

Who Gets to Belong in College?
An Empirical Review of How Institutions Can Assess and Expand
Opportunities for Belonging on Campus

Kathryn M. Kroeper
Department of Psychology
Sacred Heart University
Fairfield, CT, USA

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2701-5053>

Maithreyi Gopalan
Department of Education Studies
University of Oregon
Eugene, OR, USA

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1013-0672>

Katherine T. U. Emerson
Equity Accelerator
Indiana University
Bloomington, IN, USA

Gregory M. Walton
Department of Psychology
Stanford University
Stanford, CA, USA

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6194-0472>

Author Note

The corresponding authors are Kathryn M. Kroeper, Department of Psychology, Sacred Heart University, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2701-5053>, Email: kroeperk@sacredheart.edu, and Gregory M. Walton, Department of Psychology, Stanford University, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6194-0472>, Email: gwalton@stanford.edu.

Word Count: 14,776 (excluding figures and references)

Acknowledgments

This paper analyzes data originally collected by the College Transition Collaborative (principal investigators: C. Logel, M. C. Murphy, G. M. Walton, and D. S. Yeager). Special thanks to David Yeager and Raj Chetty for statistical and visualization consultation, and to Sam Erman for feedback on an earlier draft.

Statements and Declarations

None.

Author Contributions

K. M. K., G. M. W., and M. G. wrote the original draft of the paper. All authors revised and edited the paper. M. G. and K.T.U.E. analyzed data; K. M. K. and M. G. produced data visualizations and compiled supplementary materials.

Abstract

Over a dozen rigorous randomized-controlled trials show that recognizing worries about belonging in a new school as normal and as improving with time can help students stay engaged, build relationships, and succeed. Such “social-belonging” interventions can help students take advantage of opportunities available to them to develop their belonging in college—yet what is the institutional role? Drawing on past literature, and reporting novel data from the College Transition Collaborative’s massive trial of the social-belonging intervention ($N=15,143$ control-condition students in 374 “local-identity” groups across 22 representative colleges and universities; Walton et al., 2023), we explore who gets to belong in college and what institutional leaders can do to expand these opportunities. First, we find that opportunities for belonging (i.e., “belonging affordances”) vary widely, both across institutions and systematically across groups. Notably, Black, Asian, and first-generation college student groups are each less likely than other groups to have minimally adequate opportunities for belonging. Second, all institutions are serving some student groups well, but all can improve: none provide adequate belonging affordances for all groups. Third, four classes of institutional factors predict belonging affordances at the identity-group level: (1) greater in-group representation, (2) more inclusive cultures, (3) greater opportunities for strong relationships, and (4) greater opportunities for productive learning. We conclude by discussing how institutions can learn for whom they are creating opportunities for belonging and for whom they are not, and how institutions can expand opportunities for belonging for groups that are not yet well served.

Abstract Word Count: 245

Keywords: social belonging, belonging affordances, in-group representation, purpose, inclusive cultures, relationships, growth mindset cultures

Who Gets to Belong in College? An Empirical Review of How Institutions Can Assess and Expand Opportunities for Belonging on Campus

Imagine Jaylen and Jordan, two college students existing at the extremes of a belonging continuum.

Jaylen is confident she belongs. Nearly everywhere she looks on campus, she sees aspects of herself reflected. Many campus events and courses resonate with her experiences, values, and identity. She's made close friends, who give her joy and support her through challenges. She helps lead a student group she's passionate about. More than one faculty member shows interest in her and helps guide her growth. She's motivated by classes, supported when she faces challenges, and excited by where she's going. Altogether, Jaylen feels at home on campus and glad to be there.

Now consider Jordan. More often than not, Jordan does not feel she belongs. Time and again, she finds that campus events and courses don't speak to her lived experiences. In residences, sometimes it seems other students don't get her; or maybe they don't even want her there, possibly because of aspects of her identity. She has few real friends on campus. She often feels isolated and alone. At best, she's on the periphery of a student group. In classes sometimes she feels judged when she doesn't understand the material immediately, as if professors just want to work with whomever already gets it. When she has tried to reach out, faculty and administrators haven't been very responsive. As a result, Jordan doesn't really have a direction or purpose. Frankly, she often feels like a visitor on campus—and an unwelcome one.¹

¹ Of course, the reality of belonging is more complex than the Jaylen and Jordan examples suggest. Belonging is not a binary, all-or-nothing experience, nor is it static. Students' sense of belonging at college shifts across different *spaces* and *over time*, shaped by their identities, interactions, and—as this paper highlights—institutional factors. Across space, students may feel a sense of belonging in one setting while questioning it in another; even students who feel largely isolated may still experience connection in specific relationships or counterspaces (Covarrubias, 2024). Across time, some students start college unsure of their place but grow more connected through affirming experiences; others may find their experience of belonging erode through repeated adversity (Walton & Cohen, 2011). We use Jaylen's and Jordan's experiences to represent two ends of a continuum by which institutional factors may shape students' opportunities to belong.

Why does a student, like Jaylen, develop a strong sense of belonging on campus, while another, like Jordan, does not? And what can *institutions* do so more students have Jaylen's experience, and not Jordan's?

Belonging is a Relationship: Both Students and Institutions Share Agency

We understand belonging as a relationship between a person and a context (Walton & Brady, 2017).² Applied to college, "belonging" reflects a student's overall sense of how well they fit in, or *could* fit in, at their institution, including whether they feel they are, or *will be*, respected and valued and supported in their growth and contributions. From this perspective, both the student *and* the institution have agency in building a better relationship (Hurtado et al., 1998, 2012; Walton et al., 2023). Yet they play different roles.

The student's primary role is to navigate the college environment. This involves persevering through the inevitable challenges and setbacks of joining a new community, building friendships, seeking out and establishing mentor relationships, choosing relevant courses, working hard to learn, and developing a professional direction. Much past research in psychology has emphasized students' agency in building their belonging, barriers that can prevent students from executing this agency, and how to overcome these barriers (Kroeper & Murphy, 2017). For instance, many students experience uncertainty about their belonging in college, particularly in settings in which their racial-ethnic, social class, or gender group has historically been excluded or faces negative stereotypes (Walton & Cohen, 2007). An exclusionary history and context can evoke a pervasive worry about whether "people like me" can belong in college. Then, even everyday challenges, like exclusion from a party or a brusque comment from an instructor, can

² In centering the relationship between a person and a context (Walton & Brady, 2017), our definition goes beyond approaches that emphasize "school connectedness" or that define belonging in terms of relationships, such as "being liked, respected, and valued by fellow students and by the teacher" (Goodenow, 1993).

1
2
3
4 seem to confirm the global fear that “people like me” do not belong here (Murphy et al., 2020;
5
6
7 Walton, Logel, et al., 2015; Walton & Cohen, 2007, 2011). That inference, in turn, can cause
8
9
10 students to disengage from others on campus, and then fail to develop the relationships with peers
11
12 and faculty members that all students need to succeed (Brady et al., 2020; Walton, Logel, et al.,
13
14 2015; Yeager et al., 2016). In this way, worries about belonging can become self-confirming.

