



2017

## "Creating a New Mythos": Reassessing Race Standards and Latina/o Students

Margarita Vizcarra  
*Loyola University Chicago*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc\\_theses](https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_theses)



Part of the [Education Policy Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Vizcarra, Margarita, "'Creating a New Mythos": Reassessing Race Standards and Latina/o Students" (2017). *Master's Theses*. 3571.

[https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc\\_theses/3571](https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_theses/3571)

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact [ecommons@luc.edu](mailto:ecommons@luc.edu).



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](#).  
Copyright © 2017 Margarita Vizcarra

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY CHICAGO

“CREATING A NEW MYTHOS”:  
REASSESSING RACE STANDARDS AND LATINA/O STUDENTS

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO  
THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL  
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF  
MASTER OF ARTS

PROGRAM IN CULTURAL AND EDUCATIONAL POLICY STUDIES

BY

MARGARITA VIZCARRA

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

MAY 2017

Copyright by Margarita Vizcarra, 2017  
All rights reserved.

## Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge the sacrifices made by my mother throughout her life that have lead me to this precise moment. Her belief in my dreams along with love and *comprension* allowed me to reach this milestone. From a young age she instilled in me the possibility of achieving anything with hard work and ingenuity. Most of all, I thank her for allowing me to be bold and fearless early in life and not drowning my curiosity in societal conformity.

The Vizcarra and Alfaro family also deserve credit for supporting my dream to move to a new city. For those that have not obtained all of the promises of the U.S. dream, your stories push me to become a better educator for those students that see themselves as outsiders. For those who have attained that dream, you're a reminder that it is still possible to prosper in foreign lands while remaining true to your identity.

Credit is also due to the hours of dialogue with scholars such as Corey Winchester and Hiram Ramirez. Their mentorship provided during this process has made a seemingly impossible task, possible.

Finally, as a fellow Tejana stated, “Un besito pa todas las haters”.

*En unas pocas centurias, the future will belong to the mestiza. Because the future depends on the breaking down of paradigms, it depends on the straddling of two or more cultures. By creating a new mythos-- that is, a change in the way we perceive reality, the way we see ourselves, and the ways we behave-- la mestiza creates a new consciousness.*

Gloria Anzaldua, *Borderlands: The new mestiza/ la frontera*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	vi
GLOSSARY	vii
ABSTRACT	ix
CHAPTER ONE: FLUID NATURE OF RACE	1
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW	7
Race versus Ethnicity	10
Directive No. 15	11
Latino Racial Identity	16
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH	22
Research Methodology	23
CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS	27
CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION	34
REFERENCES	39
VITA	44

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Origin Data for California 2010	28
Table 2. Origin Data for Florida 2010	30
Table 3. Origin Data for Texas 2010	31
Table 4. U.S. Department of Education Percentage Distribution of Public School Membership for the state of California: School year 2010–11	32
Table 5. U.S. Department of Education Percentage Distribution of Public School Membership for the state of Florida: School year 2010–11	33
Table 6. U.S. Department of Education Percentage Distribution of Public School Membership for the state of Texas: School year 2010–11	33

## GLOSSARY

American Indian and Alaska Native— A person having origins in any of the original peoples of North and South America (including Central America) and who maintains tribal affiliation or community attachment.

Asian— A person having origins in any of the original peoples of the Far East, Southeast Asia, or the Indian subcontinent including, for example, Cambodia, China, India, Japan, Korea, Malaysia, Pakistan, the Philippine Islands, Thailand, and Vietnam

Black or African American – A person having origins in any of the Black racial groups of Africa.

Hispanic-refers to a person of Cuban, Mexican, Puerto Rican, South or Central American, or other Spanish culture or origin The term, “Spanish origin,” can be used in addition to “Hispanic”

Latino- a person who was born or lives in South America, Central America, or Mexico or a person in the U.S. whose family is originally from South America, Central America, or Mexico

Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander— A person having origins in any of the original peoples of Hawaii, Guam, Samoa, or other Pacific Islands.

Multiracial- relating to or including more than one race of people

White – A person having origins in any of the original peoples of Europe, the Middle East, or North Africa

National Center for Education Statistics (NCES)- The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) is the primary federal entity for collecting and analyzing data related to education in the U.S. and other nations. NCES is located within the U.S. Department of Education and the Institute of Education Sciences.

Mulatto- a person of mixed white and black ancestry

Quadroon- a person of one-quarter black ancestry

Octoroon- a person of one-eighth black ancestry

Aleut- a member of a people of the Aleutian and Shumagin islands and the western part of Alaska Peninsula



Eskimo-a member of a group of peoples of northern Canada, Greenland, Alaska, and eastern Siberia

## Abstract

This research will focus on the race and ethnicity categories used to classify people in the United States in relation to school-age students. The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) first standardized federal race and ethnicity categories in 1977 in order to enforce compliance with civil rights laws. In 1997, revisions were made to these standards due to increasing criticism by the public, advocacy groups, and government agencies (Williams, 2008). The 1977 decision by the OMB designated the category of Hispanic, or Latino, as an ethnicity rather than a race which was once again upheld in the 1997 update. The U.S. Census Bureau complied with these changes with each decennial questionnaire released thereafter and by the 2010-2011 school year the U.S. Department of Education (DOE) required all schools to do the same. The OMB's admission that these categories are of no scientific or biological backing brings to question their ability to speak to the lived experience of people in the U.S. Additionally research shows that since the United States began counting its population, race categories were frequently altered with each census in order to exclude some members of society from opportunities based on their identity. Given this burdensome legacy, the question arises-- does a variation in measurement policy, of the race definitions outlined by the Office of Management and Budgets, change the number of students identified under each race within the U.S. Department of Education and U.S. Census Bureau? Using Census 2010 data of people identified younger than the age of 18 and U.S. Department of Education (DOE) data, this research will attempt to understand how

designating people that racially identify as Latino into their own category has the ability to change the total count of those belonging to other races.

## CHAPTER ONE

### FLUID NATURE OF RACE

Demographers and sociologists increasingly understand race and ethnicity as unsettled concepts. The U.S. Census acknowledges an individual's identity based on these markers as a “fluid and mutable self-identified construct, which can change across time, experience, context, and other factors” (Compton, Bentley, Ennis, & Rastogi, 2013, p. 31). Research by Flores-González, Aranda, and Vaquera (2014) demonstrates how youth view their race and the shifts in this identity as they engage in daily interactions that provide insight as to their placement on the U.S. color line. Despite growing acknowledgement of the fluidity of the terms, race and ethnicity are still data points by which the U.S government categorizes people on the decennial census along with other government agencies such as the Department of Education (DOE). Within these two departments, enumerating Latinos racial identity has become a point of contention as many chose to identify outside of the provided race categories by selecting race as Other or by refusing to respond. Brown, Hitlin, Elder (2007) argue that the category of Other has become a proxy for the Hispanic identity. The terms Hispanic and Latino are interchangeably used to reflect their application within policy and research. During the 2010 census, 97 percent of the people reporting race as Other, ethnically identified as Latino (Humes, Jones, & Ramirez, 2011). On the other hand, DOE policy does not provide respondents with the option of selecting Other or even an option of leaving the question unanswered. Under DOE, primary and secondary schools are still at liberty to use observer identification to assign a race category for parents refusing to

select a category for their children. This policy entanglement has the ability to report different numbers under each category. This brings to question, how does this variation in measurement policy shape the demographic information under the Department of Education and the U.S. Census?

As federal entities, the U.S. Census Bureau and the U.S. Department of Education (DOE) participate in the shaping of race and ethnicity definitions for the general public. Federal institutions serve “as an important actor in proffering elements that individuals draw on in identity construction and in certifying those identities” (Hoover, Marcia, & Parris, 1997, p. 21). The availability of predisposed categories legitimizes some identities and leaves others fighting for public recognition under state agencies. Even as self-identification is the preferred collection method for the census, the “state provides both the language for and the mode of identity expression in this one dimension” (Yanow, 2003, p. 92). At one time the public was only concerned with the fact that they would be counted but now the concern has an added element of counting under the correct category. With the option of selecting more than one race since 2000, negotiations “both within and across groups for a measurement system that will advance their claims on resources and promote their assertions of group identity” (Prewitt, 2004, p. 145).

Despite the use of these descriptors to identify the population for the last 220 years, both race and ethnicity are socially constructed, “based on primordialist claims regarding differences between persons” (Cornell & Hartmann, 2004, p. 29). Within policy the U.S has followed an understanding of these concepts as separate. Cornell and Hartmann (1998) define ethnicity as a “group of persons distinguished largely by common culture, typically including language, religion, or other patterns of behavior and belief” (p. 17). As for the concept of race, Morning

(2005) defines it as the “grouping of people believed to share common descent, based on perceived innate physical similarities” (p. 45). These concepts are beliefs about shared origins in which ethnicity is grounded in cultural similarity and race in biological commonality (Morning, 2005). This distinction between the concepts is an occurrence in academic spaces which influenced policy but is less prevalent in everyday interactions.

