronfenbrenner’s models, Renn (2004) identified aspects of the college environment that correspond with micro, meso, exo, and macrosystems. Microsystems include students’ classes, jobs, friendship groups, and roommates. The mesosystem accounts for the interaction between such microsystems. Examples of components of college students’ exosystem include federal financial aid policy, institutional policy makers, parents’ workplace/job security, and faculty curriculum committees. (The DLE model has a separate policy context as a macrolevel influence.) Finally, the macrosystem is comprised of more abstract forces such as cultural expectations, historical trends and events, and social forces in general. While Renn (2000, 2003, 2004) focused on the influence of these different levels of systems on multiracial identity, she noted that future research should also examine the campus climate for multiracial college students.
Social Identity Theory, Development, and Outcomes

Higher education research is beginning to connect social identity theory and development to educational outcomes, including some that are considered multicultural competencies as well as achievement (Boyd et al. 2003; Pizzolato et al. 2008; Sellers et al. 1998) and retention (Chavous 2000). Although few in number, recent studies examined feminist activism (social agency; Yoder et al. 2011), socially responsible leadership (Dugan and Komives 2010), as well as identifying discrimination (Cameron 2004); these can be regarded under the umbrella of multicultural competencies. In one study, sociocultural conversations with peers, faculty mentoring, and community service were positively linked to leadership efficacy as an intermediate outcome for socially responsible leadership (Dugan and Komives 2010). Identity salience as part of identity development may potentially be related to developing socially responsible leadership, however, such a relationship remains to be tested. Similarly, research has also found racial centrality, another dimension of racial identity salience, to be predictive of perceptions of group-based discrimination and disadvantage because it increases one’s likelihood of responding as a member of the identity group (Cameron 2004). With regard to a gendered activist identity, a small study of midwestern college women found that self-labeling as feminist enhanced feminist action (Yoder et al. 2001). Although complexities exist around identity and labeling, this study also raises questions about mobilizing nonfeminist identified people of all genders to work toward gender equity issues. Increasing salience of social identities, whether targeted or privileged, seems to be an important part of the process of supporting students in their social identity development and in developing a critical consciousness of oppression, which may then lead to equity-minded action and coalition building between privileged and oppressed groups and their members (Zúñiga et al. 2005).

As for identity and achievement in college, research is reexamining the relationship between social identity development and academic achievement, and theoretical support for a relationship with college student retention. The centrality of students’ racial identity has been linked to higher academic performance in college (Sellers et al. 1998). Conversely, having a low racial centrality has been associated with lower perceptions of fit between African Americans and their college environment (Chavous 2000). Moreover, ethnic identity and epistemological development together are as indicative of college GPA as the traditional measures of high school GPA and SAT scores (Pizzolato et al. 2008). Boyd et al. (2003) also link identity processing style to academic performance. These studies suggest that racial and ethnic identity and development may potentially be related to retention via academic performance and social fit. In that vein, Rodgers and Summers (2008) propose a reconceptualization of Bean and Eaton’s (2000) model for retention that extends its applicability to African American students at predominantly White institutions (PWIs). Rodgers and Summer’s (2008) model accounts for ethnic and bicultural identity development in analysis. Research to date has begun to connect college achievement and retention with aspects of primarily racial and ethnic identity, and
much remains to be examined with regard to additional social identities and intersectionality in relation to achievement.

Actors within the institution also bring their own multiple social group identities to the learning environment (Marchesani and Adams 1992), which the broader society has defined, ascribed meaning, and given status, including race/ethnicity, socioeconomic class, gender, sexual orientation, and dis/ability, among others (Johnson 2005; Omi and Winant 1994; Tatum 2000). For example, student experiences in the classroom context and cocurricular context are shaped by dynamics of who they are in relation to what they learn and how they interact with institutional actors (Marchesani and Adams 1992). Within an institution, interactions among diverse people with various social group identities may easily replicate the normative power relations in society, which privilege certain groups and oppress others (e.g., Adams et al. 2000; Johnson 2005; Tatum 2000), thus creating a hostile climate for diversity. Institutions are also positioned to counter and undo institutional oppression and interpersonal bias. In essence, what the DLE model provides is an opportunity to understand the various contexts in which diverse students learn, and how these varying contexts are linked to students’ multiple social identities in the campus climate for diversity.

The Curricular Context

The classroom experience in the DLE model draws on Jackson’s (1988) initial model as cited in Marchesani and Adams (1992) to understand that a diverse learning environment should involve a diverse curriculum content that is associated with the multiple social identities of students. More important to this experience are the interactions between the students and instructors based on their own social group identities. In addition, the extent to which faculty use inclusive pedagogies, are self-reflective, and take note of their students’ identities are critical areas for student success within the classroom. Thus, diverse learning environments are characterized by the dynamic interplay between faculty and student identity, content, and pedagogy, all of which are facilitated by processes such as intentional socialization, validation, and inclusion that creates the psychological sense of integration or sense of belonging.

Instructor’s Identity: Influences in the Classroom

Cohen and Brawer (1972) put it best when they wrote a piece on instructor identity: “The teacher is both a person and a practitioner” (p. 1). Reflection on identity is key: the better one understands oneself, the more one’s performance can benefit the students he or she teaches. Reybold (2003) conducted a study on the experience of becoming faculty, focusing on how graduate students come to adopt their instructor or faculty identity. He identified five dominant pathways that doctoral students and young faculty exhibited: anointed, pilgrim, visionary, philosopher, and drifter.
The anointed prioritize research productivity over teaching proficiency, the pilgrim sees the doctoral program as a training camp for becoming a faculty and researcher, the visionary sees their teaching and research goals as a way of achieving social change, and the philosophers pursue faculty positions to fulfill their quest for intellectual growth and enlightenment (Reybold 2003). In taking into consideration instructors’ initial period of professional identity formation, a new dimension of understanding instructors’ perspectives is born and provides insight into why they engage in certain pedagogical practices. It is important to further understand how these professional roles intersect with multiple social identities among faculty.

Focusing on how identity directly influences classroom practices, one study on the impact of gender and race on faculty teaching experiences reported that 82% of female faculty participants had experiences of being challenged about their position (i.e., students mistook them for graduate students or secretaries). At the same time, their efforts in achieving classroom success were dismissed by their colleagues, and they endured double-standards in etiquette and dress (Kardia and Wright 2004). These women reported investing time in pedagogical practices to meet these challenges and establish credibility in the classroom. This included being a “warm authoritarian” by staying tough and bringing in humor, using dress and demeanor strategically, enforcing a preferred form of address, clarifying academic and behavioral expectations, being selective about making personal disclosures in the classroom, having high standards for students, emphasizing credentials and qualifications on the first day of class, and posting and keeping regular office hours (Kardia and Wright 2004).

The literature on faculty of color is substantial (Turner et al. 2008), and Stanley (2006) summarized it best as focused on four broad and “interlocking themes” related to this review including: the degree to which faculty of color feel comfortable in the institution; documented experiences of discrimination; challenges related to teaching, and tenure and promotion—in other words, several dimensions of the campus climate. Based on 27 faculty narratives, using autoethnography, the study illustrated how salient race and gender identity becomes for faculty of color in the areas identified. Additional faculty narratives are beginning to appear in print that document instructors’ reflection on their own identities made salient in different institutional contexts, challenges related to the climate of the institution, as well as moments of empowerment among young faculty interested in social justice aims (Murakami-Ramalho et al. 2010; Núñez and Murakami-Ramalho 2011; Tuitt et al. 2009). These studies explore the intersections of identity, including multiracial/ethnic faculty. Another study focused on instructors with disabilities and how their self-understanding influenced their pedagogical knowledge and practice (Gabel 2001). One participant of the study described how he used his own childhood experience of feeling lost, struggling to learn, and having behavioral problems to connect with a student who was exhibiting similar behavior. Another participant shares in that practice, where she reveals she’s become a more reflective and sensitive teacher since being diagnosed with leukemia. The author proposes that instructors reflect deeply on disability and pedagogy and ask themselves who they want their students to become and how they can help them succeed to achieve their goals (Gabel 2001).
Bromley (1989) also writes on the importance of relating an instructor’s identity to the classroom and encourages critical educators to explicitly introduce their identities and personal backgrounds into the classroom as a way of creating explanatory, motivational, and integrating power. He argues that in order to engage in critical pedagogy, instructors must link their identity to the topics discussed in class, such as systemic societal factors that influence our daily lives (Bromley 1989). Rendón (2009) indicates that instructors engage in multiple roles that inform positionality: as teacher/learners, they are experts that remain open to learning; as artists, they foster creativity and insight; as activist/social agents, they are concerned with social justice work; as healer/liberators, they help heal the “wounds of students’ past invalidation and self-limiting beliefs” (p. 138), and as humanitarians, they view their teaching in a broader context as a service to humanity. This conceptualization was introduced to empower instructors to reform their pedagogy, make their daily work more relevant to their own identity, and address larger social justice aims. Clearly, more work is needed to extend the link between instructor identity, pedagogy, interactions with multiple student identities, and outcomes.