15
16 Causal evidence for this process comes from randomized intervention field-experiments
17
18 testing the “social-belonging intervention.” This brief reading-and-writing exercise offers students
19
20 the idea that worries about belonging are normal in the transition to college and can improve with
21
22 time (Walton & Brady, 2020). In many settings, this can help students sustain a sense of belonging
23
24 in the face of everyday challenges, stay engaged and build stronger relationships, and succeed at
25
26 higher rates, with the greatest benefits for students from underserved racial-ethnic and social-class
27
28 backgrounds, who face acute social-identity based reasons to question their belonging in
29
30 mainstream institutions.

31
32
33
34
35
36 But belonging is not the sole responsibility of the student. Institutions also have agency to
37
38 create the conditions in which all students *can* belong (Datnow et al., 2002; Destin, 2020; Gray et
39
40 al., 2018; Hurtado et al., 1998, 2012; Strayhorn, 2023; Walton & Wilson, 2018; Walton & Yeager,
41
42 2020). What is their role?

43
44
45
46 By way of analogy, consider a dinner party in which a host (institution) invites guests
47
48 (students). The guests have an important role. They can choose to come, navigate the space, decide
49
50 with whom to interact and what conversations or activities to engage in. But, in general, guests act
51
52 within the parameters set by the host. It’s the host who decides whom to invite to the party (admit
53
54 to the institution). It’s the host who structures the evening and defines its progression—deciding
55
56 whether to play a silly party game or open up the pool; to listen to one kind of music or another,
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 or to break out the karaoke machine; to drink a high-end wine or share Jell-O shots; to eat burgers
5
6 or Coq au Vin. The host thus has disproportionate influence over the environment and overall
7
8 experience of the party, how people interact and whom and what the space is for. When a guest
9
10 feels out of place—perhaps they don't know anyone, the music is unfamiliar, or the food isn't what
11
12 they're used to—a thoughtful host can notice and make adjustments, offering a warm welcome,
13
14 introducing them to other like-minded guests, inviting them to suggest music they like, or offering
15
16 a dish that feels more familiar, improving their experience. In such a case, a guest who was initially
17
18 uncomfortable might stick it out, grow more at ease, and even help shape the party atmosphere—
19
20 perhaps introducing a party game the host hadn't planned. In doing so, the guest not only makes
21
22 the party more enjoyable for themselves but may also help create a more welcoming environment for
23
24 others who might otherwise have remained on the fringes. However, when the host fails to notice—
25
26 or worse, actively ignores—a guest's discomfort, expecting them to simply fall in line with the
27
28 scheduled program, that guest's unease may deepen, making it more likely that they will disengage
29
30 from the party or leave it altogether.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 Likewise, institutional leaders have differential power to shape the norms, values, policies,
39
40 and practices that structure students' experiences. In particular, they have the power to steer the
41
42 collective ethos toward, or away from, an inclusive one for students from diverse backgrounds.
43
44 For instance, institutions may admit a diverse student body—or just token numbers of students
45
46 from underrepresented groups. They may offer classes and coursework and support activities that
47
48 resonate with diverse students, problems they care about, and who they aspire to become—or they
49
50 might expect students to conform to a cultural default (Cheryan & Markus, 2020). In a
51
52 sociocultural and historical context in which racial-ethnic and social-class exclusion and negative
53
54 stereotypes have been endemic in education (Bonilla-Silva & Peoples, 2022; Ornstein, 2019;
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Stephens, Markus, et al., 2012), institutions can actively challenge negative stereotypes and embody norms of group-based respect—or they can allow stereotypes and biases to fester. They may create spaces that make it easier for students to meet and develop friendships, or easier to interact with faculty who can become mentors—or they may make this harder. They may promulgate values of learning and becoming, even when a student doesn't get it at first or has not had particular prior opportunities—or they may create a culture that values identifying the “smart” students while excluding the rest. People within the college, from peers to faculty, can be proactive *and* responsive to students from diverse backgrounds, open and eager to develop strong relationships with them, and supportive of their growth and discovery—or disengaged, overwhelmed by other responsibilities, or biased in their responses.

Like dinner party hosts, institutions hold particular power over the campus climate. When students encounter institutions that are not designed for them, do not listen to them, and are unresponsive to their needs, some may resist, leveraging their frustration for deeper engagement and activism (Bettencourt, 2021; Covarrubias et al., 2022; Santa-Ramirez, 2022). Others may decide it's not worth it and leave (Brown & Rodríguez, 2009; Loo & Rolison, 1986; Tinto, 1988; Van Gilder et al., 2024).

Belonging Inequities in College

We take it as a given that higher education institutions have a responsibility to serve all students equitably. However, higher education institutions were not in general built to serve the diversity of modern students. They were designed by and for a narrow slice of the population, primarily White students from middle and upper class backgrounds (Bonilla-Silva & Peoples, 2022; Hurtado et al., 1999; Ornstein, 2019). It is unsurprising, then, that there are inequalities in students' sense of belonging in college along racial-ethnic and social class lines (Brannon, 2023;

Gopalan & Brady, 2019; Langhout et al., 2009; Ostrove & Long, 2007; Stephens, Fryberg, et al., 2012; Walton & Cohen, 2007). In turn, many higher education institutions have struggled with pervasive low completion rates, particularly among students from historically underserved backgrounds (Ellsworth et al., 2022; Hausmann et al., 2007). Yet we also believe that colleges and universities have the power to remake campus norms, values, policies, and practices to be more responsive to and fitting for modern students (Destin, 2020; Gray et al., 2018; Hurtado et al., 1998, 2012). It is by understanding the barriers to belonging that diverse student identity groups face that institutions can make the changes that will create a welcoming and inclusive environment for every student.

Overview

In this empirical review, we ask two primary questions:

1. How do opportunities for belonging vary *across* and *within* (a) higher education institutions and (b) racial-ethnic and social-class groups?
2. What predicts students' opportunities for belonging, and what can institutions learn from these predictors to create more equitable belonging opportunities?

To answer these questions, we first review multiple streams of past research to identify specific contextual barriers to belonging for college students.

We then empirically explore these barriers using robust data from control-condition students in a multi-site randomized controlled trial of the social-belonging intervention conducted by the College Transition Collaborative (CTC). In so doing, we clarify challenges to belonging for diverse student identity groups, which contribute to institutional inequality in a sample that generalizes to 749 4-year post-secondary institutions in the United States. These results draw on but go beyond past research, which has tended to examine variability in opportunities for belonging

in small samples, and/or in one institution at a time, or that has examined specific predictors of belonging opportunities in isolation from other factors. For instance, past research has theorized and, in some cases, shown that students of color and students from first-generation backgrounds are afforded fewer opportunities to belong than students from other backgrounds (Destin, 2020; Gray et al., 2018; Hurtado et al., 1998, 2012). Yet typically such research has examined only one or a few institutional contexts, even as there is certainly variability across contexts. In general, past research has not provided the research designs or statistical models necessary to quantify variability within identity groups across contexts or over time (Fong et al., 2024; Gelman, 2015; Kaplan, 2023; Kaplan et al., 2020; though see: Graham et al., 2022 for examples in K-12 settings). Even when institutional contexts are considered, they are often discussed in broad, simplified terms (e.g., “Does the institution meet an enrollment threshold to qualify as an HSI?”; Covarrubias et al., 2023), or examine only a single contextual factor (e.g., in-group representation; Walton, Logel, et al., 2015). Here we report results (a) that generalize to a large portion of the post-secondary landscape in the United States; (b) that integrate and test the role of multiple aspects of institutional contexts and diverse student identities in predicting variability in belonging opportunities; and (c) that examine the role of these multiple potential predictors of belonging opportunities simultaneously.