Ordinary people understand race and ethnicity as overlapping concepts meant to interrogate the origin of a person. Omi and Winant provide a working definition for race which factors in the power dynamics associated with race classifications and not just visual and cultural markers. Omi and Winant (2014) define race as “a concept that signifies and symbolizes social conflicts and interests by referring to different types of human bodies” (p. 110). They do not dismiss the importance of intersectionality yet they identify race as a master category-- “a fundamental concept that has profoundly shaped, and continues to shape, the history, polity, economic structure, and culture of the United States” (Omi & Winant, 2014, p.106). Ethnicity is understood as a paradigm by which race is explained “in the sense that [it has] particular core assumptions and [highlights] particular key issues and research variables” (Omi & Winant, 2014, p.10). There is a “crucial and non-reducible visual dimension to the definition and understanding of racial categories” (Omi & Winant, 2014, p. 111). Visuals such as “skin color, physical build, hair texture, the structure of cheek bones, the shape of the nose, or the presence/absence of an epicanthic fold” have the ability to denote race (Omi & Winant, 2014, p. 111). Despite the importance of visual differences, “once specific concepts of race are widely circulated and accepted as social reality, racial difference is not dependent on visual observation alone” (Omi & Winant, 2014, p. 111). Omi and Winant’s interpretation of race seeks to move away from

debating the topic solely on the side of essence versus illusion. Instead, they are critical of both arguments as race is not something found in nature nor should it be dubbed as a misinterpretation of reality. Although race is not “real” in a biological sense, it is indeed real as a social category with definite social consequences.” (Omi & Winant, 2014, p. 110). Race is a master category that has been established as a legitimate means of understanding U.S. society. Simply stating that it is not real would not purge it from policy, history, or education. For the purpose of this research Omi and Winant’s definition of race, by which ethnicity is used to interpret the master category, will be used.

It is important to restructure this reality by reevaluating the working definitions of race and ethnicity in policies as current definitions do not coexist with the public’s understanding of groups or a person’s self-understanding. This ultimately creates policies that fall into issues of misrepresentation. Restructuring these definitions would provide policymakers with a better understanding of the communities they serve along with issues related to those identities. For example, federal laws crafted in the 50’s and 60’s meant to protect the public against racial discrimination did not consider the perspective of multiracial individuals. Updates to those laws were made as this community advocated for recognition by the state. This acknowledgement allowed individuals to see themselves represented in their society as they were considered part of it. In similar fashion, the increasing presence of Latinos in the U.S. has created a need for a better portrayal of this group, within this environment that has frequently casted them as outsiders.

Although the fluidity of race can be noticed with each passing census, this has not stopped state agencies from building a narrative about each classification as well as the people that are a part of those categories (Yanow, 2003). In the case of DOE, race and ethnicity data

gathered from students is used for “research and statistical analysis, measuring accountability and student achievement, civil rights enforcement, and monitoring of the identification and placement of students in special education” (U.S. Department of Education, 2007). Census data is used to define school district assignment areas, plan for new schools, and inform funding allocations of local and state agencies (U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 2016). All other federal departments that contribute to the shaping of these definitions derive their categories of race and ethnicity from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) as they set the standard for all agencies to follow.

As more people identify as being Latino and Asian, or non-White in general, it is important to ensure accurate collection, reporting, and interpretation of data when using the variable of race or ethnicity as the variables are socially constructed and contextual. According to Pew Research (2015a) “Americans younger than 18 accounted for 23% of the total population in 2013, but they were 46% of the multiracial population” (p. 30). Additionally, a report from the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) explains that between a ten-year span from 2002 to 2012, “the number of White students enrolled in public elementary and secondary school decreased from 28.6 million to 25.4 million, and their share of public school enrolment decreased from 59 to 51 percent” (Kena et. al., 2015, p.80). Projections estimate that by Fall 2024, “the number of White students enrolled in public schools” will decline from 25.2 million to 24.2 million, reducing the shared enrollment to 46 percent due in part to the increased enrollment of Latino and Asian/Pacific Islander students (Kena et. al., 2015, p.81).

Although race is socially constructed, as later elaborated, this concept has real implications for students, educators, and institutions responsible in overseeing schools. Further



review of the federally imposed race and ethnicity categories is valid as it will become a pertinent issue as younger populations continue to identify with more than one race and as the Latino population increases. Using U.S. Census data from 2010 and NCES data for the 2010-2011 school year, this research attempts to further understand the impact of the Latino identity on recognized race category by the Census and Department of Education. Results reveal Latinos as hidden in plain sight. The legacy of understanding race in visual terms, grounded in ideals of purity among groups, does not allow Latinos to find their place in this context. This research demonstrates the redistribution of the Latino count among recognized race categories when Latinos are not provided with a race classification. Allowing other categories to absorb the Latino count permits the state to make decisions without the proper sources of information.

## CHAPTER TWO

### LITERATURE REVIEW

In order to begin restructuring current definitions of race and ethnicity embedded in policy, it is important to understand the trajectory of these definitions. First a brief history of Census categories is provided, followed by an explanation of the emergence in labeling groups as a race or ethnicity, and the permeation of race categories outside of the census through Directive No. 15. Finally, Latinos understanding of their identity within the U.S. is explored.

Accepting race as a socially constructed concept implies understanding time and place as influential factors in creating the meaning of this description (Omi & Winant, 2014). During the first census of 1790, the institution of slavery was visible as enumerators were asked to identify people based on sovereignty status, age, and gender. The categories such as “free white males over 15”, “free white males over 12”, “free white females younger than 15”, “free white females”, “all other free persons- except Indians not taxed”, and “slaves” speak of the time in which they existed and would be rendered ineffective categories of measurement as society changed (Yanow, 2003, Table 3.2 p. 83; Rodriguez, 2000; Bohme & United States Bureau of the d, 1989). An array of categories’ made their way through a revolving door of terms constructing a system of classification depicting the population as “White” and “Other”. Current race categories defined by the OMB are heavily influenced by the historical course of the initial groups identified by the government. Additionally, the category of Other has taken on a characteristic of its own as it is used by many people that identify ethnically as Latino.

In the case of DOE policy, it strenuously restricts respondents' choices as it does not allow people to identify students as Other.

Early census counts used the term color rather than race, as the primary term of classification (Rodriguez, 2000). Between 1790 to 1840 the population was racially identified as "White", "Black" and "Indian" (Anderson & Fienberg, 1999). Until 1860 the "Black" category was also divided by indication of slavery along with those who were partially black into the "Mulatto" category (Pew Research Center, 2015b). Division of the "Black" category continued in 1890 with the inclusion of the term "Quadroon", and "Octoroon" (Pew Research Center, 2015b). Categories further grew during the mid-nineteenth-century to the early twentieth-century along with questions addressing nativity and immigration status (Anderson & Fienberg, 1999). These questions sought to identify "many of the new demographic groups that migrated to the United States after the mid-nineteenth century" (Anderson & Fienberg, 1999, p. 176). For example, 1870 was the first year in which "Chinese", was introduced to the census. In 1890, the meaning of the Indian category was broadened to "include a complete count of American Indians on tribal land" (Pew Research Center, 2015b). The "Other" category was first included in 1910 and by 1920, categories such as "Japanese", "Filipino", "Hindu" and "Korean" were added. The following census of 1930 the "Mexican" category made its first and only appearance. The Census of 1950 eliminated the "Korean" and "Hindu" category and renamed "Indian" people "American Indian" (Pew Research Center, 2015b). The following census of 1960 introduced the categories of "Aleut", "Eskimo", "Part Hawaiian", "Hawaiian", and provided respondents the opportunity to select their own race, a duty previously given to enumerators (Pew Research Center, 2015b). During the 1970 count, people were asked for their "origin" to identify if they

were from a Spanish speaking country (Rodriguez, 2000). In the 1980 census, the term “Hispanic” was first used to describe people of Spanish speaking descent who were to be identified as an ethnicity but not as a race.