Pedagogy/Teaching Methods

There is a vast literature on pedagogy and various teaching methods, consequently we limit this review to the scholarship that particularly addresses teaching in diverse classrooms. Tuitt (2003) describes inclusive pedagogy as an emerging body of scholarship that “advocates teaching practices that embrace the whole student in the learning process” and provides “insight into how college educators can create classrooms in which diversity is valued as a central component of the process” (p. 243). Inclusive pedagogy seeks to transform higher education as well as engage in a broader vision of social transformation. This genre includes “critical pedagogy” that has origins in the work of Paulo Freire (1971) that influenced subsequent developments advanced by the writing of critical pedagogy scholars Giroux, McIlrue, hooks, and Darder (cited in Tuitt 2003). This pedagogy focuses on the development of a critical consciousness among learners—not as objects but as subjects and knowers of the world. Freire’s (1970, 1983) classic identification and critique of “banking education” as a description of the traditional way of delivering knowledge to disempowered learners has had a strong impact on rethinking practice throughout education. Feminist pedagogy in higher education, beginning in the 1960s, is an example of critical pedagogy in practice because of its focus on consciousness raising, value placed on the experience and voice of the learner, and social transformation aims (Weiler 1991). Both reflect a parallel development of changes in pedagogy (with global impact) inspired by larger sociohistorical change that shaped dynamics in diverse classrooms.

Tuitt (2003) acknowledged feminist scholarship as important to the development of inclusive pedagogy in higher education, as well as other models focused on multicultural education and race-centered pedagogies that have implications for higher education. The scholarship on inclusive pedagogy models also includes those described as “engaging pedagogy” (Hooks 1984) that connects students with
content and their own life experiences; “equity pedagogy” (Banks and McGee 1997), which involves students in a process of knowledge construction and helps “students to become reflective and active citizens of a public, democratic society” (cited in Tuit 2003, p. 246); and “culturally relevant” pedagogy (Ladson-Billings 1995). Ladson-Billings (1995), describes culturally relevant pedagogy as a series of teaching behaviors that are meant to bridge the classroom with her/his students’ cultural backgrounds. She argues that a culturally relevant teacher must be willing to meet three criteria: “an ability to develop students academically, a willingness to nurture and support cultural competence, and the development of a sociopolitical or critical consciousness” (p. 483). According to Rendón (1994), instructors can also provide a validating experience for students in their classrooms by following a few guidelines, including demonstrating a genuine concern for teaching students, being personable and approachable toward students, treating all students equally, structuring learning experiences that allows students to feel confident in their learning capacities, working with students who need extra help on a one-on-one basis, and providing helpful and meaningful feedback to students.

Rendón (2009) also reviewed a brief history of inclusive pedagogies, ways of knowing, and intelligences (multiple and spiritual) and introduced a new model called *sentipensante* (sensing/ thinking) pedagogy reflecting cognitive and affective integration of instructors’ reflective practice—an approach based on “wholeness, harmony, social justice and liberation” (p. 132). This model can also come under the umbrella of inclusive pedagogy, as it ties in many forms of teaching practices with the development of instructor and student identity. However, Tuit (2003) stated that there are few studies about the consequences of inclusive pedagogies in diverse classrooms in higher education. He relied on a few studies of Black students in teaching/learning environments (Baker 1998; Steele 1999; Zimmerman 1991 as cited in Tuit 2003) and a review of inclusive pedagogy scholarship to identify teaching practices or the characteristics of inclusive pedagogy. These principles include: (1) positive student-faculty interaction to create a welcoming environment for learning, (2) sharing power which makes students and faculty equally responsible for constructing knowledge, (3) a dialogical process of professor-student interaction to “create respectful, challenging, and collaborative learning environments” (p. 248), characterized by trust and risk-taking, (4) the activation of student voices, “to hear each other is an act of recognition”—“no student remains invisible in the classroom” (Hooks 1984, cited in Tuit 2003, p. 249), and (5) use of personal narratives to personalize subject matter, and make connections between classroom and life experience learning. The framework developed by Tuit (2003) provides a new way of linking studies on forms of teaching methods in higher education with the transformational goals of inclusive pedagogy scholarship. We identified a new set of instructor-identity-based narratives (reviewed in the previous section) that can be linked with an array of practices focused on students with multiple social identities.

For example, Danowitz and Tuit (2011) use autoethnographic methods to illustrate how they work toward curriculum change and how inclusive pedagogy principles work in practice in a higher education program. Determining what works best in diverse higher education classrooms is clearly a focus of future research and practice.
Course Content: Making Curriculum Inclusive

Minnich (1990) states why it is so important to focus on change in the curriculum in higher education:

As long as we do not engage in critique and correction of the curriculum, the framework of meaning behind particular questions of what to teach to whom will continue to prove inhospitable to all those who have been excluded from knowledge and knowledge-making and also from effective participation in understanding and exercising power on a basic cultural level. (p. 11–12)

An accumulation of studies have also provided a strong rationale for making the curriculum more inclusive. In a single-institution study, researchers found that when students are exposed to diversity in the curriculum, they are more likely to develop critical perspectives on how their institution fosters a positive climate for diversity (Mayhew et al. 2006). The study further suggests that the instructors’ design of curricula that integrates different racial and ethnic perspectives leads to a more welcoming environment for diverse students (Mayhew et al. 2006). As stated in the section on the organization dimension of the climate, diversifying the content of courses in the curriculum has been extensively studied: students who report taking courses with diversity content (either required or electively) demonstrate significant change in the reduction of prejudice toward racial groups (Engberg 2004; Denson 2009) and LGBT peers (Engberg et al. 2007). Further, the aggregate level of student participation in a diverse curriculum on a campus is also associated with reduction of prejudice among individuals (Denson and Chang 2009). Consistent evidence has also been affirmed through meta-analytic studies linking diversity coursework and students’ cognitive development (Bowman 2010) and civic behaviors and dispositions (Bowman 2011). The cognitive benefits associated with diversity coursework are more influential for particular groups; while it may create comfort for diverse groups, cognitive gains were more evident for White students and students from low- and middle-income families (Bowman 2009). This same study also showed that taking one diversity course (vs. none) is associated with greater cognitive gains than additional courses, suggesting initial encounters with diverse perspectives have a significant effect in altering students’ thinking. Denson (2009) and Bowman (2010, 2011) both concluded that while diversity in the curriculum is important, content-knowledge interventions are more effective when contact with diverse racial groups is also incorporated. This suggests that diversifying course content and using inclusive pedagogy that increases intergroup contact makes for optimal conditions in diverse learning environments and the achievement of desirable outcomes.

The Cocurricular Context

Much of what students learn in college also occurs outside of the classroom, in campus-facilitated programs and activities made possible by cocurricular programming. The cocurricular aspect of the collegiate environment is equally important in
advancing the education of students, affecting student development, and creating a positive climate on campus. For this reason, we incorporate a component of the framework that models the dynamic dimensions of the cocurricular context. It is also based on the Jackson (1988)/Marchesani and Adams (1992) model of the curricular context to parallel dynamics in the cocurricular environment. Similar to the components within a classroom setting, the cocurricular aspect of a college campus mirrors the interaction of staff identities with student identities, programming for design of content, and practices centered on student development.

Staff Identity

Acknowledging the influence that staff has on the cocurricular life of a student in college (Bresciani 2006; Kuh et al. 2005), it is critical to have a diverse staff who possess the multicultural competencies to work with diverse students. One study found that student affairs moves more rapidly in the training and diversification of staff than academic affairs (Richardson and Skinner 1990). How a student perceives college personnel is likely to shape comfort levels and engagement in activities that facilitate competencies for a multicultural society, habits of mind for lifelong learning, achievement, and retention. From a theoretical standpoint, staff has the capacity to become vital institutional agents in a student’s navigation of college and ultimate success. Institutional agents are described as individuals who have the capacity and commitment to directly or indirectly transmit institutional knowledge and resources to students (Stanton-Salazar 2004, 2010; Stanton-Salazar and Dornbusch 1995).

One of the few empirical studies focusing on staff was conducted at a large, public, predominantly White university in the Midwest and found that an institution’s ability to achieve a positive climate for diversity is contingent upon (among other things) the personal characteristics of the staff member including race, gender, education level, and age (Mayhew et al. 2006). Although studies centering the experiences of staff members are scant, the finding that perceptions vary as a function of race and gender mirrors previous findings on students and faculty (Griffin 2008; Hurtado et al. 1998b; Nora and Cabrera 1996). Staff members at often times have direct and frequent contact with students. This is why their influence has the potential to leave a lasting impression of the institution. Diverse staff identities are important as potential influences on students’ perceptions of the compositional diversity of the institution at the least, and at most can be vital to the success of students when they take on the role of institutional agents (Stanton-Salazar 2004, 2010).