Finally, we discuss what institutions can do to help ensure every student they serve, especially those students in groups that have been historically excluded, can come to feel they belong on campus.

I. A Review of Four Classes of Institutional Barriers to Belonging in Higher Education

Belonging is both a core human need (Baumeister & Leary, 1995) and widely considered a linchpin for success in college (Strayhorn, 2018; Walton & Brady, 2017). When students are

supported in their belonging, they find greater intrinsic value in their studies (Carr & Walton, 2014; Freeman et al., 2007; Gopalan & Brady, 2019; Walton et al., 2012). In turn, they demonstrate greater motivation and engagement (Gillen-O’Neel, 2021; Walton & Cohen, 2007), which contributes to higher achievement (Carini et al., 2006; Deci et al., 1991; Murphy & Zirkel, 2015; Shook & Clay, 2012; Walton & Cohen, 2011), better health and well-being (Gopalan & Brady, 2019; Walton & Cohen, 2011), greater persistence and retention (Berger & Milem, 1999; Gopalan & Brady, 2019; Hausmann et al., 2007), and, ultimately, improved life satisfaction and career success (Brady et al., 2020). Because students from historically underserved racial-ethnic and social-class backgrounds in higher education face the most pervasive questions about their belonging, efforts to support belonging, including race-neutral efforts, can have the greatest benefits for these student groups (Brady et al., 2020; Erman & Walton, 2014; Gillen-O’Neel, 2021; Murphy & Zirkel, 2015; Walton & Cohen, 2011).

In this section, we review four classes of institutional factors that expand (or constrain) opportunities to belong in college: (1) in-group representation; (2) inclusive (vs. exclusive) campus cultures; (3) opportunities to develop strong relationships, and (4) opportunities for productive learning (see Table 1). We identified these factors relying on past research, anticipating that they may contribute to racial-ethnic and social-class inequality in opportunities for belonging as well as to variability across contexts.³ While these factors overlap, and can become mutually reinforcing in a student’s experience, it is useful to distinguish them both because research has examined their

³ This empirical review uses data from the College Transition Collaborative’s massive trial of the social-belonging intervention (Walton et al., 2023). During study planning, our large team of experts on belonging, which was led by social psychologists but also included researchers with training in economics, statistics, policy, and higher education, deliberated on which measures to include in the survey, which ultimately gave rise to the four classes of institutional factors discussed here. This discussion was grounded in our collective understanding of the belonging literature at that point in time, with particular attention to theories and research that provide causal evidence of factors that affect belonging. We conceptualize these factors as important influences on belonging but not as encompassing all such influences.

influence as distinct factors and because they point to different steps institutions can take to improve campus climates. Although not our emphasis here, we also presume that the relationship between belonging and these factors is often reciprocal and recursive.

In the subsequent section, we report new analyses from the College Transition Collaborative trial that operationalize these factors and quantify their predictive relationship with the opportunities to belong experienced by different student identity groups. In doing so, we provide an unparalleled map of the landscape of belonging affordances in US higher education.

Finally, we conclude by reviewing *how* institutions can make changes to improve their campus climate to be more inclusive, focusing on the factors identified here.

Factor 1: In-Group Representation

The underrepresentation of students of color and those from less affluent backgrounds on college campuses creates challenges to belonging for students in these groups for several reasons.

First, the mere fact of underrepresentation can make a person's identity more salient, both for themselves and for those around them (Graham et al., 2022; Kanter, 1977; Kardosh et al., 2022; Lord & Saenz, 1985; Taylor et al., 1978). For instance, when a student's race-ethnicity is underrepresented in a classroom (e.g., one Black student in a predominantly White class) they are more likely to reference their race-ethnicity (McGuire et al., 1978). This heightened salience can prompt worries about being tokenized or stereotyped by others (Cohen & Swim, 1995; Davis et al., 2004; Keller & Sekaquaptewa, 2008; Lewis & Shah, 2021; Mallett et al., 2011; Purdie-Vaughns et al., 2008; Robinson, 2013; Steele et al., 2002), which can erode feelings of belonging (Krusemark, 2012).

Second, underrepresentation acts as a cue. Students who survey their college environment and see few people from their group there may wonder why their group is poorly represented.

1
2
3
4 Particularly when underrepresentation is paired with a history of negative stereotypes that allege
5 that one's group is less capable than others or less deserving of educational opportunities, students
6
7 may suspect that their group is underrepresented because it isn't welcome—that it doesn't *belong*
8
9 there (Davis et al., 2004; Kumar et al., 2019; Murphy & Zirkel, 2015).
10
11
12
13

14 Third, the reality of underrepresentation means that there are fewer opportunities to connect
15
16 with members of one's own group on campus. This makes it more difficult to form in-group
17
18 friendships, to join in-group networks, or to find and engage in cultural events that celebrate one's
19
20 racial-ethnic or social class identity (Brannon & Lin, 2021; Rolón-Dow et al., 2022). It may also
21
22 mean that culturally relevant coursework, affinity groups, and campus events are less common
23
24 (Rolón-Dow et al., 2022), and it may restrict opportunities to effectively advocate for these
25
26 resources or address other group-specific concerns (Astin & Bayer, 1971).
27
28
29
30

31 Revealing the importance of ingroup representation, Murphy and colleagues (2007)
32
33 showed advanced math, science, and engineering college students a promotional video for a STEM
34
35 leadership conference. Half saw a video in which men outnumbered women three to one; half saw
36
37 a gender-balanced video. Women who saw the gender-imbalanced video (vs. the gender-balanced
38
39 video) not only anticipated a diminished sense of belonging and expressed less interest in attending
40
41 the conference. They also showed heightened cognitive and physiological vigilance, including
42
43 greater memory for trivial aspects of the video and increased heart rate and sweating. In a context
44
45 in which women face negative stereotypes (see Thébaud & Charles, 2018), the gender-imbalanced
46
47 video triggered a psychological threat.
48
49
50
51
52

53 The harms associated with low in-group representation, evident in controlled experiments,
54
55 also emerge in real-world academic environments. One field study of women in engineering found
56
57 that, in male-dominated majors (<20% women, averaging 10% women), women underperformed
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

relative to men and reported lower levels of belonging and worse social and psychological experiences on an array of measures; by contrast, no gender disparities emerged at the same institution in more gender-balanced majors (>20% women, averaging 33% women; Walton, Logel, et al., 2015). Similarly, increased representation of racial-ethnic minority and first-generation students in STEM courses has been linked to higher grades for all college students, but especially for students within these minoritized groups (Bowman et al., 2023).