This brief history of race categories in the census demonstrates an interaction between national origin, color, heritage, and ancestry as the building blocks of the current understanding of the terms. Anderson and Fienberg (2000) elaborate that these changes did not occur in isolation of the sociopolitical climate. Instead these changes were the policies that separated “those people who were entitled to the full measure of opportunity and participation in the society from those who were not so entitled because of their racial, ethnic or national origin” (Anderson & Fienberg, 2000, p. 101). For example, from the 1790s to the 1940s naturalization laws restricted citizenship only to those immigrants who were White, a decision made by court cases in the late 19th and early 20th century (Anderson & Fienberg, 1999). Immigrants of Chinese and other Asian origin were not classified as White and therefore excluded from becoming citizens and by 1882 the Chinese Exclusion Act “barred further Chinese immigration” (Anderson & Fienberg, 1999, p. 179). As for other groups, “Native Americans faced removal and genocide, blacks were subjected to racial slavery and Jim Crow, Latin@s were invaded and colonized” (Omi & Winant, 2014, p. 8). The 1950’s and 1960’s ushered a new era with laws, such as the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Voting Rights Act of 1965, Federal Executive Order 11246, and the Housing Act of 1968, intended to “guarantee equal opportunity and access to the benefit of society” (Anderson & Fienberg, 1999, p. 184). As people began to challenge race classifications and their negative implications, “the racial classifications in the federal statistical system were called upon to meet the needs of the civil rights enforcement” (Anderson &

Fienberg, 1999, p. 184). In requesting additional information to identify racial discrimination, “statistical systems continued to build racial classifications into the emerging data systems of the nation, including systems of administrative records, immigration records and vital registration systems, as well as the census” (Anderson & Fienberg, 2000, p. 102; Prewitt, 2013). Using the available categories at the time to meet political needs, the government continued the process of institutional recognition of the race categories without digging into the meaning of these categories.

### **Race versus Ethnicity**

As the state constructed the boundaries of race, differentiating between Whites and non-Whites, new immigrant groups began reshaping these margins. During the final years of the 19<sup>th</sup> century and early part of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, waves of European migrants, which presented differently from first European settlers, began to enter the U.S (Hattam, 2004). These differences led these groups to be identified as an ethnicity.

Prior to this influx of new arrivals, census publications displayed a strong desire to build the White identity as northern European, Protestant, and phenotypically as fair-skinned blonds (Rodriguez, 2000; Yanow, 2003). These European groups entering the U.S. were othered as they descended from eastern and southern Europe (Prewitt, 2013). Features such as red hair among the Irish or swarthy dark curly hair among the Greeks and Italians visually distinguished them (Yanow, 2003). Polish Jews, Irish, and Italian Catholics brought different languages, cultures, and religions, placing them outside of the construction what it meant to be “White” at the time (Omi & Winant, 2014).

These groups were pressured to assimilate into the image of the White category in order to obtain the status associated with the label (Omi & Winant, 2014). The inclusion of new

immigrants was a strategic political and corporate countermeasure used to neutralize radicalism and syndicalism growing within the immigrant communities (Omi & Winant, 2014). Halting the racialization process, was intended to prevent the growth of a collective effort among Black, Asian, and new European immigrants for social and legal equality. In order to explain this integration, ethnicity theorists “focused on the U.S. processes of incorporation such as assimilation and cultural pluralism” (Omi & Winant, 2014, p. 11). They also challenged the way race was understood as a biological characteristic visible to onlookers and instead credited differences to culture (Omi & Winant, 2014). Although this paradigm questioned the ideas of race, it did not profoundly alter them as it continued to define whiteness by which European immigrants became included, integrated, and assimilated to the White category (Omi & Winant, 2014). When attempting to apply this model to other non-White groups, such as Asians, Blacks, Native Americans, and Latinos, this argument fell apart as it diminished the importance of visual markers to impose “stigma, exclusion, privilege, and violence” (Omi & Winant, 2014). Fading differences between groups was not as simple as learning a new language, changing religions, or adopting new customs that ultimately rendered someone as White. Despite this weakness of broad applicability, the contemporary relevance of ethnicity is credited to the immigrants arriving after 1965 primarily from Asia and Latin America, which coincided with the Civil Rights movement that “revived distinctions between race and ethnicity” (Cornell & Hartmann, 2004, p. 53).

### **Directive No. 15**

A new policy adopted by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) streamlining race and ethnicity categories brought forth a new era in identifying people in the U.S. These categories, which historically allowed for systemic discrimination, would attempt to find a new

purpose as a tool to provide everyone full access to housing, education, and employment regardless of that persons race or ethnicity.

The standards issued by the OMB in 1977, known as Directive No. 15, “stemmed in large measure from new responsibilities to enforce civil rights laws” (Wallman, 1998, p. 31). This directive was intended to ensure the equal treatment of historically discriminated Americans due to their race or ethnicity (Wallman, 1998). Data tracking would allow the government to monitor “equal access to housing, education, employment, opportunities, and other areas” (Wallman, 1998, p. 31). The OMB’s race categories decided upon were the minimum number of race categories available for selection in government documents:

American Indian or Alaska Native. A person having origins in any of the original peoples of North America, and who maintains cultural identification through tribal affiliation or community recognition

Asian or Pacific Islander. A person having origins in any of the original peoples of the Far East, Southeast Asia, the Indian subcontinent, or the Pacific Islands This area includes, for example, China, India, Japan, Korea, the Philippine Islands, and Samoa.

Black. A person having origins in any of the black racial groups of Africa.

Hispanic. A person of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South American or other Spanish culture or origin, regardless of race

White. A person having origins in any of the original peoples of Europe, North Africa, or the Middle East (Office of Management and Budget, 1977, p. 37).

Ethnicity would be two categories, “Hispanic origin” or “Not of Hispanic origin” (Office of Management and Budget, 1977). Additional categories could be included on questionnaires yet these would need to be collapsed into the categories specified under Directive No. 15 (Office of Management and Budget, 1977). The impact of these standards reached far beyond adjusting categories available for selection in the census, they include household surveys, school registration forms, mortgage lending applications, medical records, and other administrative

forms (Wallman, 1998; Hattam, 2004).

Adjustments to these standards were made in 1997 as a response to “ongoing criticism of the census and to a rapid change in the racial and ethnic makeup of the country” which “launched an extensive review of the racial categorization system in 1993” (Williams, 2008, p. 5). During the revision process of Directive No. 15 the American Anthropological Association (AAA) expressed criticism of the existing standards sighting an “absence of ‘scientific or anthropological’ foundations in its formulation” (1997). They also asserted a lack of clarification on the meaning or distinction between the concepts of race and ethnicity (AAA, 1997). The AAA (1997) credited the concept of race in the United States to “European folk taxonomy or classification system sometime after Columbus sailed to the Americas” (1997). Bias interpretation of data collection allowed for traits such as behavior and intellectual level to be strongly correlated with a person's race and served as a mechanism to rank races in terms of superiority (AAA, 1997). Using the concept of race to categorize people was described as controversial due to the “numerous instances in human history in which a categorical treatment of people” was used (AAA, 1997).

The AAA (1997) also criticized Directive No. 15 as it ignored the historical evolution of the terms which influenced contemporary categories. A historical understanding of the categories would determine that initial development was done “by a then-dominant white, European-descended population” with the intention of distinguishing and controlling “other ‘non-white’ populations in various ways” (AAA, 1997). Amongst other recommendations, the AAA (1997) suggested for the combination of “the ‘race’ and ‘ethnicity’ categories into one question to appear as ‘race/ethnicity’ in order to address the OMB’s inability to define these terms as distinct



categories” and to address “research findings that many respondents conceptualize ‘race’ and ‘ethnicity’ as one in the same”. They also suggested for the development of new terms under the race categories, as the current terms were seen as outdated. In general, they advocated for the elimination of the term race due to the lack of scientific evidence proving this concept as a natural phenomenon. Gradually eliminating the term race would allow for a more accurate term such as “ethnic origin” (AAA, 1997).

Revisions to Directive No. 15 resulted in providing respondents the option of selecting more than one race but without the option of selecting from a multiracial category (Wallman, 1998). The “Asian or Pacific Islander” category would be separated into “Asian” and “Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander” (Wallman, 1998). Two categories would transition into new terms, “Black” would become “Black or African American” and “Hispanic” would become “Hispanic or Latino” but remain an ethnic category (Wallman, 1998).

Presenting the public with the option to identify with more than one race fundamentally challenged a long standing belief of race as pure. An overarching theme in the construction of race in the U.S was the acceptance of hypodescendence or the ‘one drop rule’ which affiliated people “with the subordinate rather than the superordinate [racial] group in order to avoid the ambiguity of intermediate identity” (Harris, 1964, p. 56). People of multiracial background known to have a Black ancestor were automatically considered to be Black (Harris, 1964; Nakashima, 1992; Rodriguez, 2000). This concept also presumed race as a fixed immutable trait in which racial groups were “distinct and mutually exclusive” (Flores-González et al., 2014, p. 1836). Hypodescendence was uniformly accepted as “crucial to maintaining the social system of white domination” (Davis, 1991, p. 63). According to Nakashima (1992) “the U.S. system has

depended on very clear racial categories for its political, social, economic, and psychological organization” (p. 177). This idea that everyone belonged in only one race category upheld the belief of continuing minimal race mixing, legally manifested through anti-miscegenation laws (Lee, 1993). Census 2000 for the first time gave people of multiracial background the ability to select more than one race.