Practice

A number of national entities outline institutional practices that help facilitate student success. One of the most widely known frameworks is AACU’s “High-Impact Educational Practices” (American Association of Colleges and Universities 2008). While extensive study is still needed on the impact of these practices on diverse
groups, they concluded that these practices were most important for underrepresented groups but also identified that these groups were significantly less likely to have access to high impact practices. While many practices are primarily academic-based, several address the cocurricular side of successful practices meant to complement student academic work. To illustrate one example, in learning communities, it is important to engage in “common intellectual experiences” (AAC&U 2008). The very nature of learning communities reinforces the importance of out-of-classroom learning. Experiential learning is also stressed within the DLE model. In a national study of living learning communities, Inkelas et al. (2007) found that participants in such practices found it easier to socially and academically transition into college and also demonstrated higher levels of critical thinking and analytical abilities. In addition, service or community-based learning as well as internships highlight that learning outside of the classroom is essential in order to prepare students to be citizens in a diverse society (AAC&U 2008). Furthermore, participation in these kinds of programs reinforces the interconnectedness of service-learning, social justice, multicultural competence, and civic engagement (Einfeld and Collins 2008). Embedded in practice is the notion of the development of the whole student, and concern for the health and welfare of students as citizens of a community of learners. Finally, Bresciani (2006) presented an illustrative compilation of good practices and key questions in assessing program effectiveness.

Compelling evidence from a range of studies shows the impact of cocurricular diversity activities on reduction of prejudice (Denson 2009), cognitive development (Bowman 2010), and civic engagement (Bowman 2011), and pluralistic orientation skills among different racial groups (Engberg and Hurtado 2011). As stated earlier, all forms of intentional educational practice that increase interaction across different groups enhance learning outcomes. It is important to note that in all of these studies, cocurricular diversity initiatives show a unique effect even after controlling for informal interaction across groups. Diversity practices can be broad-based or targeted. Hurtado et al. (2008) identify a typology of campus-facilitated diversity initiatives, based on ten public university campuses. These practices range from institutional-wide strategic initiatives, organized community outreach initiatives, cocurricular initiatives or events, “safe space” initiatives (identity and awareness programs for target groups), integrative learning initiatives such as intergroup dialogue, and service learning that span academic and student affairs. Intergroup dialogue, in particular, is used in both curricular and cocurricular contexts, has a specific pedagogy of engagement and a developing body of scholarship (Zúñiga et al. 2007). Thus, there are distinct practices that have been studied in relation to desired outcomes.

Programming

In considering the cocurricular aspect of campus life, programming is the most visible and identifiable within an institution—everything from student activities to first-year orientation and diversity events falls under this category. Most student af-
fairs programming has a clear educational purpose and activities intended to result in desired outcomes, and it is analogous to course content in the curricular context. At present there are more studies on specific types of practices but little research on the effects of intentional programming efforts. Still the positive effects of co-curricular activities identified in the literature suggest that broad base discussions should occur regarding coordination of programming within and across campus units to achieve desired outcomes. This direct influence on student learning and development confirms that student affairs practitioners can be purposeful in creating learning opportunities for their students with proven results. Each one of these components (staff identity, practice, and programming) come together to form coherent cocurricular learning experiences. With regard to the climate for diversity, it is crucial that diversity and equity programming not only focus on supporting students from targeted social identity groups, but also incorporate ally development (Edwards 2006) for students with privileged social identities as well. In this way, programming can be inclusive of all students and challenge unequal social power based on group identities through collaboration and shared responsibility.

**Processes**

Processes occur at the intersection of student and educator’s identities, and intentional practices (content, pedagogy, practice, and programming), that advance both diversity and learning to achieve essential outcomes. These processes that occur are socialization or resocialization, validation, and building a sense of community through encouraging students’ sense of belonging. There are also other processes that occur but these are conceptualized as most salient in diverse learning environments, although they are also likely to work in less diverse settings.

**Socialization or Resocialization**

One of the key processes that occurs during college is socialization. A classic definition of college impact asserts that colleges socialize students in preparation for work/life in the larger society:

As socializing institutions, colleges and universities have the task of influencing students so that they leave campus with improved or different knowledge, skills, attitudes, and values. Designated socializing agents (primarily the faculty) act on behalf of the organization to train, develop, modify, or in some way “act upon” the individuals (students) who enter it, in more or less formal ways. (Feldman and Newcomb 1969, pp. 227–228)

While there is much evidence about the impact of college, and growing research on the conditional effects on certain groups of diverse students (Pascarella and Terenzini 2005), we still know much less about the actual processes that occur in the mutual exchange between diverse students and faculty, diverse staff and students, and diverse peers and students that result in a variety of outcomes. Lacy (1978) con-
cluded that although the direct effect of the college environment on student values (liberalism, cognitive complexity, thinking introversion, autonomy, theoretical orientation, social conscience, and cultural sophistication) was small, when examined through the mediation of peer and faculty interaction, the influence of the college environment remains great. This conclusion was mirrored nearly 30 years later in the conclusions of Pascarella and Terenzini’s comprehensive synthesis of college impact research (2005). Focus is now needed on socialization processes that are compatible with diverse students’ experiences. For the mechanisms of socialization are also institutional agents (Stanton-Šalazar 2004, 2010) that can help students from historically underrepresented groups make the most of opportunities in college. Most of the studies that use the socialization process as a frame have been focused on graduate students in preparation for a particular career. Antony (2002) provides a synthesis of both career choice and research on how higher education institutions work to socialize graduate students’ in their professional fields. He concludes that although most research and frameworks offered by scholars make a case for congruence and assimilation to graduate culture, it is problematic to continue theorizing about graduate school socialization in this way because it ignores the fact that individuals, whose unique identities are not similar to graduate school culture, may find it difficult assimilating to the culture. It is appropriate to acknowledge and study institutional and cultural socialization processes to interrogate the dominant norms, messages, rules, roles, and models of ways of being (Harro 2000) to understand exclusion and inclusion. In their model of *Multicultural Teaching and Learning* in the classroom, Marchesani and Adams (1992) posit that both instructors and students experience a dynamic between monocultural and multicultural socialization in classrooms that can result in culture shock or alienation for students.

Harro (2000) stated that we are socialized in our respective social identities throughout our lifetime “by powerful forces in our worlds to play the roles prescribed by an inequitable social system” (p. 15). He goes on to detail using recognition of the “cycle of socialization” to examine students’ own social identity development and develop critical thinking about how their own views are shaped by institutions. In this case, he shows how educators can also be resocializing agents for students from multiple social identities groups, teaching students to recognize prejudice, understand the sources of conflict, and interrupt unthinking social behaviors. If higher educations’ goal is to improve both individual social mobility and advance social equity, educators have to adopt the stance of a resocializing agent. Studies about these resocialization processes can be tied to practices and inclusive pedagogy that raise consciousness, challenge existing worldviews, and provide students with the tools to become “empowered, informed, and responsible” learners (AAC&U 2002).

**Creating Community: Sense of Belonging**

At the intersection of curricular and cocurricular spheres is also the process of creating community, which also may spur in-group and out-group dynamics (Tajfel
1974, 1981; Tajfel and Turner 1979). Drawn from the work on social cohesion in sociology (Bollen and Hoyle 1990), sense of belonging is a measure of an individual’s perceived social cohesion in a variety of environments (from college campuses to nations). Much like the psychological sense of integration in Tinto’s model (1993), many researchers have studied sense of belonging among diverse groups of students as distinct from student involvements or memberships. That is, studies have shown that diverse students’ involvements differ in the degree to which they generate a sense of belonging (Hurtado and Carter 1997; Locks et al. 2008; Shammas 2009b), so not all types of engagement in college will produce the same desired sense of community, and subsequently have different effects on transition to college, retention, and degree attainment (Hausman et al. 2007; Nuñez 2009a). Many of the studies have already been mentioned in this review. We summarize here the main developments in this work. First, we note that sense of belonging is now the focus of studies on a variety of identity groups (Hausman et al. 2007; Hurtado and Carter 1997; Hurtado and Ponjuan 2005; Langhout et al. 2009; Locks et al. 2008; Museus and Maramba 2011; Nuñez 2009b; Shammas 2009a). As a result, it is now part of a new integration model that is focused on diverse college students (Nora 2003; Nora et al. 2005). Second, the studies have made a definitive connection with the campus climate—positive climates are associated with a higher sense of belonging, and mediating factors such as diverse friendships and positive interactions across difference improve sense of belonging in a negative climate (Locks et al. 2008; Nuñez 2009b; Ostrove and Long 2007; Shammas 2009b). New research is now extending into subenvironments such as majors; perceptions of a hostile climate are associated with a lower sense of belonging among both students of color and White students in STEM fields in the first year of college (Hurtado et al. 2007).

Scholars have also begun to examine sense of belonging across other dimensions of social identity. Langhout et al. (2009) explored how experiences with classism in a private, elite institution influenced school belonging and several psychosocial outcomes. The measures of school belonging in this study consist of school affect and school normative scales (Allen and Meyer 1990), and course adjustment and roommate adjustment (Solberg et al. 1993). Although they subsume these transition measures under the concept of sense of belonging, these are typically separate concepts in higher education research; nevertheless, their study examines important perceptions illustrative of students’ sense of belonging in college as it pertains to socioeconomic class and classism. Langhout et al. (2009) found that classism was negatively associated with school belonging and psychosocial outcomes. Classism, as experiences of feeling discriminated against in relation to class background, was also positively associated with intentions to leave school without graduating. Interestingly, race and gender were not associated with classism in this study, however, this could be a result of the low representation of racially/ethnically diverse students in the sample. Ostrove and Long (2007) also examined students’ sense of belonging based on socioeconomic class at a predominantly White, small, liberal-arts college in the Midwest as it relates to social and academic adjustment to college. They found that two measures of socioeconomic class, factors measuring subjective and objective indicators, were directly related to students’ sense of belonging, and in-
directly predictive of students’ social and academic adjustment through sense of belonging. These findings related to social class and sense of belonging mirror the research on students of color: students with less privilege and power in the societal and institutional context are more likely to experience a lower sense of belonging, which can influence students’ decisions to persist in their postsecondary goals (Hausman et al. 2007).