In another study, Black engineering students at Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs), as compared to peers attending Predominantly White Institutions (PWIs), experienced a greater sense of institutional belonging (Kumar et al., 2019). Many students, in their qualitative responses, pointed to the significance of being among “people like me.” Although PWIs will not typically become minority-serving institutions, this research suggests that increasing the representation of students from historically underrepresented racial-ethnic and social class backgrounds on campus is one way to expand opportunities for belonging for students from these groups.

Factor 2: Inclusive (vs. Exclusive) Campus Cultures

While an adequate presence of students of color and those from less affluent backgrounds is important, representation alone does not ensure that students experience a sense of belonging on campus (Covarrubias et al., 2023; Garces & Jayakumar, 2014; Hurtado et al., 1998, 2012; Hurtado & Ruiz Alvarado, 2015; Muragishi et al., 2023; Sanchez, 2019). It is also important that students experience the overall campus culture as inclusive rather than exclusive (Hurtado & Carter, 1997; Slaten et al., 2014). What differentiates an inclusive campus culture from an exclusive one?

Sincere Commitments to Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion. First, how an institution approaches diversity, equity, and inclusion shapes whether students from groups that could be

1
2
3
4 excluded feel welcome and valued on campus (Hurtado et al., 2012; Lewis & Shah, 2021). When
5
6 students from marginalized racial-ethnic and social class backgrounds perceive inadequacy or
7
8 insincerity in their college's commitment to these values (Lewis & Shah, 2021; Rolón-Dow et al.,
9
10 2022; Wilton et al., 2020) and/or when these students perceive their institution as unresponsive to
11
12 their values, goals, and concerns (Brannon et al., 2015; Browman & Destin, 2016; Stephens,
13
14 Townsend, et al., 2012; Valandra et al., 2022), it can negatively impact their sense of belonging
15
16 within the institution. To illustrate, consider how in the wake of the George Floyd murder, many
17
18 universities issued statements condemning racism and expressing solidarity with the Black
19
20 community. Although the intent behind these solidarity statements was likely positive, Valandra
21
22 et al. (2022) point out that many such statements were seen as insincere ('empty platitudes').
23
24 Experiments revealed that when solidarity statements lacked specific mention of concrete actions
25
26 that institutions would take to address racial inequities, they were more often seen as performative
27
28 which, in turn, tended to undercut Black Americans' sense of belonging in these institutions
29
30 (Derricks et al., 2023). An inclusive campus, therefore, is sincere in its promotion of diversity,
31
32 equity, and inclusion, and holds itself accountable when it falls short. Institutions, however, may
33
34 vary in how effectively they promote and uphold values of inclusion in general and/or with regard
35
36 to different student groups.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45
46 ***Reduced Social Identity Threats.*** Second, when people enter a space in which their group
47
48 has been devalued, mistreated, or marginalized, they may experience identity threat: a pervasive
49
50 concern and vigilance to the prospect of group-based devaluation, exclusion, or disrespect
51
52 (Murphy & Taylor, 2012; Steele et al., 2002), which can diminish their feelings of belonging
53
54 (Cohen & Garcia, 2008; Walton & Cohen, 2007).
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 Identity threat arises from cues, both overt and subtle, that signal to certain groups that they
5
6 are less valued than others in a setting, or are at risk of devaluation (Steele et al., 2002; Walton,
7
8 Murphy, et al., 2015). One such cue we've already discussed is insufficient in-group representation
9
10 (Murphy et al., 2007; Purdie-Vaughns et al., 2008), but there are many others (Cheryan & Markus,
11
12 2020; Murphy et al., 2018; Murphy & Taylor, 2012). For example, practices that emphasize
13
14 independence and competition over interdependence and collaboration can imply to students from
15
16 more interdependent communities, like first-generation college students, that they do not fit
17
18 (Canning et al., 2020; Diekman et al., 2010; Fryberg & Markus, 2007). Additionally, curricular
19
20 exclusion—where the contributions and histories of people of color and people from working class
21
22 backgrounds are omitted in favor of an emphasis on the wealthy and White—can signal to students
23
24 from these excluded racial-ethnic and social class groups that their identities and histories are not
25
26 valued (e.g., Van Gilder et al., 2024). Physical cues on campus—such as which groups are
27
28 represented in campus cultural centers, and the presence (or absence) of gender-affirming
29
30 restrooms and private lactation rooms—can also signal who is typical and valued (Krusemark,
31
32 2012). Similarly, the tradition of honoring founders (typically White men) or donors (wealthy)
33
34 with statues or building names can signal who is valued on campus—wealthy White people—and
35
36 who isn't—everyone else (Alderman & Rose-Redwood, 2020; Inwood & Martin, 2008; Johnson
37
38 et al., 2022; Trawalter et al., 2021).

39
40
41 As an empirical demonstration of the role of physical cues, Cheryan and colleagues (2009)
42
43 filled a computer science classroom with stereotypically masculine items, like Star Trek posters
44
45 and video game paraphernalia. This signaled a geeky masculine representation of computer
46
47 science, which undermined women's sense of belonging and interest in the field relative to men.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

But when the room featured gender-neutral objects instead, such as nature posters and water bottles, if anything women expressed *more* interest in computer science than men.

So, an inclusive campus seeks to identify and eliminate identity threatening cues. Yet, institutions may vary in how well they recognize these threats and mitigate their impacts.

Reduced Bias and Discrimination. Third, both bias and the failure to acknowledge and address bias hinder students' experience of belonging (Hurtado & Ruiz Alvarado, 2015; Hussain & Jones, 2021; Levin et al., 2006; Slaten et al., 2016), as well as elevate identity threat (Logel et al., 2009), undermine emotional, cognitive, and physical health (Clark et al., 1999; Green et al., 2024; Keels et al., 2017; Murphy et al., 2013; Paradies et al., 2015), and ultimately reduce the likelihood students can form the kinds of relationships they need to thrive (Milkman et al., 2015).

Bias manifests in many forms, from subtle microaggressions (Ellis et al., 2019; Keels et al., 2017; Lewis et al., 2021; Morales, 2014; Solórzano et al., 2000; Van Gilder et al., 2024) to overt discrimination (Bonilla-Silva & Peoples, 2022; Davis et al., 2004; Jenkins et al., 2021; Smith et al., 2016; Valandra et al., 2022). All can erode feelings of belonging (Lewis & Shah, 2021; Tachine et al., 2017). As one example, an audit study by Milkman et al. (2015) of more than 6,500 professors in the United States revealed that faculty on average were more responsive to requests for informal mentorship from students with names suggesting a White male identity than all other student groups (see also Moss-Racusin et al., 2012; Zhao & Biernat, 2017). These results imply that it is not just the awareness of bias that can undermine students' experience and belonging. A direct consequence of bias is to constrain opportunities for students to form relationships that will support their learning and growth.

So, an inclusive campus proactively seeks to prevent bias and discrimination, and when discrimination does occur, actively confronts and addresses it. Yet, institutions may vary in

whether they acknowledge bias and discrimination, and if they do, in how they attempt to prevent or address it (and for whom).