Provided this new format option in self-identification, Jones and Bullock (2013) provide insight as to how the multiracial group continued to change from Census 2000 to Census 2010. Despite the processing error in Census 2000, which overstated the national “Two or More Race population by about 1 million people”, their research estimated an increase in the multiracial population within ten years (Jones & Bullock, 2013, p. 7). Multiracial individuals accounted for 6.8 million people or 2.4 percent of the population in Census 2000 which grew to 9.0 million or 2.9 percent of the total population by Census 2010 (Jones & Bullock, 2013). Much of this population was found to be concentrated in 10 states: California, Texas, New York, Florida, Hawaii, Washington, Illinois, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Ohio, which accounted for 60 percent of this population (Jones & Bullock, 2013). California’s multiracial population surpassed all other states at 1.8 million and also held the most individuals identifying as Black and White, American Indian/Alaska Native and White, Asian and White, and White and Some Other Race (Jones & Bullock, 2013). With the exception of Mississippi, every state “had a multiple race population of 1.5% or more” (Jones & Bullock, 2013, p. 11). A transition from a pure race ideology allowed for communities and individuals to find a means of reflecting their lived experience as multiracial. Policy restrictions allowed for a research gap to grow by not recognizing multiracial people prior to 2000, unless designations such as octoroon, quadroon,

and mulatto available to enumerators between the latter part of the 19th century through the beginning of the 20th century are taken into consideration.

### **Latino Racial Identity**

As previously indicated Omi and Winant's (2014) research identified ethnicity as a paradigm by which race can be understood. In this light, the distinction made between these two terms at the institutional level becomes invalid as those considered to be ethnicities would undergo the racialization process. Omi and Winant (2014) defined racialization as "the extension of racial meaning to a previously racially unclassified relationship, social practice, or group" (p. 111). Brown, Hitlin, and Elder (2007) stated that the analytical understanding imposed by the government as blurred "when individuals actually categorize themselves" and instead see social groupings alongside "social origins" (p. 160). Latinos have become the most recent group to resist the institutional categorization process imposed by the state while challenging the idea that ethnic groups eventually assimilate into other racial groups. As with the multiracial race population, Latinos present an interesting puzzle for the race definitions used by the U.S. as the visual markers that are believed to be consistent within groups are not as obvious among those who fall under the label Latino or Hispanic. Flores-González et al. (2014) identified the issue of race among Latinos similar of that affecting multiracial people in the U.S. as both simultaneously claiming and being assigned a race. The term Latino is a pan-ethnic category that describes people of Latin America with varied backgrounds, similar cultural elements such as the Spanish language, history of Spanish colonization and U.S. intervention, along with similar experiences of racialization once in the U.S. (Suarez-Orozco & Paez, 2008). Despite these similarities, according to Alcoff (2000), this identity does not fit into the racialized boundaries in the U.S. which make use of easily identifiable features and biological heredity as a

means of identifying race. These characteristics do not apply to Latinos within the U.S. or even in any national subset (Alcoff, 2000). Latinos mixed race heritage, as understood by U.S. standards, of White, Black, Indigenous, and Asian origin does not fit into any of the recognized U.S. racial categories which uphold a race as pure in nature (Morning, 2011; Rodriguez, 2000).

Court cases defined Latinos as White but socially a racial minority group (Gomez, 2008; Haney-López, 2006) yet without a racial category to reflect this racialization. Institutional categories do not accurately reflect the racial identity of Latinos as many of them make up a significant portion of the people using the “Some Other Race (SOR) [category] instead of a conventional racial category” (Flores-González et al., 2014, p.1836). The census has seen a decline in the number of White Latinos proportional to the increase in Latinos who identify as ‘Some Other Race’ (Flores-González et al., 2014, p. 1837). Written responses acknowledge national origin or the pan-ethnic terms of Latino or Hispanic, suggesting this pan-ethnic identity may be thought in terms as a race category (Hitlin, Brown & Elder, 2007). Shifts in self-identification reveal a “rational and logical response to an insufficient system of classification” (Flores-González et al., 2014, p. 1845). Additionally, choice restrictions reflect a “continuing racial exclusion and the growing sense among Latino youth” of not belonging to the U.S. (Flores-González et al., 2014, p. 1848).

Perceptions of exclusion are furthered as Latinos consider their institutional racial identity as Other. An overwhelming majority of people only reporting “Some Other Race” were of Latino origin. Of the 19.1 million people reporting as Other race alone, 18.5 million or 97 percent also reported Latino origin, “compared with only 1 million people of non-Hispanic origin” (Humes et al., 2011, p. 17). The majority of Latinos reporting Other only reported one

race while amongst non-Hispanics “about 42 percent reported more than one race (nearly four times higher than their Hispanic counterparts).” (Humes et al., 2011, p. 17). Studies on the Other category determined that it “represents a substantive social reality” (Hitlin et al., 2007, p. 171). Removing the “other” race category has a “minimal effect on the tabulation of non-Hispanics” (Hitlin et al., 2007, p. 172).

Research by the U.S. Census Bureau addressing the large number of Latinos selecting Other, suggested for the combination of the “Hispanic origin question” along with careful consideration in improving the detailed portion of that category (Compton et al., 2013). They also acknowledged an individual's race and ethnic identity as being a “fluid and mutable self-identified construct, which can change across time, experience, context, and other factors” (Compton et al., 2013, p. 31). Inquiring about race and ethnicity in a combined question resulted in a dramatic reduction in the number of respondents reporting Other along with a reduction in the number of people reporting White alone (Compton et al., 2013). Reduction in the White only numbers was attributed to a “direct result of Hispanic respondents finding their identity in the combined question” (Compton et al., 2013, p. 75). Overall the Bureau’s research expressed,

It is clear that the implementation of the OMB standards in census and surveys is not well understood and the categories are considered unacceptable by increasing numbers of respondents, which has resulted in an inability or unwillingness for some respondents to self identify as the OMB standards intended (Compton et al., 2013, p. 78-79).

This conclusion aligned with the recommendation of other researchers tracing the implementation of the OMB’s race standards in the K-12 system along with post-secondary institution (Renn & Lunceford, 2004). They found it necessary to provide a way for people to express their Latino identity in education demographics as the experience of this identity aligned with other racial groups (Renn & Lunceford, 2004).

Analysis of the 1996 Race and Ethnic Targeted Test (RAETT) demonstrated that 56 percent of Hispanics within their sample selected “Hispanic” as their only identity when provided with the opportunity to do so (Hirschman, Alba, & Farley, 2000). This research also revealed that “measurement of race/ethnicity are potentially more consequential for Hispanics than for any other group” as the population is sensitive to variations in the format and order of the questions (Hirschman et al., 2000, p. 388). Combined question format reduced the number of non-responses within the Hispanic population and the overall population. Proximately 2 to 4 percent of the total population does not answer the race questions, which increases in predominantly Hispanic areas to 13 to 14 percent (Hirschman et al., 2000). These numbers are reduced to 1 percent or less “in all segments of the population when ‘Hispanic’ is included as a category in a classification combined race and Hispanic origin” (Hirschman et al., 2000, p. 391). It is implied that this could be due to a better understanding of the question when Hispanics are included.

Requiring the two part question of race and ethnicity as separate concepts has undeniable consequences. Latino advocates are concerned as to how the Latino ethnicity will be considered when considering racial identification (Amaro & Zambrana, 2000). Allowing respondents to select more than one race prompted the release of Bulletin 00-02 by the OMB which provided guidelines specifying that the following combinations categories be considered for the purpose of civil rights monitoring and enforcement: Black or African American & White, American Indian/Alaska Native & White, Asian & White, American Indian/Alaska Native & Black. The OMB’s Bulletin 00-02 required that combination groups accounting for more than 1 percent-- be included in tabulations but the decision of incorporation would be at the discretion of agencies to

determine. As of 2010 these categories make up 57 percent of the 9.9 million people who report more than one race or 2.9 percent of the population (Humes et al., 2011). Under these guidelines the OMB is not responsible for enforcing compliance of civil rights regulations for those that identify as Latino (Hitlin et al., 2007). Little over half of Latinos report as only White and 36 percent reported as Other (Humes et al., 2011). Among the non-Latino population only 2.3 percent reported as multiracial meanwhile 6 percent of the Latino population identified with more than one race (Hitlin et al., 2007).