Given these developments, most researchers are likely to regard sense of belonging as a proxy for a process of inclusion (or exclusion), and sometimes perhaps a proxy for the climate. Sense of belonging should continue to be studied as a mediating factor in retention, and as a separate construct from multiple dimensions of the climate. Changes in sense of belonging can be indicators of climate change, or more importantly, as features of campus subenvironments or “safe spaces” that foster community regardless of the overall campus climate for diversity.

Validation

Validation occurs through a student’s interactions across the curricular and cocurricular contexts of an institution. The concept of validation originates from Rendón’s (1994) work with first-generation college students. Rendón (1994) defined validation as an enabling, supportive process that encourages students to acknowledge their self-worth and potential for success in higher education. Rendón’s theory of validation emerged through a qualitative assessment on the persistence of nontraditional students in higher education. Rendón (1994) found that those with validating educational experiences were more likely to persist despite academic and social challenges. Furthermore, students who were not involved or integrated into the social aspects of the college experience still showed signs of success. These findings are contrary to Astin’s (1984, 1993) theory of involvement and Tinto’s (1993) theory of student departure. Rendón’s (1994) theory of validation therefore proposes that students are most likely to succeed in college if they are empowered and view themselves as capable learners through the academic and interpersonal validation that they receive from in-class and out-of-class agents. Validation occurs through active fostering of academic and interpersonal development between agents in the college environment and students. These agents can exist in a classroom, such as faculty, or outside of the classroom, such as counselors, administrators, and staff (Rendón 1994; Rendón and Jalomo 1995).

Beyond individual experiences, Rendón’s (1994) theory of validation also emphasizes the importance of institutional transformation in regards to serving a diverse student population. Agents within colleges and universities should initiate contact with students to promote their development across academic and interpersonal contexts because nontraditional students are often not as familiar with navigating postsecondary environments. As such, Rendón (1994) encourages colleges and universities to invest in developing the validating capabilities of staff and faculty. Some scholars have developed conceptual models to assess validation in edu-
cational contexts for different student populations that emphasize an institution’s influence on student success outcomes (Holmes et al. 2001). Holmes et al.’s (2001) proposed a model for the success of African American students in predominantly White institutions, which included all of the key agents within the institution (e.g., faculty, staff, administrators) along with institutional policies and academic programs. Actual measures of validation and its influence on student outcomes would further our understanding of the key elements related to student success of historically underrepresented students.

Consequently, several scholars have begun to develop measures of validation and empirically examine its relationship to student success (Barnett 2006; Hurtado et al. 2011a). Within a single community college sample, Barnett (2006) found that four distinct measures of student perceptions of faculty validation had a positive relationship with students’ intentions to persist and their sense of integration on campus. The study provides empirical evidence on the influence of validation and student success, yet it focuses on validation by faculty in one community college environment. Subsequent research showed that validation was related to integration and intent to persist, but that this varies by student identity group (older vs. younger students, race/ethnicity, gender; Barnett 2011). Although faculty are important agents in the academic experience of all students, it is also important to consider the influence that staff have on the students’ educational experiences and outcomes. Hurtado et al. (2011a) tested measures that tap into a student’s sense of academic validation within the classroom and interpersonal validation through interactions with both faculty and staff. While both validation measures were reliable and valid for students of color and white students across several broad access institutions (2- and 4-year institutions), there were distinct differences across groups. Students of color reported lower levels on both measures as compared to their white counterparts. Also, feeling empowered by faculty only has a strong relationship with white students’ sense of academic validation, whereas for students of color, this sense of empowerment is directly associated with general interpersonal forms of validation. Future research will examine how these forms of validation influence other student experiences and outcomes.

**Macrolevel Contexts**

The DLE model highlights that larger social forces and external communities shape and constrain dynamics within each institutional context. However, the model (Fig. 2.1) also reflects that institutions themselves are in dynamic interaction with these communities and multiple contexts. Rather than an extensive review of the literature, the following section makes connections that can be the focus of scholarship, providing examples of studies that link across contexts, in each macrocontext to illustrate institutional dynamics.
Community Context and External Commitments

Community contexts and external commitments are an aspect of what Bronfenbrenner (1976, 1977) calls the exosystem (e.g., connections with external communities and associative networks) where institutions of higher education are engaged in mutual relations based on exchange and influence. We consider this context to reflect the linkages that institutions and individuals have with local communities, disciplinary networks, alumni networks, parents, religious affiliations, etc. We focus on key aspects that are related to the campus climates for diversity and consequent individual and institutional outcomes. These communities include the local community surrounding the institutions and their subcommunities. Community colleges and broad access institutions, in particular, often have a commitment to serving their local regions due to their funding base and mission (Cohen and Brawer 2008). This commitment and focus on the local context shapes how institutions build relationships with their surrounding communities, be it in creating a college-going culture among historically underrepresented populations and college pathways, through service learning and civic engagement, or even as contexts for identity development. Students’ home communities or other communities they may be connected to “outside” of college, (i.e., religious, cultural, social, political, etc.), are also part of the web of relationships. For many students in broad access institutions and community colleges, school is also “outside” of their primary community. This section focuses on how local regional communities and institutions shape one another and influence outcomes, again reflecting that institutions do not exist in a vacuum, but are located within communities in which they have multiple relationships.

Higher education has long recognized its relationship with the communities in which institutions are located, which stems back to an initial purpose of publicly funded land-grant institutions—a democratizing moment in its history (Cohen 1998). Many types of institutions specifically aim to serve their local community, as is the case for community colleges and many regionally focused teaching universities. Institutions also engage students in the local communities through continuing education, volunteer initiatives, administrative and academic outreach, campus cultural events, and service-learning (Bringle and Hatcher 2002). The Carnegie Classification defines community engagement as describing “the collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity” (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching 1998, p. 3). Important here is the local context, as its relation to the climate for diversity has been undertheorized. Carnegie (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching n.d.) also notes that community engagement tends to manifest through outreach and partnerships. They distinguish the two by specifying:

Outreach focuses on the application and provision of institutional resources for community use with benefits to both campus and community. Partnerships focuses [sic] on collaborative interactions with community and related scholarship for the mutually beneficial exchange, exploration, and application of knowledge, information, and resources (research, capacity building, economic development, etc.). (p. 5)
Developing trusting relationships between higher education institutions and the community are key including the sustainability of partnerships, clarity in contributing roles in the partnership, regular feedback and evaluation from community partners, and a shared desire regarding outcomes (Bringle and Hatcher 2002).

A primary area of community engagement is through college outreach and recruitment, in which creating a college-going culture (McClafferty et al. 2002) in local communities and schools is often a goal. This includes working with K-12 schools as well as with other community entities such as nonprofit organizations, faith centers, or other institutions that serve the needs of the local community. With regard to building partnerships with local schools, building a college culture in schools requires academic momentum, an understanding of how college plans develop, a clear mission statement, comprehensive services, and coordinated and systemic college support (Corwin and Tierney 2007). Corwin and Tierney (2007) acknowledge many actors in creating college cultures within K-12 education, including developing partnerships with institutions of higher education. McClafferty et al. (2002) add to these “high academic standards with formal and informal communication networks that promote and support college expectations; a school staff that is collectively committed to students’ college goals; and resources devoted to counseling and advising college bound students,” (p. 6) and advocate for an organizational change in K-12 school culture. Perna’s (2006a; Perna and Thomas 2006) model for college access has dimensions that capture communities and families as part of the multilayered influences in students’ college enrollment decisions. Perna (2006a) and Perna and Thomas (2006) argue that the college enrollment choices students make can only be understood if students and their families, K-12 schools, higher education institutions, and the broader societal, economic, and policy contexts are taken into account, and have found that each layer does indeed play an important role. One college choice study incorporating the local community context finds that for Latina high school students and their parents, sources and types of information change over time—and sources include those considered experts within family networks, faith-based communities, and K-12 counselors (Alvarez 2010). This study lends support for developing partnerships between higher education and local communities, formally and informally, in order to facilitate college-going among the underrepresented students. Another study examined a collaborative partnership between a business school, a private company, and high school students to increase access to college and business leadership for underrepresented students (Siegel 2008). This study was unique in the diversity of constituents involved in preparing students for college. While creating a college-going culture in schools and in other parts of local communities is an important aspect of community engagement, higher education institutions must understand that it does not end at college entrance.