Factor 3: Opportunities to Develop Strong Relationships, or Lack Thereof

The degree to which a university does, or does not, create opportunities for students to develop strong relationships on campus can influence students' sense of belonging (Slaten et al., 2014, 2016). Close personal relationships serve many functions related to belonging for college students, and many kinds of relationships play important roles.

Opportunities to Develop Peer Relationships. Close peer friendships can help students navigate and handle many of the challenges that come up in college, as well as support psychological well-being (Bolger et al., 2000; Fisher et al., 2019; Hausmann et al., 2007; Hoffman et al., 2002; Locks et al., 2008; Rubin et al., 2016). For instance, friendships support academic motivation. One laboratory study found a social connection as minimal as a shared birthday with a math major led undergraduates to express greater motivation in math and to persist 65% longer on an insoluble math puzzle (Walton et al., 2012), an effect that was mediated by greater feelings of belonging in math. Similarly, peer collaboration can be a powerful source of intrinsic motivation: Simply being treated as a partner on a task, rather than as working separately, can lead students to enjoy challenges more, to persist longer, and to choose to pursue more challenges in the future (Carr & Walton, 2014).

For students from underrepresented groups, it is helpful, in addition, to distinguish *intragroup friendships* (with other members of one's group) and *intergroup friendships* (with a broader community, such as with students in a majority group on campus). Both serve important functions and can face particular barriers.

Intragroup friendships can create a sense of community with one's in-group on campus; provide opportunities to see in-group members who have succeeded in the institution, who may constitute effective role models and peer-mentors; provide opportunities to deepen an appreciation for one's in-group identity; support the perception that the institution, which hosts these relationships, values one's identity; and provide opportunities for collective advocacy (Brannon & Lin, 2021; Carter et al., 2019; Dennehy & Dasgupta, 2017; Lockwood & Kunda, 1997; Thelamour et al., 2019). Yet opportunities to develop and maintain intragroup friendships on campus can vary, both as a function of the representation of a student's group on campus and institutional support for the student's identity group, through community centers, affinity groups, ethnic-themed cultural groups, and classes (Bonilla-Silva & Peoples, 2022; Stellino, 2020).

Strong intergroup friendships are also valuable. For students from underrepresented groups, these friendships can seem to represent the institution and belonging in it as a whole; provide opportunities to understand challenges in college from a broader perspective; and, like intragroup friendships, buffer against the negative mental health effects of discrimination (Akcinar et al., 2011; Benner & Wang, 2017; Carey et al., 2022; Mendoza-Denton & Page-Gould, 2008; Muragishi et al., 2023; Shook & Clay, 2012; Walton, Logel, et al., 2015). Intergroup friendships also serve important roles for majority-group students, including to broaden their perspectives and reduce intergroup prejudice (Brannon & Walton, 2013; Shook & Fazio, 2008). Several past trials of the social-belonging intervention find a strengthening of students' close friendships on campus in parallel to improvements in students' academic trajectory, including both closer friendships in general for students from underrepresented groups (Yeager, Walton, et al., 2016) and more cross-group friends, in particular (Walton, Logel, et al., 2015). Yet institutional contexts vary in the availability of these friendships, potentially even *within* institutions across different student

identity groups. One source of this variance involves basic features of the college environment, which shape the opportunities all students have to interact with each other, including the availability of on-campus housing and residential programming; the presence of small or collaborative or project-based classes; and space and support for student groups in general. Other factors include default normative patterns of interaction among peers and in classes. Such patterns can functionally include or exclude students from minoritized backgrounds, including in student work groups (Binning et al., 2024; Dasgupta et al., 2015; Muragishi et al., 2023). Additionally, even as similarities are, in general, a basis of friendships (Pettigrew, 1998; Walton et al., 2012), it is also important for students from different groups to be able to recognize and value differences (Sanchez et al., 2022). Yet college environments may vary in the extent to which they support cross-group friends in recognizing and valuing both similarities and differences, which may contribute to instability in these friendships (Carey et al., 2022; Plummer et al., 2016; Rude & Herda, 2010; Shelton et al., 2023; Shook & Fazio, 2008; Trail et al., 2009).

Opportunities to Develop Strong Mentor Relationships. In addition to peer friendships, mentor relationships with faculty and other instructors play many roles for students (Campbell & Campbell, 1997, 2007; Freeman et al., 2007; Hallinan, 2008; Kraft et al., 2023; Miller et al., 2019; Palmer & Gasman, 2008; Whitten et al., 2020). Instructors not only help students plan their courses, link them to campus support services, and provide high-quality learning experiences (Chang et al., 2014; Chhuon & Wallace, 2014; Deil-Amen & Rosenbaum, 2003). They also communicate to students that they are seen, valued, cared for, and believed in. In the best circumstances, mentors share with mentees a vision of the good and capable person they can become, even when they are struggling or not there yet (Chhuon & Wallace, 2014; Drake, 2011; Hoffman et al., 2002). Indeed, one of the strongest predictors of students' sense of belonging in

school is perceived support from teachers (Allen et al., 2018). Experimental and longitudinal evidence finds that specific approaches to affirm or restore trust and strengthen relationships with mentors can have powerful lasting benefits for students' experience in both secondary and post-secondary school (Carrell & Kurlaender, 2023; Dennehy & Dasgupta, 2017; Gehlbach et al., 2016; Walton et al., 2021; Wu et al., 2022; Yeager, Purdie-Vaughns, et al., 2014).

However, opportunities to develop and maintain mentor relationships varies (Limeri et al., 2019), including along racial-ethnic and social class lines (e.g., Van Gilder et al., 2024). As mentioned above, audit studies show that college faculty can be less responsive to outreach from students from historically marginalized groups (Milkman et al., 2015; Moss-Racusin et al., 2012; Zhao & Biernat, 2017). And beyond initial engagement, mentor-mentee relationships that bridge social identity divides can also involve some of the same tensions that arise in other cross-group interactions, including concerns about negative and stereotypical judgment, which can give rise to mistrust (Cohen et al., 1999; Cohen & Steele, 2002). Just as the social-belonging intervention has improved students' development of close friendships in college, so it has improved students' development of mentor relationships, particularly among students of color and first-generation students including at the end of the first year (Yeager et al., 2016, Table S21) and in retrospective reports after college (Brady et al., 2020). In the latter case, this gain in mentorship statistically mediated large treatment-caused improvements in Black graduates' life satisfaction and career satisfaction and success in young adulthood. Yet if such mentor relationships are unavailable, gains that hinge on them will go unrealized.

Factor 4: Productive Learning Opportunities, or Lack Thereof

College is centered on the goals of learning: on identifying and developing a purpose, specific skills, and values that can guide a student into adult life and help them become the person

they aspire to be. So, when a student doubts their belonging in college, they are not merely questioning their social place. They are wrestling with their opportunity to pursue this transformative journey. Thus, another factor that influences students' opportunity to belong is whether the post-secondary institution gives students opportunities to learn and develop in ways that are meaningful to them (Slaten et al., 2014, 2016). Such opportunities serve as pathways for students to engage substantively with academic and non-academic pursuits on campus, fostering a deeper sense of connectedness.