Unlike the census, education institutions have a brief history in handling the question of race. The 1964 Civil Rights Act called for the federal government to begin gathering enrollment data for public schools. Prior to this, national data was not collected and Latinos were not officially defined as a statistical category “until the Office of Civil Rights started compiling national school enrollment data by race and ethnicity in 1967” (Orfield, Kucsera, and Siegel-Hawley, 2012, p. 14).

Although data collection on race and ethnicity is currently gathered at a federal level, primary and secondary education data is mainly regulated at the state level. Across states different ways of collecting, aggregating, and reporting data was common as seen in the research by the NCES when attempting to understand the ways in which the OMB’s race and ethnicity standards were being applied (NCES, 1996; NCES, 1998). In some situations, the way a local education agency (LEA), a school or district, reported demographic information to the State Education Agency (SEA), is due to the needs of that school or district to describe its population (NCES, 1996; NCES, 1998). Prior to the 2010-2011 school year, education institutions were not obligated to adopt the 1997 OMB standards and until that time only a few states had taken

initiative to make these changes by their own account (NCES 1996; NCES 1998). With the release of the DOE's final guidelines on reporting race and ethnic data in 2007, primary, secondary, and institutions of higher education were given instructions on how to collect data on race and ethnicity for federal purposes. At the time of the OMB's 1997 changes, self-identification "was a critical aspect of the data collection process" (Renn, 2009, p. 167). In addition, given the large number of Latinos that continue to deviate from using the race categories provided, instead selecting 'Some Other Race', it could be argued that respondents are not given an opportunity to accurately self-identify under the current recognized race categories.

Tracing changes of the race categories used in the census, reflects the country's historical needs as seen by different political factions, whose influence was reflected in "political and ideological choices" as to who was to be counted (Rodriguez, 2000, p. 65; Lee, 1993). According to Rodriguez (2000) race categories "describe the population(s) from the perspective of those who have the power to select them, and in turn, they influence the way that populations see themselves" (p. 65). In the case of the DOE, the approval of observer identification is an institutional acceptance of "external, visual, race-ethnic identification" of the population which "embodies and sustains a common 'knowledge' of 'scientific' character" (Yanow, 2003, p. 99). In describing Latinos as a ethnicity reduces this identity "to something like a preference, something variable and chosen, in the way one's religion or language is chose" (Omi & Winant, 2014, p. 22).



## CHAPTER THREE

### RESEARCH

At the moment, there is an unclear depiction of one of the fastest growing group in our population along with those of multiracial background. Those considered to be non-White, such as Latinos and multiracial people, find themselves resisting the institutional structure created by the OMB (Rodriguez, 2000; Williams, 2008).

Census questionnaires allow respondents to write in their race by selecting ‘Some Other Race’ or Other, an option often used by Latinos. On the other hand, DOE policy does not allow for this to occur as parents are required to select from the categories provided of American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian, Black/African American, Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, or White, without a restriction to the number of races selected. The final guidelines by DOE acknowledge that the new policy differs from the reporting method used by the Census Bureau which would not allow for data comparability between the two agencies:

“We recognized that there may be differences in how different Federal agencies collect racial and ethnic data. The Department will continue to study the similarities and differences between the data received by the Department and data received by other Federal agencies and will consider providing any appropriate guidance to the public on this matter, in the future” (U.S. Department of Education, 2007, p. 59271).

At the moment there is no research similar to that done by the National Center for schools were asked to identify their data collection practices, policy adjustments, or personal training practices (NCES, 1996; NCES, 1998). Which brings the question:

Does a variation in measurement policy, of the race definitions outlined by the Office of Management and Budgets, change the number of students identified under each race within the U.S. Department of Education and U.S. Census Bureau?

Provided that DOE policy does not allow for deviation from federal race standards and the census does, how does this change the racial depictions of school-aged students under both agencies? When comparing the aggregate DOE data to census information, what are some of the differences seen? Also how does the count of the multiracial population depicted by the census change when the race response is considered for those that identify as Latino?

### **Research Methodology**

Census 2010 data for the states of California, Texas and Florida were used to test the question posed as they hold 50 percent of the Latino population in the country (Ennis, Rios-Vargas, & Albert, 2011). Renn's (2009) research explains that growing numbers in the multiracial student population along with those in the Latino student population have the ability to affect these three states along with a "national portrait of education demographics" in the future (p. 178). This study intends to build on the research developed by Lopez (2003) addressing various tabulation methods and their impact on data summaries when considering multiracial students and the Latino category as a race rather than an ethnicity. Unlike Census questionnaires, education guidelines for primary and secondary institutions do not provide respondents an opportunity to identify as racially Other. Therefore, if a respondent is dissatisfied with the choices available they are still obligated to select from the provided categories or a choice will be made on their behalf by a designated person in their school (U.S. Department of Education, 2007). For this reason, census data is ideal as people who are actively resisting the categories are given the space to do so. Furthermore, by selecting to identify as Latino in combination with a race, a 'one drop rule' format is implemented as the student is only allocated

to the Latino category instead of the Two or More Races count. Even if a student identifies as Black, White, and Latino in a questionnaire they would only be classified under the Latino category without having their race reported under the Two or More Races count in order to avoid duplication.

First, Census 2010 data was collected for the states of California, Texas, and Florida. For those identified as under the age of 18, two tabulation methods were used: (a) represented race data as defined by the OMB, in which ethnicity is a subgroup of a race category and (b) represents race data as defined by the OMB in addition to including the Latino category as a race instead of an ethnicity. Under tabulation method (b) people identified as Latino in combination with another race would be counted as Two or More Races. These results were compared with aggregate numbers reported to the DOE as part of the NCES's data collection for the 2010-2011 year.

A respondent of the 2010 Census was first asked to identify their ethnicity by answering the following question "Is this person of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin?". They had the options of answering the following way: "No, not Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin; Yes, Mexican, Mexican Am., Chicano; Yes, Puerto Rican; Yes, Cuban; Yes, another Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin with space to specify". The respondent was then asked about their race in the following question "What is this person's race? Mark one or more boxes". Respondents had the following options: White; Black, African Am., or Negro; American Indian/Alaska Native, with space to indicate tribal affiliation; Asian Indian; Japanese; Native Hawaiian; Chinese; Korean; Guamanian or Chamorro; Filipino; Vietnamese; Samoan; Other Asian, with space to specify; Other Pacific Islander, with space to specify, and Some Other Race, with space

to specify.

In using tabulation method A, a respondent's race was counted as belonging to the categories designated by the OMB along with the Other category without a breakdown of the ethnicity of each race category:

- American Indian/Alaska Native
- Asian
- Black/African American
- Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander
- White
- Some Other Race
- Two or More Races

Additionally, the following combination categories were calculated as outlined by the OMB's Bulletin 00-02

- American Indian/Alaska Native and White
- Asian and White
- Black/African American and White
- American Indian/Alaska Native and Black/African American (OMB, 2000).

Tabulation method B considered the Latino category as a race instead of an ethnicity. In order to classify someone within the Latino race that person would have identified under the Other category and as Latino.

- American Indian/Alaska Native
- Asian
- Black/African American
- Latino or Hispanic
- Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander
- White
- Some Other Race
- Two or More Races

Additionally, the following combination categories were calculated as outlined by the OMB's Bulletin 00-02 (2000), in addition to one combination category including the Latino category:

American Indian/Alaska Native *and* White  
Asian *and* White  
Black/African American *and* White  
Latino or Hispanic *and* White  
American Indian/Alaska Native *and* Black/African American

The combination category of Latino or Hispanic and White includes the number of people who selected “White” for their race and “Latino” for their ethnicity. Due to the two part question in the census, it is unclear if these people are of a multiracial background or if they selected White for their race because of the omission of a Latino category under the question.

Census data stands as the largest source of information collected in which respondents are asked about their race and ethnicity. Although not free of flaws, as found in the research, census questions continue to represent the institutions understanding of what race and ethnicity categories are in our society.