For highly mobile students at broad access institutions, there is no boundary between the community and any particular college context. Developing research on college student enrollment mobility maps multiple patterns and pathways students traverse toward degree attainment. The Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U 2002) highlights that student attendance at multiple institutions
of higher education is a challenge to be met in the twenty-first century. Research examines enrollment patterns at and between 2- and 4-year institutions, and has identified that students’ demographic, financial, and academic characteristics play a key role in how students engage in enrollment patterns (Adelman 2006; Peter and Cataldi 2005). In particular, higher income and more academically prepared students are more likely to enroll continuously, with lower income and less academically prepared students being more likely to enroll discontinuously at single or multiple institutions (Goldrick-Rab 2006). Although a variety of patterns have been documented, Goldrick-Rab (2006) offers a model of college pathways that can be applied to student mobility regardless of institution type, examining continuity of enrollment and number of institutions attended. Four macro patterns include: traditional enrollment, which is continuous enrollment at a single institution; interrupted enrollment, specified as discontinuous enrollment at a single institution; fluid movement, which is continuous enrollment at two or more institutions; and interrupted movement, or discontinuous enrollment and attending two or more institutions (Goldrick-Rab 2006). As the credit hour allows students to transfer credits between institutions (McCormick 2003), multiple institution attendance seems to be becoming the norm with approximately 60% of all college students taking courses at more than one institution (Adelman 2006; Peter and Cataldi 2005). This may be particularly true for students who reside in perhaps metropolitan or other areas where a number of institutions share a common geographic locale. In general, it appears student mobility is a new social norm that influences dynamics with institutions. Institutions must collaborate with one another in facilitating fluid movement among institutions where this may already be occurring informally, and work with the local community to ensure pathways toward degree completion.

Complex college pathways have implications for retention and degree attainment (Adelman 2006; DesJardins et al. 2002, 2006; McCormick 2003); given the policy context to increase degree attainment, institutional engagement in local communities to support continuity multiple pathways for lower income and less academically prepared students may be needed now more than ever. In a study of 21 community colleges using National Student Clearinghouse data, researchers found that attending a community college farther from home increases the likelihood of earning a degree, transferring, and still being enrolled, compared to dropping out (Porchea et al. 2010); conversely then, students who live and attend community college in their home communities seem to be more likely to drop or stop out. Research also examines how groups of students may be more inclined to enroll in college that is close to their home, such as community college students (Adelman 2005). In addition, many enrollment patterns, particularly those that include stopping out, may delay or hinder degree attainment at 4-year institutions as well (Adelman 2006; DesJardins et al. 2002, 2006; McCormick 2003). This can be understood as a call to institutions to continue to develop partnerships in local communities and with each other to support the educational progress of students in their local regions, whether through developing college-going cultures, supporting continual progress toward a degree, or via service learning and civic engagement.
In considering the development of cultural competencies for a diverse society, service learning and civic engagement are promising practices that institutions can foster through community engagement. In particular, when diversity-related content is infused into these types of first-year courses, students’ commitment to social justice and awareness is more likely to increase (Engberg and Mayhew 2007). Mayhew and Engberg (2011) examined the relationship between service learning and charitable and social justice responsibility; they found that it has positive effects on charitable responsibility but not on social justice responsibility. Given the importance scholars place on institutions moving from a charity-minded approach to a partnership approach (Marullo and Edwards 2000), it may be feasible that the method of implementation of service learning may lead to increases in charitable responsibility without social justice goals that could bring about improvements in the community.

Challenges exist for institutions in successfully enacting effective forms of community engagement, although research has begun to identify ways of improving community engagement. In research institutions in particular, faculty reward structures do not foster engaging in service or the application of scholarship to the local communities, as scholars are often tied to national and international arenas; if these institutional types are to sustain this type of community engagement, there is a need to reconfigure higher education (Antonio 2002; Boyer 1990). This relates to the purpose of higher education, and if it is to educate citizens for a democracy, working out of an ecology of education may facilitate higher education reform and improve civic participation (Longo 2007). This relationship with the community must be reciprocal, in which institutions incorporate the community culture and resources to truly become centers for democratic education (Longo 2007). Enhancing a community’s human capital, social capital, physical infrastructure, economic infrastructure, institutional infrastructure, and political strength (Cox 2000) can bring about change in the community, and thus also help higher education become sites of democratic education. In such endeavors, institutions must not engage with communities as an act of charity, but in partnership with the community (Marullo and Edwards 2000; Ward and Wolf-Wendel 2000). That is, universities and communities are better off when both are doing well, and that requires privileged universities to work with local communities (Marullo and Edwards 2000). Of utmost importance in partnering with the local community is for institutions to be flexible and incremental in their work (Wiewel and Lieber 1998). In a study that focused on community perspectives of a partnership, the community personnel view their campus partners very positively, note challenges and benefits to working with service learning students, and that increased coordination and communication with university contacts would improve the partnership (Ward and Vernon 1999). These challenges and guidelines may help campuses improve their approach and effectiveness as they partner with their local communities through service learning and other forms of civic engagement.

The local community may also influence the campus climate for diversity. To illustrate, case study analyses showed that students, staff, faculty, and administrators consistently mentioned the local context in voicing their perceptions of the insti-
tutional climate for diversity (Key 1999: Hurtado et al. 1998a). For some students and faculty, a perceptibly conservative local community brought them to see their institution as a safe haven from hostile encounters they had around issues of sexual orientation, gender, and race. On the other hand, many students of color considered leaving because of the lack of diversity in the local community and hostile experiences they had while engaging in the community. In addition, mixed race identity development literature has begun to conceptualize the local community context as a moderately proximal context that may shape students’ racial identity development (Renn 2004). Although research that examines the influence of the local community on the campus climate for diversity and student outcomes currently appears to be minimal, emerging work suggests that this is a prime area for study and practice.

In sum, institutions of higher education share common space with their local communities, and can effectively engage in those communities through partnerships and outreach, which may take the form of research and service. In light of the literature on creating a college-going culture, enrollment mobility, service learning, and civic engagement, these practices must be taken into account in considering their influence on the campus climate for diversity and the development of student outcomes.

**External Commitments**

In addition to institution’s relationships with their local community, at the individual level, students maintain links with external communities as well. Bean and Metzner (1985) presented a conceptual model of nontraditional student attrition based on a thorough review of the literature. Some of the external commitment variables included in their model are finances, hours of employment, outside encouragement, family responsibilities, and an opportunity to transfer. Interestingly many of these external factors that affected community college students over 25 years ago are still prevalent today. A growing number of students entering college even as first time, full-time freshman are working more hours per week than ever before (Pryor et al. 2007), indicating additional external commitments during college.

Research shows that the ability to finance college plays an important role in student persistence, especially for students from lower-income backgrounds (Paulsen and St. John 2002; Titus 2006b). For some students, such as Latina/os, this lack of financial aid may result in many of them working additional hours, attending college part-time, or deferring enrollment to mitigate college costs (Rooney 2002). In addition, Latina/o college students are more likely to work, be employed for longer hours, and drop out of school due to financial reasons than non-Latina/os (Sedlacek et al. 2003). First-generation students share a similar experience—they tend to work more hours as compared to the rest of their peers and tend to take longer to complete their degrees (Terenzini et al. 1996), but overall, the students who tend to work longer hours while in school are more likely to have lower grade point averages, be they female, Black, and/or Latina/o (Lyons and Hunt 2003).
Additional external factors that impact student success can include family obligations; students whose cultural background emphasizes family interdependence may be expected to fulfill obligations to the family that conflict with college responsibilities (Tseng 2004). On the other hand, students with collectivistic orientations can experience a positive influence from their families, as they are motivated to achieve in order to meet the demands and expectations of family members (Markus and Kitayama 1991). For Latina/o and first-generation students, aside from experiencing stress related to financial constraints, familial obligations are likely to impact their college experience (Inman and Mayers 1999; Rodriguez et al. 2000). Family responsibilities that interfere with academic work create additional stress on underrepresented students’ transition to college, particularly in demanding STEM fields (Hurtado et al. 2007).

In sum, institutional relationships with local community, the climate of the community, and external push and pull factors, appear to have differing effects on the campus climate in diverse learning environments, as well as intermediate and final educational outcomes. The relationship between the local community and the climate for diversity appears ripe for empirical research, whereas the relationship between external commitments, the climate, and outcomes may benefit from continued research on nuances in these relationships.

The Policy Context

Educational policies at local, state, and federal levels create an important external context that shapes campuses and student outcomes. Institutions operate within the policies and practices of the states in which they are situated, as well as those at the federal level, which impacts the actions that institutions can take to support student success (Tinto and Pusser 2006). Although the federal government delegates the responsibility of regulating and financing postsecondary education to states (Cohen 1998; Gladieux et al. 2005), key federal policies have impacted access to higher education largely through financial aid, whereas state policies have addressed issues of affirmative action, in-state tuition for undocumented students, merit aid, and the structure of public higher education systems including their transfer functions. Unique aspects of higher education, such as academic freedom and professional autonomy, typically limit the direct influence of policies on the educational environments of colleges and universities (Hearn and Holdsworth 2002). However, the drive for greater postsecondary institutional accountability has become more prominent after the passage of No Child Left Behind (Tinto and Pusser 2006), and student learning outcomes are at the center of most accountability efforts (Hearn and Holdsworth 2002). Scholars have examined how the broader policy context exerts pressure on institutions to act in specific ways, which in turn impact student experiences in college and postsecondary educational outcomes. The study of policy development as it relates to student success is relatively new (Tinto and Pusser 2006), however, in the current context of increased accountability, it is im-
important to understand how federal and state policies directly and indirectly influence postsecondary outcomes. It is important to note that Perna (2006a) has introduced a multicontextual model (later refined by Perna and Thomas 2006) that captures many of the similar domains of macro–micro influences illustrated in the DLE model, with a particular focus on the external and contextual forces that influence students’ college choices at the individual level and shape student outcomes. This has guided subsequent multilevel studies on student choice and access in relation to college finances (Perna 2006b, 2007), on socioeconomic differences in the parental involvement of their child’s college-going behaviors (Rowan-Kenyon et al. 2008), and on the role of counselors in student college choice and access across achievement and socioeconomic levels (2008). Titus (2006a) incorporated individual levels (including perceptions of the campus racial climate) and institutional and state-level policy to illustrate a multicontextual approach to degree attainment. Dynamic panel modeling of changing state policy in relation to the production of bachelor’s degrees (Titus 2009) is also a new development in research that links the institutional- and policy-level contexts. Both conceptual and research approaches have important implications for further investigating equity in outcomes for diverse students based on larger policy contexts.