Pathways to Purpose. The reason people pursue post-secondary education, sometimes moving far from home, sacrificing other opportunities, or going into debt, is because they believe a college education will help them become the kind of person they would like to be and to do the kinds of things they would like to do in their lives. That might mean gaining skills that could help them pursue an interesting or important profession; being financially secure and able to support a family; joining new and diverse communities that enrich their lives; and/or developing ways to give back or make a difference in a problem or to a community they care about.

Colleges and universities can support students' growth in identifying and developing this sense of purpose and forging a path to achieving it, including through course offerings, programs, student groups, and structured approaches that help students reflect on their purposes in classwork and college (Diekman et al., 2024; Hulleman & Harackiewicz, 2020; O'Keefe et al., 2018, 2023). Yet success in doing so may vary across institutions and student groups. In turn, if a student finds their college environment is not helping them develop and pursue long-term goals they value, they may experience a lack of belonging on campus (Lewis et al., 2019).

Growth (vs. Fixed) Mindsets Cultures. Campus cultures, and their many subcultures (e.g., colleges, departments, and classrooms), also vary considerably in the beliefs they express and

1
2
3
4 imply about the nature of intelligence, known as *institutional mindsets* (Murphy et al., 2021, 2025).
5
6 Some spaces exhibit more of a *fixed mindset culture*, where the prevailing values and norms hold
7
8 that intelligence is a static, innate trait. This mindset emphasizes so-called natural talent and
9
10 interprets failure as a sign of inherent inability. Policies and practices in these places prioritize
11
12 recruiting and retaining only the “best and brightest,” as in “weed-out classes,” overlooking the
13
14 potential for growth and development in a broader population. Other spaces, however, exhibit
15
16 more of a *growth mindset culture*, where the prevailing values and norms hold that intelligence
17
18 can be nurtured through persistence, strategic effort, and support-seeking. Accordingly, policies
19
20 and practices are tailored to nurture the potential in *all* students, not just those who excel initially.
21
22 These environments value progress and resilience, and encourage learning from setbacks.
23
24
25
26
27

28
29 Research consistently shows that fixed mindset cultures, compared to growth mindset
30
31 cultures, are linked to a reduced sense of belonging, often negatively impacting engagement and
32
33 performance (Good et al., 2012; Hecht, Dweck, et al., 2023; Kroeper et al., 2025; LaCosse et al.,
34
35 2021; Muenks et al., 2020, in press; Rattan et al., 2018). Fixed mindset cultures particularly harm
36
37 students from marginalized racial-ethnic, social class, and gender backgrounds (Canning et al.,
38
39 2019, 2022; Emerson & Murphy, 2015; Good et al., 2012; LaCosse et al., 2021; Rattan et al.,
40
41 2018). One longitudinal field study found that even as all students performed worse in STEM
42
43 classes taught by professors who endorsed a fixed (rather than growth) mindset, this harm was
44
45 greatest for racially minoritized students (Canning et al., 2019).
46
47
48
49

50
51 The differential effects of fixed mindset cultures can be understood through a social
52
53 identity threat lens (Emerson & Murphy, 2014; Walton, Murphy, et al., 2015). Fixed mindset
54
55 cultures imply that certain people are naturally smart while others are not. Students from
56
57 historically marginalized communities, who contend with stereotypes that allege that they are less
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

capable than others, are therefore particularly likely to be perceived—and to fear that they will be perceived—as lacking in ability (Canning et al., 2022; Emerson & Murphy, 2015; Rattan et al., 2018). Testing this identity threat process, Canning et al. (2022) had students evaluate a calculus syllabus that either reflected a fixed mindset (e.g., “Students that struggled in Calculus I will not be able to keep up”) or a growth mindset (e.g., “If you have not mastered concepts yet, see me or a TA for resources”). Women in the fixed mindset condition experienced greater concerns about stereotyping and a reduced sense of belonging, which contributed to lower test performance—a pattern not shown by men.

Current research advocates for educational environments to cultivate growth mindset cultures (Hecht, Bryan, et al., 2023; Kroeper, Fried, et al., 2022; Muenks et al., 2024), as these cultures are more inclusive, equitable, and effective in nurturing a sense of belonging. Yet, institutions may vary in how successfully they implement and sustain them.

II. An Empirical Examination

So far, we have reviewed past literature examining four classes of institutional factors that restrict or expand opportunities for belonging in college: (1) in-group representation, (2) inclusive cultures, (3) opportunities for strong relationships, and (4) opportunities for productive learning. All these factors may vary, both by student identity groups and institutional contexts. Traditionally, these factors have been studied in isolation—fragmented and scattered across many often small-scale studies. The CTC trial allows us to examine the predictive role of these factors simultaneously, in one large, diverse, and representative sample. In doing so, we can begin to build an integrated understanding of the variability in students’ opportunity to belong in post-secondary institutions in the United States and predictors of this variability.

In this section, we will examine variation in opportunities to belong, *across* and *within* the 22 institutions involved in the CTC trial. To do so, we examine variability across the 374 “local-identity groups” (LIGs) in this trial. Then, we operationalize the four factors outlined above, and quantify their predictive relationship with variability in the opportunities to belong experienced by different student groups. Finally, we conclude by discussing how institutions can broaden opportunities for belonging, especially for student groups not yet well-served, by focusing on these four classes of factors.

Data and Background

In the 2015-2016 (Cohort 1) and 2016-2017 (Cohort 2) academic years, the CTC carried out a multi-site randomized controlled trial (RCT) of the social-belonging intervention in partnership with 22 diverse post-secondary institutions. A total of 26,911 college students formed the analytic sample for primary experimental tests (Walton et al., 2023). The participating institutions vary in size, geography, and selectivity, and include broad-access public universities, public flagship universities, liberal arts colleges, and selective private universities (for details, see Table S1). Generalizability analyses show that this sample reasonably represents 749 4-year colleges and universities in the United States, which collectively welcome more than a million students to college every year (Walton et al., 2023).

During the summer before beginning college, students recruited for the CTC trial were randomized to complete belonging or active control materials through online modules offered by their matriculating institution. Then, toward the end of their first year at college, these same students were invited to participate in a spring term survey,⁴ which asked about their experiences

⁴ The spring survey was administered via Qualtrics and took no more than 15 minutes, including open-ended responses. At most schools, all students were invited to participate; however, at schools with very large student populations, a random subsample was invited, with an oversampling of underrepresented racial/ethnic minority students to ensure adequate sample sizes across groups.

of belonging and perceptions of the campus environment, among other questions not central to the focus of this paper.

A primary focus of the CTC trial was to examine heterogeneity in intervention effectiveness, particularly as a function of belonging affordances (Walton et al., 2023; for other studies using CTC data, see: Bowman et al., 2022, 2023; Gilbertson et al., 2022; LaCosse et al., 2020; Logel et al., 2021; Stubblebine et al., 2024). Results showed the social-belonging intervention significantly improved progress in college, namely the rate at which students completed the first year full-time enrolled, particularly among students in groups that had historically progressed at lower rates. Yet these gains were constrained by belonging affordances: Among student groups that did not have minimally adequate opportunities to belong at their institution, the intervention had no detectable effect on academic progress.