It must be acknowledged that the census is submitted by one household member on behalf of the household unit. There is a possibility that people under the age of 18 did not complete this form themselves therefore these responses do not align with the OMB’s preference of self-identification. It is also possible for the household responded to identify the person under the age of 18 in a different manner than they would have if given the option of self-identification. Additionally, everyone indicated to be under the age of 18 was considered for the study even though not everyone in that age group would be enrolled in primary or secondary education.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### RESULTS

Census data of California, Florida, and Texas are first analyzed using the previously mentioned tabulation methods, followed by a comparison of tabulation method B with the information reported by the NCES. As tabulation method A does not account for the category of Latino, comparison with NCES data would be unfit as their calculation method does consider the category. Under tabulation method A all three states have a majority White population among school-age children. The second largest category in California and Texas is Other at 22.8 percent and 13.3 percent respectively. In table 2, Florida's Black population comes in as second largest at 21.6 percent. The rest of California's school-age population, in table 1, consists of 10.7 percent Asian, 8.4 percent Two or More Races, 6.3 percent Black, 1.1 percent American Indian, and 0.4 percent Pacific Islander. Florida's remaining school-aged population is Other at 5.2 percent, Two or More Races at 4.9 percent, Asian at 2.5 percent, American Indian/Alaska Native at 0.4 percent, and Pacific Islander at 0.1 percent. Finally, table 3 shows that Texas school-age population identifies as 12.5 percent Black, 4.4 percent Two or More Races, 3.5 percent Asian, 0.8 percent American Indian, and 0.1 percent Pacific Islander.

Including Latino as a race, under tabulation method B, drastically increases the multiracial category of Two or More Races in all three states. Texas reports the highest count of people identified as Two or More Races at 37.4 percent while California reports the second with 33 percent and Florida comes in third with 26.1 percent. Within the Two of More Races group,

the combination of “Latino or Hispanic & White” has the highest percentage of people that identify as part of that group. As previously stated there are limitations to the conclusions that could be drawn from these numbers as the two question format does influence responses.

Table 1. Origin Data for California 2010

<b>Tabulation Method</b>	<b>Method A</b>		<b>Method B</b>	
<b>Data Used</b>	<b>Race Alone</b>		<b>Race and Latino Origin</b>	
<b>Population</b>	<b>Under Age 18</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Under Age 18</b>	<b>Total</b>
<i>Persons</i>	<i>9,295,040</i>	<i>37,253,956</i>	<i>9,295,040</i>	<i>37,253,956</i>
% American Indian/Alaska Native	1.1	1.0	0.4	0.4
% Asian	10.7	13.1	10.4	12.8
% Black/African American	6.3	6.2	5.6	5.8
% Latino	-	-	22.6	16.7
% Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.4
% White	50.2	57.6	27.4	40.2
% Other	22.8	17.0	0.3	0.2
% Two or More Races	8.4	4.9	33	23.5
% American Indian/Alaska Native & Black	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
% American Indian/Alaska Native & White	0.7	0.6	0.4	0.4
% Asian & White	2.4	1.2	2	1.1
% Black/African American & White	1.1	0.5	1	0.4
% Latino or Hispanic & White	-	-	23	17.4
% Other Two or More Races	4.2	2.5	7	4.2

Source: Census 2010 (SF 1)

The White and Other school-age population decreases as Latinos are counted as a race.

California's White population declines from 50.2 percent to 27.4 percent and the Other population declines from 22.8 percent to 0.3 percent. The White population in

Table 2. Origin Data for Florida 2010

<b>Tabulation Method</b>	<b>Method A</b>		<b>Method B</b>	
<b>Data Used</b>	<b>Race Alone</b>		<b>Race and Latino Origin</b>	
<b>Population</b>	<b>Under Age 18</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Under Age 18</b>	<b>Total</b>
<i>Persons</i>	<i>4,002,091</i>	<i>18,801,310</i>	<i>4,002,091</i>	<i>18,801,310</i>
% American Indian/Alaska Native	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.3
% Asian	2.5	2.4	2.4	2.4
% Black/African American	21.6	16.0	20.4	15.2
% Latino	-	-	4.7	3.4
% Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
% White	65.4	75.0	45.6	57.9
% Other	5.2	3.6	0.4	0.3
% Two or More Races	4.9	2.5	26.1	20.7
% American Indian/Alaska Native & Black	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
% American Indian/Alaska Native & White	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3
% Asian & White	0.8	0.4	0.7	0.3
% Black/African American & White	1.8	0.6	1.5	0.5
% Latino or Hispanic & White	-	-	19.7	17.2
% Other Two or More Races	1.9	1.2	3.8	2.4

Source: Census 2010 (SF 1)

Florida drops to 45.6 percent from 65.4 percent as the Other category decreases to 0.4 percent from 5.2 percent under tabulation method A. Texas White school-age population demonstrates



the largest change as it drops from 65.5 percent to 33.8 percent, while the Other category moves from 13.3 percent to 0.2 percent. Additionally, the American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian, Black/African American, and Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander categories in the three states also experience a decline in percentage but not to the extent seen in the White and Other category.

Table 3. Origin Data for Texas 2010

<b>Tabulation Method</b>	<b>Method A</b>		<b>Method B</b>	
<b>Data Used</b>	<b>Race Alone</b>		<b>Race and Latino Origin</b>	
<b>Population</b>	<b>Under Age 18</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Under Age 18</b>	<b>Total</b>
<i>Persons</i>	<i>6,865,824</i>	<i>25,145,561</i>	<i>6,865,824</i>	<i>25,145,561</i>
% American Indian/Alaska Native	0.8	0.7	0.3	0.3
% Asian	3.5	3.8	3.4	3.8
% Black/African American	12.5	11.9	11.8	11.5
% Latino	-	-	13.1	10.3
% Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
% White	65.5	70.4	33.8	45.3
% Other	13.3	10.5	0.2	0.1
% Two or More Races	4.4	2.7	37.4	28.6
% American Indian/Alaska Native & Black	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
% American Indian/Alaska Native & White	0.4	0.4	0.2	0.3
% Asian & White	0.7	0.4	0.6	0.3
% Black/African American & White	1.1	0.4	0.9	0.4
% Latino or Hispanic & White	-	-	31.7	25.1
% Other Two or More Races	2.2	1.5	3.9	2.5

Source: Census 2010 (SF 1)

As NCES information provides a breakdown of race categories with the inclusion of the Latino ethnicity, comparing tabulation method B and NCES data is most appropriate as it

provides an opportunity to understand the impact of this category along with the Other category. This comparison does demonstrate a change in the number of students identifies under each race under all three states. Since the Latino responses are compiled into one category, regardless of combination with other racial identities, this leads the percentage of reported Latinos to be much larger under NCES data in each state.

Table 4. U.S. Department of Education Percentage Distribution of Public School Membership for the state of California: School year 2010–11

<i>Persons</i>	<i>6,217,174</i>
% American Indian	0.7
% Asian	11.1
% Black	6.7
% Latino	51.4
% Pacific Islander	0.6
% White	26.6
% Other	-
% Two or More Races	2.9

Source: Keaton, P. (2012). Public Elementary and Secondary School Student Enrollment and Staff Counts From the Common Core of Data: School Year 2010–11 (NCES 2012-327). U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.

California NCES data reports 51.4 percent of students as Latino while tabulation method B only reports them as 22.6 percent of the population. Florida NCES data shows Latino students as 28 percent of the population while tabulation method B reports this category at 4.7 percent. As for Texas the NCES reports Latinos as 50.3 percent of the population in contrast to the 13.1 percent using tabulation method B. Current DOE policy has made the Latino identity a catch all category that has the ability to override combination responses which affects the Latino and Two or More races count.

Table 5. U.S. Department of Education Percentage Distribution of Public School Membership for the state of Florida: School year 2010–11

<i>Persons</i>	<i>2,643,347</i>
% American Indian	0.4
% Asian	2.5
% Black	23
% Latino	28
% Pacific Islander	0.1
% White	43
% Other	-
% Two or More Races	3

Source: Keaton, P. (2012). Public Elementary and Secondary School Student Enrollment and Staff Counts From the Common Core of Data: School Year 2010–11 (NCES 2012-327). U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.

Table 6. U.S. Department of Education Percentage Distribution of Public School Membership for the state of Texas: School year 2010–11

<i>Persons</i>	<i>4,935,715</i>
% American Indian	0.5
% Asian	3.4
% Black	12.9
% Latino	50.3
% Pacific Islander	0.1
% White	31.2
% Other	-
% Two or More Races	1.6

Source: Keaton, P. (2012). Public Elementary and Secondary School Student Enrollment and Staff Counts From the Common Core of Data: School Year 2010–11 (NCES 2012-327). U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.

The number of students attributed to the Two of More races category is larger when using tabulation method B as opposed to NCES data. California’s NCES data reports students of Two or More races as 2.9 percent but tabulation method B reports this group as 22.6 percent. NCES

data reports the Two or More race category in Florida as 3 percent and 1.6 percent for Texas while tabulation method B reports 26.1 percent and 37.4 percent, respectively.

As for the remaining racial categories of American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian, Black/African American, and Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander—NCES reports higher percentages than Census data in all three states. The White category is the only one to experience a decline in each state as the Latino category is included. Comparing tabulation method A and B with official NCES data is limited as the omission of the Other category has the ability to alter the percentages reported. NCES data also reported the Two or More Race category in smaller percentages than either tabulation method A or B in the three states.