Many presumably race-neutral merit-oriented policies produce inequitable outcomes across racialized groups (Orfield et al. 2007). At play is the concept of institutional racism in which discrimination based on race, ethnicity, gender, or other social identities is redirected to nonracial or nongendered entities such as merit (Anderson 1993; Feagin and Feagin 1978; Glazer 1975). Both federal and state policies play an important role in the campus climate for diversity in a post-civil rights “colorblind” era, and in the development of equitable outcomes for retention and achievement in particular. Select federal and state policies are addressed in this section together under the closely related topics of access and affirmative action, access and financial aid, and baccalaureate attainment; studies that have examined their effects with regard to racial or ethnic diversity and equity are also discussed.

College Access and Affirmative Action Policy

American ideals include the notion of equal opportunity, and many presume that this is a reality for all people in the post-civil rights era. Affirmative action was developed to ensure that historically excluded groups be included in applicant pools and be represented in colleges and employment sectors. However, over the last several decades, state affirmative action policies have been dismantled (Harper et al. 2009) and fewer publicly funded 4-year institutions are considering race as a factor in the admissions process (Grodsky and Kalogrides 2008). Supreme Court cases have played a prominent role in this process, specifically that Grutter v. Bollinger and Gratz v. Bollinger reaffirmed an earlier ruling in Bakke that prohibited the use of racial quotas in university admissions, however, acknowledged that diversity is a compelling interest for the purposes of higher education. The ruling in Grutter concluded that diversity was a compelling interest and that a narrow tailoring of the
use of race was permissible, provided there are no quotas, that diversity is needed to prepare future leaders, and that a critical mass was necessary in order to facilitate these educational goals. However, in *Gratz*, the court ruled that the use of a points system in undergraduate admissions was too narrowly tailored and was therefore unconstitutional (Morfin et al. 2006). The use of diversity as a compelling interest rests on “the diversity rationale” that highlights the educational benefits of diversity for all students, and has a long intellectual history that can be traced back to Aristotle (Moses and Chang 2006). Although the diversity rationale informed affirmative action policy, when used alone, it fails to address social justice and equity issues (Moses and Chang 2006). Nevertheless, these cases set precedents about the role of race in college access via institutional admissions processes.

As affirmative action has given way to colorblind “race neutral” preferences in policy, historically excluded groups have seen concerning drops in college admission and enrollment. For example, after the passing of *Hopwood* in 1996 in Texas (another anti-affirmative action case) substantial decreases in admission and enrollment of Black and Latino students were seen (Long and Tienda 2008, 2010). Similarly, after the passing of the anti-affirmative action Proposition 209 in 1998 in California, enrollments of African Americans and Latina/os declined substantially at the University of California (Morfin et al. 2006; Contreras 2005; Santos et al. 2010). Anti-affirmative action legislation, and subsequent inaction by institutions along permissible race-conscious avenues, decreases the racial diversity in the composition of the student body, a crucial dimension of the campus climate for diversity.

Affirmative action based on race-conscious versus colorblind categories also differentially affects achievement and retention in college. In an interesting simulation study of three forms of affirmative action, Massey and Mooney (2007) found that Black and Latina/o students enrolled under race-conscious affirmative action were more likely to persist at the end of their junior year despite lower grades, compared to legacy admits who earned low grades and were more likely to drop out, as well as athlete admits who were also more likely to drop out. This study shows that of these three forms of affirmative action, the race-conscious action for minority students has the most positive effects in terms of student retention. The legacy affirmative action is presumably “colorblind,” however, these students who are given preferential treatment tend to be White and is, therefore, a racially biased institutional policy that remains despite a currently “race-neutral” policy environment. This study calls into question the accepted norm of other forms of affirmative action and provides support for race-conscious affirmative action over “colorblind” policies.

Even so, there is room for institutions to address inequity in access and enrollment across racial groups through a comprehensive review in admissions given the Supreme Court’s ruling in *Grutter*; however, the institutional tendency is to prefer seemingly race-neutral policies to avoid the politicized discourse around race and admissions (Morfin et al. 2006). Studies are beginning to show “race-neutral” policy has race-specific impact (Contreras 2005; Santos et al. 2010). Santos et al. (2010) show how policy changes in Regents’ decisions and subsequent state proposition 209 led to the adoption of race-neutral University of California admissions policies, with the race-neutral policy resulting in systemic increases in disparate
impact for the admission of Black and Latino groups relative to other groups. If campuses continue to privilege colorblind policies regardless of their states’ law on affirmative action, admitting a top percentage of students in each high school, rather than a top percentage of high school graduates state-wide, may be the best nonracial merit-based policy that will result in an increase in Black and Latina/o admission rates (Chapa and Horn in Orfield 2007). Such adjustments take into account the segregated nature of K-12 education, differential school resources, and that students of color tend to be concentrated in lower-performing schools in low-income areas (St. John et al. 2007). Due to the structural inequalities in K-12 education produced by property rights and the intersection with race (Ladson-Billings and Tate 1995), students of color who are often low-income students have less opportunity to accumulate the “race-neutral” forms of merit used in college admissions such as SAT scores, AP classes, and extracurricular activities. However, a Texas-based simulation study found that the nonracial weights, such as income levels, when applied to many underrepresented students in the admission process did not sufficiently restore Black and Latina/o admission rates (Long and Tienda 2008). In addition, the mean applicant test scores rose at less selective Texas institutions, signaling that students were applying more broadly to secure admission at less selective institutions (Long and Tienda 2010). Institutions in states with affirmative action bans may look into adopting critically constructed nonracial admission policies that will still improve the compositional diversity of their campuses, even if they may not restore them to previous levels during affirmative action. It is disheartening to see that despite an opportunity for institutions to affirm diversity through admission processes via Grutter (Morfin et al. 2006), few have done so in favor of maintaining seemingly race-neutral admissions policies that effectively produce inequitable outcomes in terms of admissions, enrollment, and retention of diverse students.

**College Access and Financial Aid Policy**

Federal policies that have and continue to impact college access via financial aid include the Servicemen’s Readjustment Act of 1944, the Higher Education Act of 1965, the Middle Income Assistance Act (MIAA), and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010. The first two federal policies had a direct impact on increased enrollments in higher education and also provided financial assistance for students to pursue a postsecondary education (Cohen 1998). In contrast, the MIAA shifted federal aid from grants to loans, effectively limiting college access for low-income students, often students of color (O’Connor 2002). The 2010 federal policy to increase baccalaureate attainment may have a similar effect given that it increases Pell Grant funding, funding to MSIs, and competitive state grants (DOE 2010). It appears to respond to the trend in higher education of increased tuition, which directly impacts the affordability of a postsecondary education for all students (Heller 2001). Even with financial assistance provided by federal grants, the burden for paying for college has been disproportionately felt by students who have been underrepresented in higher education, specifically lower-income, African American,
and Latina/o students (Heller 2001). In addition, state merit aid tends to be awarded disproportionately to White upper-income students despite its colorblind approach (Dynarski 2004; St. John et al. 2007). These inequitable effects of federal and state aid policy raise concern if we are to pursue equity in retention and achievement outcomes, a necessity for an effective and just diverse society.

In a review of financial aid policy, St. John et al. (2007) found that although race-conscious aid programs have been under attack, much can be done to move toward more equitable funding across racial groups for higher education. They find that in response to decreasing public funding for higher education and the resulting inequitable enrollment across racial groups, state race-conscious aid programs have more than doubled; however, given the policy climate around affirmative action, they recommend modifying other existing programs. Such an approach is needed, as need-based aid helps equalize educational opportunity but is not adequate alone. In their analysis of state merit aid programs, the authors find they can be redesigned to be more equitable, and that targeted aid programs can be modified to improve diverse enrollments. In their simulation study, when merit aid programs account for high school attended (and their relative quality), merit aid is awarded relatively proportionate to the population racial groups. This is similar to Chapa and Horn’s (2007) suggestion that the top students from each high school be granted admission, rather than the top students overall. Both approaches to admissions and merit aid do not disproportionately punish students of color if they had to attend a lower-performing high school in a low-income area. This approach, however, remains successful through the perpetuation of neighborhood segregation across racial and economic lines (Orfield and Lee 2005). Together, these approaches may help produce more equity in college access via financial aid.