Although these results helped inspire our emphasis on belonging affordances, and although we use data from the CTC trial here, our primary purpose is not to describe the social-belonging intervention. Instead, focusing on the 15,143 students assigned to the control group, we aim to deepen our understanding of belonging affordances: Absent intervention, how much does the opportunity to belong vary *across* and *within* institutions, as well as *across* and *within* racial-ethnic and social-class groups? How well do key institutional factors, drawn from past literature, predict these belonging affordances?

Key Terminology

We briefly overview our terms here, describing how we assessed key measures and how we interpret them. More details are provided in the Supplementary Information (*SI*). For further technical details, see Walton et al. (2023).

Local-Identity Groups (LIGs). As part of the CTC trial, we classified students into LIGs based on students' (a) race-ethnicity, (b) first-generation status, (c) cohort, and (d) college (Walton et al., 2023). Thus, each LIG represents students of a given race-ethnicity, with a given first- or continuing-generation status, enrolled at a specific college, in a specific cohort (e.g., "continuing-generation Black students starting at Yale University in the 2016-2017 academic year"; "first-generation Asian students starting at Southern Oregon University in the 2015-2016 academic year").⁵ Understanding variability at the LIG-level offers far more theoretical nuance and statistical power than traditional approaches, which compare only a few static, canonical groups (e.g., Black vs. White students) or that broadly categorize students as "disadvantaged" vs. "advantaged." Such approaches presume that the same groups that are underserved at one institution will be underserved at another. The LIG-level approach relaxes this assumption, allowing us to detect and quantify variability in belonging affordances *across* and *within* institutions and identity groups simultaneously.

Belonging. This measure, assessed at the student level, reflects each student's sense of how well they fit in at their school at the time of the spring term survey. It consists of 4-items: "I feel like I belong at [school name]", "I fit in well at [school name]"; and "I feel comfortable at [school name]", rated on a 6-point scale from 1 (*Strongly Disagree*) to 6 (*Strongly Agree*); "When you think about [school name], how often, if ever, do you wonder: 'Maybe I don't belong here?'" , rated on a 5-point scale from 1 (*Never*) to 5 (*Always*). This final item was reverse-scored. All items were converted to a 10-point scale, prior to averaging.

⁵ Racial-ethnic identity and first-generation status were obtained from student self-reports at the point of intervention delivery, supplemented with institutional demographic records when self-report data were unavailable. Although 456 LIGs were possible, the final analytic sample includes only 374 LIGs, as not all race-ethnicity and first-generation-status combinations were present in all college cohorts.

Belonging Affordances. This measure, assessed at the LIG-level, estimates each identity group's *opportunity to belong* at a specific college within a specific cohort. To operationalize this opportunity to belong, we measured the degree to which students in a given race \times first-generation status identity group, in a particular cohort, at a particular college achieved a sense of belonging, on average, by the end of the spring semester of their first year, absent treatment.

Following Walton et al. (2023), we used a multilevel random effects model to obtain Empirical Bayes (EB) estimates of belonging for each LIG. We used the EB estimation method because the LIGs varied widely in size. EB estimation reduces the fluctuations in raw group means that can be especially large for small groups. EB estimates thus provide an informative average mean value (see Raudenbush & Bryk, 2002). The *SI* provides further computational information. While we interpret this measure as an estimate of belonging affordances, it is a proxy rather than a direct measure of this construct, as the degree to which students in a given identity group achieve a given level of belonging reflects both local contextual affordances and other influences (e.g., potentially including students' prior experiences in school and broader cultural and societal factors; Offidani-Bertrand et al., 2022).

In the present study, we examine belonging affordances in two ways: continuously, when analyzing predictors of belonging affordances, and categorically, when examining variability in the percentage of LIGs for which belonging affordances were "minimally adequate." Following Walton et al. (2023), we defined "minimally adequate" belonging affordances using Bayesian Causal Forest (BCF) analyses. This method uses machine-learning to identify complex, non-linear interactions and is known for conservatively detecting true heterogeneity where it exists, while avoiding over-interpretation (Hahn et al., 2020; Yeager et al., 2019). Using BCF analysis, Walton and colleagues found that the threshold at which the belonging affordances moderator impacted

the social-belonging intervention's treatment effect was at -0.50 SD, which corresponded to the 36th percentile among LIGs. For LIGs with a Belonging Affordance EB estimate below this threshold, the social-belonging intervention did not improve first-year full-time completion rates, whereas for LIGs above this threshold, it was beneficial on average. That is, among student groups with minimally adequate opportunities to belong, the intervention helped students translate these opportunities into greater progress through the first year of college.

Institutional Factors. These measures reflect the four classes of institutional factors that we expect, based on the literature reviewed above, to predict belonging affordances: (1) in-group representation, (2) inclusive campus cultures, (3) opportunities for strong relationships, and (4) opportunities for productive learning. In examining how these factors predict belonging affordances, we seek to open up what is otherwise essentially a black box: *why* might some student groups experience greater belonging affordances than others? Our hope is that understanding these predictive relationships will inform both theory (what underlies belonging at the group level?) and practice (what might institutions do to expand belonging affordances?). Estimates of in-group representation were computed from data provided by each institution. All other measures were obtained from the spring-term survey (see Table S6). As with the belonging affordances measure, we derived EB estimates at the LIG-level for each institutional factor within each class. Full descriptive details and inter-correlations are provided in the *SI* (Tables S2-S3).

Results

How Do Opportunities for Belonging Vary?

How Do Belonging Affordances Vary by Identity Groups? First, we observe meaningful variation across identity groups. Some identity groups are systematically better served than others (see Fig. 1 and Table 2). For instance, while 97% of White LIGs, 90% of Hispanic/Latinx LIGs,

and 70% of continuing-generation LIGs had adequate belonging affordances—meaning their LIG-level EB estimates exceeded the “minimally adequate belonging affordances” cut-point—only 28% of Black LIGs, 22% of Asian LIGs, and 57% of first-generation LIGs did. There were also important identity intersections, particularly among Asian and Black LIGs. Whereas 42% of Black and 39% of Asian *continuing-generation* LIGs had adequate belonging affordances, only 14% of Black and 0% of Asian *first-generation* LIGs did. The results reveal systemic disparities in belonging affordances in the post-secondary system in the United States. Black and Asian first-generation students in particular have the fewest opportunities to belong.

Second, we observe meaningful variation within each identity group (see Fig. S1). To illustrate, Black continuing-generation college students at School 7 had the lowest mean belonging affordances in the entire sample (EB Estimate=-2.67), placing them in the 0th percentile of all LIGs; in contrast, at School 16, Black continuing-generation college students had a much higher mean belonging affordance (EB Estimate=0.31), placing them in the 73rd percentile of all LIGs. Similarly, Native American first-generation college students had low belonging affordances at School 5 (EB Estimate=-0.99, 10th percentile); however, at School 18, this group had one of the highest belonging affordances (EB Estimate=1.61, the 90th percentile). Thus, even as there is systemic variation across identity groups, these groups are not monoliths. There is important variation within groups. Some institutions offer adequate belonging opportunities to groups that are generally less well served. As we will address: Why? What institutional practices could make belonging affordances more equitable?