## CHAPTER FIVE

### DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

A historical account of the Census upholds the idea that race is not static. As people in power felt the need to identify new social groups, or existing ones, they demonstrated this authority by naming and outlining the parameters by which people would be identified as part of a group. Census taken prior to the adoption of self-identification are a direct indication of how the public was told to identify and how it was possible for this to change every ten years. Only in the last forty to fifty years has the Census attempted to provide the public with more autonomy over their identity resulting in the empowerment of non-White communities, therefore there is still room for improvement.

With the inclusion of self-identification the government unintentionally created an avenue of measuring the public's understanding of the categories provided by the state. One of the most vocal groups to advocate for a change in the way the state perceived them was the multiracial community. New waves of immigrants, as with previous groups, also continue to challenge the interpretation of race categories along with the criteria used to include people within each group. Current understanding of Latinos as an ethnicity interprets this identity similar to that of eastern and southern Europeans migrants who assimilated into racial categories recognized in the U.S. Yet research presented demonstrates the community as susceptible to misrepresentation as the current race categories and their interpretations do not align with how Latinos see themselves. Additionally, incoherent policies can worsen the issue as these categories continue to regulate a student's educational experience.

As previously mentioned current use of this data by the DOE and the Census affects the function of students within the school, school management and the narrative build about particular schools. This information is used to research student achievement and placement in special education programs (U.S. Department of Education, 2007). Policy makers also use this data to make decisions as to a communities need for a new school. Districts use these numbers to redefine boundaries and to inform the allocation of funding by local and state agencies (U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 2016). As the DOE and the Census oversee a different aspect of a school it would be beneficial to have policies that accurately portray the communities being served by both agencies.

There is little research in the realm of education that does not address the topic of race and its implications on schools and students. Areas such as sociology of education, policy research, and critical analyses of schooling are unable to provide a complete account of the education system without considering the importance of race (Brown & De Lissovoy, 2011). Providing scholars and districts with race categories representative of the community they serve is imperative to resolve issues such as the inadequate distribution of resources for students of color, unequal access to higher education among racial groups, disproportional effects of disciplinary policies on students of color, and the growing resegregation of public schools (Brown & De Lissovoy, 2011; Orfield et al., 2012). Leaving Latinos to blend among the Other, Two or More Races, and the White categories does not allow for the resolution of these problems. Data collection by the federal government on public school enrollment tracked the growth of the Latino population; altering these categories could possibly lead more people to

identify as part of the group that speaks to their racial identity, ultimately allowing the state to take notice of other trends in communities in order to provide appropriate resources.

Drawing extensive conclusions from the data presented is limited to the very principal of self-identification. Given the age of the population in question, it is possible they are not provided with the opportunity to select their own identity. Therefore, census and DOE data analyzed could be more of a reflection of a parent or guardian's understanding of race and ethnicity, as opposed to that of the child. Despite this possibility, self-identification is still crucial to understanding the Latino identity given the changes experienced when this option was provided. The 1980 Census reported a drop in the number of Latinos who identified as White, as understood by the census, from 93.3 percent in 1970 to 57.5 percent in 1980 (Rodriguez, 2000). Since then, the census has seen a decline in the number of White Latinos, as defined by the census, proportional to the increase in Latinos who identify as 'Some Other Race' (Flores-González et al., 2014, p. 1837). Although this method may not provide people under the age of 18 an opportunity to identify their race and ethnicity, it does provide insight to the complications Latinos face when answering these questions that might seem straightforward to other groups of people. It also brings attention to the issues around data comparability when race categories are limited and restricted by the state.

Presently data provided by the Census Bureau and the DOE is not comparable due to the differences in data collection, as indicated by the DOE. The rapid growth of Latinos in the U.S. requires better research of this population as the group is prone to providing different responses given a variation in question format, as specified by the Census. Tabulation method B, in this research, provides an understanding as to how NCES data could account for race, with the

acceptance of Latino as an option, without one identity overruling another. The DOE's current policy has the ability to mask combination categories paired with the Latino identity as the catchall policy obstructs a deeper awareness of the Two or More Race category as well as the Latino category.

Variables such as a person's time in the U.S., place of birth, language, education level, and acculturation have all been considered when attempting to provide insight to the reasons for people selecting to identify as Other (Rodriguez, 2000). Some research uncovered increased reports of racial identification as White when considering a person's Latino group, such as Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, and Other Latino (Bates, Martin, DeMaio, & De La Puente, 2006). The number of respondents reporting as White increased when the race question was placed after the Hispanic origin question across all four groups (Bates et al., 2006). In the case of Cubans, they were most likely to identify as White (Bates et al., 2006). This is relevant considering Texas and California are primarily composed of people of Mexican descent, while Florida has a heavy presence of Cubans (Ennis et al, 2011). In order to make a connection to larger implications of the results presented, many of these factors would also need to be considered.

Further research is necessary as the interpretation of race within the education system is dependent of several variables, beyond the scope of this research, which are further complicated when considering the Latino population. It is presumed that parents or guardians select the race and ethnic identity of their student on school records which might be different from the way students themselves identify. Given the limited race categories provided along with the omission of Other, within school records, it would be valuable to research how often parents



or students are forced to choose a race category they do not identify. While the census no longer approves of observer identification the DOE does, making it necessary to research the frequency in which this tool is used to complete school records. Also in those cases the regularity in which the observer misidentifies the race or ethnicity of a student and which categories are often misidentified. It would also be beneficial to examine the effects of a combined race and ethnicity question format on student records, such as the Census has done with their research. Provided the Latino category overrides race categories in DOE data it is necessary to identify the combination categories found within the Latino category. The financial impact of these policies are also reasonable to explore.

Research on the racial and ethnic identities of school-age children estimates forthcoming demographic changes which would determine policy development. Current policy is in need of reconfiguring race not only as a visual description but also as a cultural account of differences between groups of people. In making this change Latinos could be recognized as race category. The Census Bureau has attempted to make this argument based on their research on the Latino community, unfortunately without creating change on a national platform.

As these changes are considered policy makers should be mindful of legislation enacted to protect communities of color. Civil rights laws created with the intention to protect groups with a history of systemic hardship should not deteriorate on the path to creating a better understanding of the general population. Taking the opposite recourse of eliminating race and ethnicity labels would not solve any of the issues faced by these communities instead it would leave policy makers without the necessary information to measure the progress of these groups.

## References

- Alcoff, L. (2000). Is Latina/o identity a racial identity? In J. E. Gracia & P. de Greiff (Eds.), *Hispanics/Latinos in the United States: Ethnicity, race and rights* (p. 23-44). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Amaro, H., & Zambrana, R. (2000). Criollo, Mestizo, Mulato, LatiNegro, Indigena, White, or Black? The US Hispanic/Latino population and multiple responses in the 2000 census. *American Journal of Public Health, 90*(11), 1724-1727.
- American Anthropological Association (AAA). (1997). "Response to OMB Directive 15: Race and Ethnic Standards for Federal Statistics and Administrative Reporting (Sept 1997). Retrieved from [new.aaanet.org/gvt/ombdraft.htm](http://new.aaanet.org/gvt/ombdraft.htm)
- Anderson, M. & Fienberg, S.E. (1999). *Who Counts? The Politics of Census-Taking in Contemporary America*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Anderson, M. & Fienberg, S.E. (2000). Race and Ethnicity and the Controversy over the U.S. Census. *Current Sociology, 48* (3), 87-110.
- Bates, N., Martin, E. A., DeMaio, T. J., & de la Puente, M. (2006). Questionnaire effects on measurements of race and Spanish origin. Research Report Series. Survey Methodology #2006-12. Washington, DC: Statistical Research Division, U.S. Census Bureau. Retrieved from <https://www.census.gov/srd/papers/pdf/rsm2006-12.pdf>
- Bohme, F., & United States. Bureau of the Census. (1989). *200 years of U.S. census taking : Population and housing questions, 1790-1990*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.
- Brown, A.L., & De Lissovoy, N. (2011) Economies of racism: grounding education policy research in the complex dialectic of race, class, and capital. *Journal of Education Policy, 26*(5), 595-619, DOI: 10.1080/02680939.2010.533289
- Brown, Hitlin, & Elder. (2007). The importance of being "other": A natural experiment about lived race over time. *Social Science Research, 36*(1), 159-174.
- Compton, E., Bentley, M., Ennis, S., & Rastogi, S. (2013). 2010 Census race and Hispanic origin alternative questionnaire experiment (Final Report). Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau.