Closely related is the topic of in-state tuition for undocumented students; another aspect of the current policy context. At the time of this writing, states are moving forward legislation resembling the Dream Act, as the federal congress has also recently begun to reintroduce that legislation. The federal act would provide a path to legal citizenship for undocumented students under certain stipulations. Many state-initiated policies in the interim aim to provide in-state tuition to undocumented students. State policies of this nature increase college enrollment rates of undocumented students, and the effect is stronger for students in metropolitan areas (Flores 2010). Such policies are aimed at providing equitable funding for students whose home is the United States, and are aimed at educating an important sector of the country’s economic base. However, securing in-state tuition is not the only challenge undocumented students face; without legal status, these students are unable to take advantage of all the opportunities within college (Perez 2009), and are hindered from engaging in society as professionals to their full potential (Gonzalez 2007). Currently, these state policies extend access to undocumented students, however, without the federal policy that creates a path toward legal citizenship through college, their professional contributions to society will remain bleak. The research highlights important aspects of the current policy context that impact college access, experiences, and society; policies at the state and federal levels will continue to address admissions, financial aid, and other concerns that will influence diverse
students in college, as well as the utility of the outcomes developed for the twenty-first century.

**Baccalaureate Attainment and Financial Aid Policy**

The influence of state-level policies on higher education is more direct than federal policies, particularly in the financing of colleges and universities (Tinto and Pusser 2006), which raises concern given that state appropriations for higher education influence the completion of a bachelor’s degree (Titus 2006a, 2009). Despite the economic and social benefits of higher education to society, state and local investment in higher education has steadily decreased (Titus 2009). Research is emerging on the impact of such state policies on degree attainment, and shows that there has been no change in the number of baccalaureate degrees awarded since the 1990s (Titus 2009). For example, the percentage of total state grants as a percentage of total appropriations of state tax funds for the operational expenses of higher education is positively associated with degree completion (Titus 2006a). In addition, increases in state need-based grant dollars per individual in the traditional college-age increased postsecondary degree completions (Titus 2009). These state-level financial policies inevitably influence an institution’s context, which is also related to college completion.

The shift of federal financial aid policy from grant-based aid toward loan-based aid over the last several decades also influences student outcomes, particularly baccalaureate degree attainment. Increased reliance on higher education loans in the first year has been shown to have a significant negative effect on degree completion for low-income students (Kim 2007). However, dependence on loans in the first year significantly decreased the degree attainment of African American college students in the same study (Kim 2007). As student populations are more diverse than ever along multiple social identities, it is important to critically examine how policy efforts impact the success of these groups given the differential degree attainments of African American, Latina/o (Titus 2006b), and lower income students (Kim 2007; Titus 2006b). With regard to undocumented Latina/o students, Flores and Horn (2009) found that those who are recipients of in-state resident tuition (IRST) persist at comparable rates to their documented Latina/o peers, lending support for the IRST policies in terms of effectiveness toward retention, and in hopes that federal policy will follow with the Dream Act. Even with such state policies, inequitable outcomes across historically and currently marginalized groups persist (degree attainment in particular), and may be due in part to colorblind policies. These studies on finance and financial aid highlight the impact comprehensive policies have on baccalaureate attainment.

The push to raise the level of degree attainments in the United States by the current Obama administration is an additional component of the current policy context for higher education (DOE 2010). As mentioned earlier, a distinctive feature of the new federal policy is the notion that the United States has fallen behind other countries both in terms of degree attainments and the skills acquired in college that are
necessary for the workplace, which are outcomes included in the DLE conceptual model. The focus on community colleges in helping to achieve this national goal is important (Dowd 2003), as nearly half of all first-time college students begin in 2-year institutions, with the proportions being greater for students over age 24; these trends have not changed over several decades (Adelman 2005). These students’ completion of community college programs, as well as transfer to 4-year institutions may help bolster degree attainment. To increase baccalaureate attainment, policy and public funding must also focus on increasing retention in broad access 4-year institutions, which tend to have low retention and graduation rates; many potential graduates enter higher education through these institutions but leave for various reasons, or attend multiple institutions (Adelman 2005, 2006; Goldrick-Rab 2006; McCormick 2003). Many of these broad access institutions enroll high proportions of students of color, and through the Higher Education Act, have been designated as MSIs. The federal accountability pressures on these institutions in particular must be met with strong funding and support at the state level if they are to produce more graduates from the base of students already enrolled in higher education.

Scholars have proposed models that take into account the policy context’s influence on student success in terms of degree completion (Perna and Thomas 2006; Tinto and Pusser 2006). These recent considerations, however, have not fully accounted for the societal factors that impact success (Hearn 2006). Furthermore, these models have not detailed the success for students who commute or attend part-time. Despite earnest efforts to expand postsecondary access and promote student success for marginalized groups in society, federal and state policies have not always benefited racial/ethnic groups equitably in terms of access and funding, such as in the case of African Americans at Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU) and PWI’s (Harper et al. 2009). Examining how federal and state policies impact student success will continue to be a crucial element in understanding differential student outcomes for students from diverse social backgrounds.

**Sociohistorical Context**

To date, only a handful of studies have linked changes in the larger sociohistorical context with changes in the institution. A few indicate that sociohistorical changes result in differences in how faculty perform their role (Lawrence and Blackburn 1985; Milem et al. 2000), address the impact of college generally (Weidman 1989), and that there are changing institutional effects on student outcomes such as political attitudes in specific time periods (Alwin et al. 1991; Dey 1997). The classic study of Bennington women documented the long-term effect of obtaining an education in college during a specific era on political attitudes and behaviors over the life span. Alwin et al. (1991) defined such period effects as the intersection of biological and historical time, with the socializing effects of a unique women’s college having a lasting impact. A study of three age cohorts (born 1922–1970) of
female African American first-generation college graduates showed that constraints and opportunities for college access and educational attainment varied based on generation, or sociohistorical context (O’Connor 2002). Furthermore, their strategies for negotiating predominantly White educational environments varied as well during different sociohistorical eras (O’Connor 2002). A primarily historical piece examines shifts in the racial composition of HBCU during different sociohistorical periods, highlighting how forced desegregation contradicted their institutional mission (Allen et al. 2007). Also contextualized in the post-civil rights era, one essay explores the possible effectiveness of leaders with privileged social identities, specifically White male Chief Diversity Officers, in dismantling systemic racism, depending on the institutional and sociohistorical context (Owen 2009). It suggests that White males may be effective in antiracist leadership in institutions that are primarily monoculturally White, however, who are moving toward multiculturalism, and must work with peers of color and weigh their experiential knowledge of related issues. Appropriate strategies for improving the climate for diversity and dismantling systemic oppression likely vary based on institution and sociohistorical period. With several national data bases and many years of higher education research, it is now possible to gain a retrospective understanding of how each era impacted diverse students, learning environments, and postsecondary outcomes.

The current sociohistorical context for diversity and improvement of equity outcomes is influenced by a broadened concept of diversity due to legal precedents, an accountability movement that has extended from K-12 to higher education, economic decline, and privatization of public higher education and with this, an increase in viewing students as consumers. At the same time, we witnessed an unprecedented historical event, the election of the first African-American President, although some progressive scholars critique his post racial identity politics and policies (e.g., Bonilla-Silva 2010). Despite critiques of President Obama’s politics around race and racism, he is also the only President in recent decades committed to improving the US position internationally in terms of degree attainments. This has been occurring at the same time that underrepresented populations are projected to increase in number (U.S. Census Bureau, Population Division 2008) and xenophobia and racist nativism are more pronounced (Pérez Huber and López 2008). No doubt there are significant period effects on students and their outcomes, and it appears that the economic downturn that began in 2008 will have a long-term effect on both institutions and students. There is a sense that we are in an era of opportunity for significant change in higher education, which must be creatively approached given severe constraint due to economic instability.

The collision of fiscal constraint with increased accountability, the desire for equitable outcomes, and the sorely needed competencies for a multicultural world pose a unique challenge to higher education in the current milieu. The DLE model focus on the habits of mind for lifelong learning, skills for a diverse and global world or multicultural competencies, and student achievement and retention coincide with a global recession and radical reductions in the budgets of postsecondary institutions. The tension between promoting student outcomes while simultaneously divesting in education spending has impacted the efforts of foundations, as-
sociations, and the federal government to improve the function of higher education (Johnson et al. 2010). Clearly, the sociohistorical context influences policies made within eras, and informs approaches to education and educational research; these are certain to change with the passage of time and affect both institutions and consequently the students we educate. This review has also illustrated that sociohistorical contexts have affected the development of diversity scholarship and educational equity. However, while scholarship on diverse learning environments is affected by these larger sociohistorical trends (e.g., the development of the educational benefits of diversity scholarship), scholars, in turn, attempt to affect institutional and social transformation through their scholarship.

Conclusion: Advancing the Study of Diverse Learning Environments

The DLE Model is a multidimensional, campus climate model that is multicontextual and inclusive of the multiple social identities of students, faculty, and staff. Simply put, it is a model of climate, practices, and outcomes. The key assumption is that monitoring dynamics surrounding an institution as well as between actors within the institution is as important as monitoring students’ behaviors and perceptions. From a sociological perspective, the model links the microlevel with the macrolevel contexts (Alexander et al. 1987) and is supported by Bronfenbrenner’s theories of human development that incorporate multiple contexts, as well as organizational theory that has long posited that educational institutions are open to external influences. In the review of literature, we identified other scholars who have adopted a multicontextual approach to research in identity development (Renn 2003, 2004) and with regard to access, student progress, and policy (Perna 2006a; Perna and Thomas 2006; Titus 2006a, 2009). This micro and macro link is further developed in the conceptualization of the DLE model to guide research on the climate and outcomes of higher education.

To advance the study of diverse campuses, we first summarize modifications from previous climate models and shifts in underlying assumptions, as well as offer observations on advances in scholarship that emerged from the review. We reflect on the convergence of scholarship and multiple methods that enliven the model from different perspectives. Second, we acknowledge omissions from this review that are important areas of scholarship on diversity, and encourage others to make use of the model as a springboard for theory development and the design of studies. Finally, we offer a vision of diverse learning environments that will advance individual and social transformation.

The focus on student outcomes in the model not only resonates with contemporary literature and policy initiatives but also ties these outcomes to the institution’s role in promoting social transformation that advances social equity, as well as democratic and economic aims (Bowen 1977). Earlier climate syntheses (Harper and Hurtado 2007; Hurtado et al. 1998, 1999) focused on understanding the problem
of underrepresentation that results in stereotyping, microaggressions, and generally hostile climates, which have negative consequences for individuals. Many of the climate studies today still identify these problems but have also now solidified a link between the climate and many outcomes (Hurtado et al. 2008), particularly student adjustment in the early years of college and retention/degree attainment (through direct and indirect relationships). We can conclude from these studies that a hostile climate has real consequences for students, and arguably for women and faculty of color and probably staff when representation is low (Stanley 2006; Thompson and Sekaquaptewa 2002; Turner et al. 2008), however, the research for the latter group is still very limited.

In addition, studies of student degree attainment have now included multiple institutions and policy contexts at the same time that individual-level perceptions of the climate are accounted for in a model (Titus 2006b). This is clearly illustrative of the interrelated elements in the DLE model, which can be used to frame more studies that link across contexts to understand effects of the climate on actors while operating under organizational and policy constraints that impact student outcomes. This work was not possible several years ago, until federal data sets included survey items on the climate (albeit limited to a single item), and researchers began to use multilevel statistical modeling to account for students nested within institutions, and institutions nested in policy contexts.

At the same time that researchers confirm the negative effects of a hostile climate, other researchers have found the positive effects of the behavioral dimension of the climate—when students have the opportunity for interaction and learning about diversity. Significant developments in the field regarding the growth and sophistication of research on student outcomes have occurred, with distinct measures of the climate and diversity initiatives, which provide evidence of the benefits of diversity for all students. The development of meta-analytic studies is evidence of the maturity of scholarship in the field (Bowman 2010, 2011; Engberg 2004; Denson 2009). This scholarship continues to be motivated by aims to improve the conditions for student success as much as it is by attempts to inform legal and political challenges to diversity in higher education.

In addition to macrolevel influences in previous climate models, including sociohistorical periods and policy contexts, we included the exosystem in the model that involves community contexts and associative relations that also involve individual and institutional external commitments. This gives further definition to external environments, relations, and commitments evident in both student models of integration/reenrollment (Nora 2003; 2005) and institutional models of assessment and transformation (Rankin and Reason 2008; Williams et al. 2005), as well as multicontextual models of access (Perna 2006a; Perna and Thomas 2006). At minimum, we hope this addition to the model brings civic engagement and diversity initiatives into convergence (Hurtado 2007), as studies show the consistent effects of interactions with diverse peers or intentional campus diversity initiatives on civic learning (Bowman 2011). The external context is also intended to reflect the realities of broad access institutions that attend to regional or urban concerns and students. For example, most of the research on highly mobile students who are less
attuned to institutional boundaries or “membership” remains at a descriptive level and needs to advance toward explanation—we know more about who these students are than about why they leave, return, or continue their studies elsewhere. How much of this student mobility is due to the climate, institutional policy, resources, or broader macrolevel influences, instead of student characteristics is not known. Some of these patterns have become a new norm at broad access institutions, and is an example of how students influence institutions in achieving retention goals.

The multidimensional nature of the climate for diversity was enhanced by the addition of an organizational dimension (Milem et al. 2005), although much more research on identifying processes and organizational structures that continue to reproduce inequalities within institutions is necessary to round out the picture. The development of organizational and institutional models for assessment is evidence that there is key interest in developing strategic activity for institutional transformation (Milem et al. 2005; Rankin and Reason 2008; Smith 1995; Williams et al. 2005). Institutions are also developing their own organizational models to frame equity and institutional transformation initiatives (see, for example, the University of Minnesota (2011), www.academic.umn.edu/equity). Although informed by organizational theory, the DLE model is not meant to replace these institutionally focused models. Each dimension of the climate can have its own model of processes, actors, and measures. The DLE model shows, instead, the interaction of systems and reciprocal influences that constrain or lead to an institution’s role in producing social transformation or the reproduction of inequality.

Borrowing from social justice teaching/learning models, the assumption is that diversity is embedded in the daily practice of actors within the institution, and students’ social identities are at the center of inclusive and exclusive practices. The dynamic lens of person, process, context, and time is at play as actors create or recreate the climate in curricular and cocurricular spheres. This part of the model integrated many areas of scholarship, including: faculty studies, with the new scholarship on faculty self-reflection and autoethnography; feminist and inclusive pedagogies designed for diverse classrooms; student development theory and studies of identity in context, feminist, and inclusive pedagogies; critical race theory, including studies of whiteness; socialization or college impact, and social cohesion (integration models or individual measures of psychological integration). The conceptual model may help to identify other converging areas of scholarship that influence practice and/or lead to greater awareness about actors’ roles as institutional agents who determine student success (Stanton-Salazar 2004, 2010) and/or the reproduction of inequality. In this way, the DLE model serves as a blueprint for locating areas of scholarship and connections, even those that originate from distinct methodologies but that share a paradigm of transformation. It is a model that can be used to guide qualitative, quantitative, multiple methods, and mixed-methods research.

At the same time, however, we acknowledge that we were unable to adequately cover research on particular areas that naturally inform or can be informed by the DLE model. Particularly relevant areas include the developing scholarship on MSIs, cultural and social capital theory studies in higher education, institutional leadership and transformation, critical race theory, and developing scholarship on
practices with transformative capacities such as intergroup relations. We gave only passing reference to many of these areas, and more thorough reviews are needed on the variety of social identity groups that constitute diversity in our institutions. We expect that each of these areas merits a thorough review of studies as they relate to advancing the study of diverse learning environments.

In terms of assessment of the climate or its use in research, Rankin and Reason (2005) state that much of the empirical work tends to conceptualize the climate as an “immeasurable construct comprised of multiple items” (p. 264). Instead, we found that research establishes that the climate is not only pervasive, but also palpable, documentable, and measurable at the organizational and individual level with real consequences for individuals. Studies can undermine conceptualization and measurement advances when there is a lack of clarity about what the climate is and whether it can be assessed. The campus climate has often been operationalized as a latent construct, and researchers have used multiple-item measures (except for a few studies that have been limited to single-item measures) to assess it in a variety of environments. Hurtado et al. (2008a) reviewed over 90 instruments used with students, faculty, and staff that address some aspect of the climate for diversity on campus, and found comprehensive climate instruments are designed to use multiple indicators to capture constructs such as perceptions of discrimination/bias, multiple forms of harassment, and positive and negative intergroup interactions. Further, multi-institutional studies have used organizational-level measures that include compositional diversity, aggregate measures of student behaviors, and aspects of the organizational dimension that affect the climate for diversity across institutions. The use of an equity index or scorecard has also linked the climate with outcomes to guide assessment for achieving social equity (Bensimon 2004; Harris and Bensimon 2007). The DLE model served as the basis for the design of a new instrument that was launched nationally in 2010 to allow for institutional comparisons with peer institutions, and longitudinal assessment when combined with Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) surveys administered by the Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA. Many of the previous studies were based on single institutions, making it difficult to understand whether an institution had a relatively good climate or hostile one. Further study of the climate dimensions will provide greater clarity with regard to the assessment of campus climates, measurement and validation of constructs, and extend the empirical link to outcomes at the individual, institutional, and societal levels.

The essence of a diverse learning environment is one that integrates inclusive practices, and is also intentional about purpose and knowledgeable about whom they educate (student identities). Actors are cognizant of their role in enhancing individual mobility that, at the same time, minimizes social inequality. Intentional education with the aim of fostering civic equality reflects a belief that our students represent our best investment for a more just, equitable, economically viable, and stable democratic society. We contend that institutions of higher education are in a position to transform power dynamics between groups that will not jeopardize an institution’s existence, but rather strengthen its effectiveness in serving diverse students and creating a more equitable society. Admittedly, we present an optimistic
view of the transformative promise of higher education but we also concede that scholarship is still needed to also identify how institutions reproduce inequality. The latter has the potential to advance institutional transformation if it moves institutional actors toward reflexivity to alter their role in the reproduction of inequality. What diverse learning environments accomplish will be important in collectively striving to achieve and educating students for an aspirational vision of the society we wish to become.
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