- Cornell, S., & Hartmann, D. (1998). *Ethnicity and race: making identities in a changing world*. Thousand Oaks: Pine Forrester Press.
- Cornell, S., & Hartmann, D. (2004). Conceptual Confusions and Divides: Race, Ethnicity, and the Study of Immigration. In Foner, N. & Fredrickson, G. (Eds.), *Not just black and white: Historical and contemporary perspectives on immigration, race, and ethnicity in the United States* (42-60). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Davis, F. (1991). *Who is black? One nation's definition*. University Park, Pa.: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Ennis, S. R., Rios-Vargas, M., & Albert, N. G. (2011). *The Hispanic Population: 2010*. Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau.
- Flores-González, N., Aranda, E., & Vaquera, E. (2014). 'Doing Race': Latino Youth's Identities and the Politics of Racial Exclusion. *American Behavioral Scientists*, 58 (14), p. 1834-1851. doi: 10.1177/0002764214550287
- Gomez, L. (2008). *Manifest destinies: The making of the Mexican American race*. New York: New York University Press.
- Haney-López, I. (2006). *White by law: The legal construction of race*. New York: New York University Press.
- Harris, M. (1964). *Patterns of race in the Americas*. (The Walker summit library, no. 1). New York: Walker.
- Hattam, V. (2004). Ethnicity: An American Genealogy. In Foner, N. & Fredrickson, G (Eds.), *Not just black and white : Historical and contemporary perspectives on immigration, race, and ethnicity in the United States* (42-60). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Hirschman, C., Alba, R., & Farley, R. (2000). The meaning and measurement of race in the U.S. census: Glimpses into the future. *Demography*, 37(3), 381-393.
- Hitlin, S., Brown, J. S., & Elder, G. H., Jr. (2007). Measuring Latinos: Racial vs. Ethnic Classification and Self-Understandings. *Social Forces*, 86(2), 587-611.
- Hoover, K., Marcia, J., & Parris, K. (1997). *The power of identity: Politics in a new key* (Chatham house studies in political thinking). Chatham, N.J.: Chatham House.
- Humes, K.R., Jones, N.A., & Ramirez, R.R. (2011). Overview of Race and Hispanic Origin: 2010. U.S. Census Bureau. Retrieved from <http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/briefs/c2010br-02.pdf>

- Jones, N.A., & Bullock, J.J. (2013). Understanding Who Reported Multiple Races in the U.S. Decennial Census: Results from Census 2000 and the 2010 Census. *Family Relations*, 62, 5-16. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-3729.2012.00759.x
- Keaton, P. (2012). Public Elementary and Secondary School Student Enrollment and Staff Counts from the Common Core of Data: School Year 2010–11 (NCES 2012-327). U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch>.
- Kena, G., Musu-Gillette, L., Robinson, J., Wang, X., Rathbun, A., Zhang, J., Wilkinson-Flicker, S., Barmer, A., and Dunlop Velez, E. (2015). The Condition of Education 2015 (NCES 2015-144). U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. Washington, DC. Retrieved [1/9/2016] from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch>.
- Lee, S. (1993). Racial classifications in the US census: 1890–1990. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 16(1), 75-94.
- Lopez, A. M. (2003). Mixed-Race School-Age Children: A Summary of Census 2000 Data. *American Educational Research Association*, 32 (6), 25-37. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3699899>
- Morning, A. (2005). 'Keywords: Race'. *Contexts* 4:44-6. Retrieved from <http://sociology.fas.nyu.edu/docs/IO/1043/Morning2005KeywordsRacein.pdf>
- Morning, A. (2011). *The nature of race: How scientists think and teach about human difference*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Nakashima, C. L. (1992). An Invisible Monster: The Creation and Denial of Mixed-Race People in America. In M.P.P.R. Editor, *Racially Mixed People in America*. (162-179). Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage Publications.
- Office of Management and Budget (OMB). (1977). Standards for the Classification of Federal Data on Race and Ethnicity (Statistical Policy Directive No. 15). Washington, DC: Office of Management and Budget. Retrieved February 7, 2016, from [http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/fedreg/notice\\_15.html](http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/fedreg/notice_15.html)
- Office of Management and Budget (OMB). (2000). OMB Bulletin No. 00-02- Guidance on Aggregation and Allocation of Data on Race for Use in Civil Rights Monitoring and Enforcement. Washington, DC: Office of Management and Budget. Retrieved March 20, 2016, from [https://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/bulletins\\_b00-02/](https://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/bulletins_b00-02/)
- Omi, M., & Winant, H. (2014). *Racial formation in the United States* (3rd ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Orfield, G., Kucsera, J., & Siegel-Hawley, G. (2012). *E Pluribus...Separation: Deepening Double Segregation for More Students*. Los Angeles: The Civil Rights Project/Projecto

- Derechos Civiles. Retrieved from [https://www.civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/research/k-12-education/integration-and-diversity/mlk-national/e-pluribus...separation-deepening-double-segregation-for-more-students/orfield\\_epluribus\\_revised\\_omplete\\_2012.pdf](https://www.civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/research/k-12-education/integration-and-diversity/mlk-national/e-pluribus...separation-deepening-double-segregation-for-more-students/orfield_epluribus_revised_omplete_2012.pdf)
- Pew Research Center. (2015a). "Multiracial in America: Proud, Diverse and Growing in Numbers." Washington, D.C.: June.
- Pew Research Center. (2015b). "What Census Calls Us: A Historical Timeline", table. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center, Retrieved from [http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/files/2015/06/ST\\_15.06.11\\_MultiRacial-Timeline.pdf](http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/files/2015/06/ST_15.06.11_MultiRacial-Timeline.pdf)
- Prewitt, K. (2004). The census counts, the census classifies. In N. Foner & G. Fredrickson (Eds.), *Not just black and white: Historical and contemporary perspectives on immigration, race, and ethnicity in the United States* (145-166). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Prewitt, K. (2013). *What is your race? : The census and our flawed efforts to classify Americans*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Renn, K. A. & Lunceford, C.J. (2004). Because the Numbers Matter: Transforming Postsecondary Education Data on Student Race and Ethnicity to Meet the Challenges of a Changing Nation. *Educational Policy*, 18 (5), 752-783. doi: 10.1177/0895904804269941
- Renn, K.A. (2009). Educational Policy, Politics, and Mixed Heritage Students in the United States. *Journal of Social Issues*, 65 (1), 165-183.
- Rodriguez, C. (2000). *Changing race: Latinos, the census, and the history of ethnicity in the United States* (Critical America). New York: New York University Press.
- Suarez-Orozco, M. & Paez, M. (2008). *Latinos: Remaking America*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. (2011). 2010 Census Summary File 1 California.
- U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. (2011). 2010 Census Summary File 1 Florida.
- U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. (2011). 2010 Census Summary File 1 Texas.
- U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. (2016). *What we do*. Retrieved from <http://www.census.gov/about/what.html>
- U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. (2013). *About*. Retrieved from <https://www.census.gov/topics/population/race/about.html>

- U.S. Department of Education. (2007). Final Guidance on Maintaining, Collecting and Reporting Racial and Ethnic Data to the U.S. Department of Education. Federal Register, Vol. 72, No. 202. October 19, 2007. Retrieved November 14, 2015, from <https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2007-10-19/pdf/E7-20613.pdf>
- U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). (1996). *Racial and Ethnic Classifications Used by Public Schools* Statistical Analysis Report NCES 96-092. Retrieved online January 12, 2016 from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs/96092.pdf>
- U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). (1998). *State Survey on Racial and Ethnic Classifications*, Statistical Analysis Report NCES 98-034. Retrieved online November 16, 2015 from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs98/98034.pdf>.
- U.S. Office of Management and Budget. (1997). Revisions to the Standards for the Classification of Federal Data on Race and Ethnicity. Retrieved from [https://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/fedreg\\_1997standards](https://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/fedreg_1997standards)
- Wallman, K.K. (1998). Data on Race and Ethnicity: Revising the Federal Standards. *The American Statistician*, 52 (1), p. 31-33. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2685562>
- Williams, K.M. (2008) *Mark One of More: Civil Rights in Multiracial America*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- Yanow, D. (2003). *Constructing "race" and "ethnicity" in America: Category-making in public policy and administration*. Armonk, N.Y: M.E. Sharpe.

## VITA

Margarita Vizcarra was born and raised in the Spring Branch neighborhood of Houston, Texas. Following her graduation from Northbrook High School she attended Texas A&M University earning a degree in Political Science with a minor in History. She became interested in education policy during her two-year employment with the National College Advising Corps (NCAC), currently known as the College Advising Corps, within the community of Aldine High School. This employment experience along with her personal identity as a Chicana initiated her interests in the education experience of communities of color. She is passionate about creating programming with youth, focused on the Latino community and challenging systemic barriers keeping youth from a fulfilling educational experience.