How Do Belonging Affordances Vary by Institutions? Just as we observe variation across identity groups, we see variation across schools (see Figs. 2 and 3). In School 15, for example, 81% of LIGs had minimally adequate belonging affordances (the highest percentage in the

sample). However, in School 10 only 41% of LIGs exceeded this cut-point (the lowest percentage in the sample).

Most schools in our sample afforded adequate belonging opportunities to most LIGs (86.3% did); however, none served all identity groups adequately. At School 15, for instance, even as White first-generation students had very high belonging affordances (EB Estimate=2.66, 99th percentile), Black first-generation students had very low belonging affordances (EB Estimate= -1.22, 4th percentile; see Fig. S2). Every college in our sample successfully created belonging affordances for at least some identity groups. And *every* institution can expand belonging affordances to more identity groups.

Importantly, this institutional variability does not merely reduce to institutional classifications. As an example, first-generation Hispanic/Latinx students had the greatest belonging affordances in our sample at one Hispanic-serving institution (HSI), ranking first among 37 college cohorts for this identity group. Yet, a different HSI had the *lowest* belonging affordances for this same identity group, ranking 37th out of the 37 college cohorts (see Covarrubias et al., 2023, for related work on the concept of ‘servingness’ and how it varies across HSIs). As another illustration, continuing-generation Black students had the greatest belonging affordances at one select private university in the sample, but were at the bottom at two other select private universities, ranking 37th and 38th of 38 college cohorts. Clearly, the nuances of contexts matter, extending beyond institutional classifications.

What Predicts Students’ Opportunities for Belonging?

What are these nuances? In this section, we aim to open the “black box” of belonging affordances by exploring the underlying institutional factors that systematically predict this variability. We calculate correlations between measures that fall in the four classes of institutional

factors reviewed earlier, linked in previous literature to belonging, quantifying their relationships with belonging affordances at the LIG-level across our large and representative dataset. Because a strong predictor of belonging affordances at the LIG-level is the proportional representation of the LIG on campus, we also calculate partial correlations that assess how well each measure predicts belonging affordances above and beyond proportional representation (see Table 3). In general, the other factors predict belonging affordances both alone and above and beyond proportional representation.

In-group Representation on Campus. Overall, higher representation of an identity group on campus predicted greater belonging affordances for that group ($r=.59, p<.001$).

Inclusive Campus Cultures. Inclusive campus cultures predicted greater belonging affordances at the LIG-level. For instance, when members of a local-identity group perceived a genuine desire on campus to enhance race and social class inclusivity, these groups experienced greater belonging affordances ($r=.42, p<.001$). Conversely, the perception of an exclusive campus culture predicted lower belonging affordances. For example, reports of greater social identity threat experiences pertaining to race and social class predicted fewer belonging affordances ($r=-.49, p<.001$), as did perceptions of pervasive bias, discrimination, and unfair treatment on campus ($r=-.31, p<.001$).

Opportunities to Cultivate Strong Relationships. The opportunity to build strong relationships on campus predicted greater belonging affordances at the LIG-level. For example, the more members of a local-identity group reported forming close friendships on campus, the greater the belonging affordances that group experienced ($r=.43, p<.001$). Likewise, the more members of a local-identity group reported establishing mentor-mentee relationships with faculty or administrators, the greater their belonging affordances ($r=.19, p<.001$).

Opportunities for Productive Learning. Productive learning opportunities also predicted greater belonging affordances at the LIG-level. When local-identity group members reported experiencing a greater sense of purpose on campus—feeling that their life on campus had direction and meaning—the greater the belonging affordances that group experienced ($r=.49, p<.001$). Conversely, the more local-identity group members perceived a prevailing fixed mindset on campus, the less that group experienced belonging affordances ($r=-.38, p<.001$).

Understanding Institutional Factors Together. While the analyses reported above examined each institutional factor, on its own and above and beyond proportional representation, we also examined these factors together. Table S3 reports correlations between and within the measures comprising the four institutional factors. As can be seen, these correlations are, at most, moderate in magnitude, suggesting that these factors are not redundant but begin to capture the complexity of college students' experience.

Table S4 reports stepwise regression analyses examining the collective predictive relationship of the institutional factors on belonging affordances. Notably, because of the relationships particularly among measures comprising each institutional factor and the potential for multicollinearity this creates, we focus on the *change in total variance explained* in this analysis rather than on individual predictor coefficients. A model with only sociodemographic factors (i.e., race and first-generation status, Model 1) explained about 19% of the variation in belonging affordances. Adding in-group representation increased the explained variance significantly, to 38% (Model 2). Adding predictors from each factor, one factor at a time (Models 3-5), further increased the explained variance, indicating that each factor was predictive above and beyond both sociodemographic factors and in-group representation. A model including all four institutional

factors explained 60% of the variance (Model 6), suggesting that these institutional factors work together to predict belonging affordances.

The stepwise regression analyses also reveal that controlling for the institutional factors significantly reduced racial-ethnic and social-class inequality in belonging affordances. This finding is consistent with our theorizing that these institutional factors contribute to inequality in belonging affordances. Our design, however, does not provide a direct test of this causal role.

Lastly, in Table S5, we report a LASSO regression, which accounts for potential multicollinearity and balances the trade-off between variance and bias using a variable selection approach. This analysis retained all institutional factors, even as one item was dropped, providing further evidence that each factor explains unique variance in belonging affordances.

III. What Can Institutions Learn to Expand Belonging Opportunities?

Our findings reveal systemic inequality in belonging affordances as a function of student identity group and substantial variability in this *across* and *within* institutions. Therefore, it is essential for researchers and institutional leaders to understand *their specific institutional context*: Which student groups are, and are not yet, afforded adequate opportunities to belong in a given institution? Why might this be? What targeted reforms might expand belonging opportunities to all students?

In this section, we discuss how institutions can listen to their students and act effectively. Focusing on the four factors identified above, we maintain a broad scope, emphasizing flexibility. Given the diversity of student populations and the unique cultures of different institutions, effective practices will vary; so too will the roles of various institutional actors. Expanding belonging affordances is not the job of a single office or administrator but a collective effort. From senior leadership to student success practitioners to faculty in the classroom, everyone can play an

important role in creating an environment where all students can belong. Here, we provide a foundational conceptual framework that a variety of institutional actors can use as they consider how to adapt and implement evidence-based strategies to enhance belonging within their contexts.

Listening to Students

In preparing for the CTC trial, we conducted focus groups with diverse students at each partner institution. *What has your experience been like? What was a time you felt like you really belonged? What was a time you felt like maybe you didn't belong? How has your experience changed over time?* Often, administrators listened in on these conversations and, often, they marveled afterward at how much they had learned. For despite their many years of hard work, many had not previously sat down and simply asked students, in open-ended ways, to share their experience.

Numerous scholars have highlighted the importance of listening to students, emphasizing how much institutions can learn from students' lived experiences (e.g., Covarrubias et al., 2022; Jehangir, 2010; Kahu et al., 2022)—not to mention how empowering it can be for students when institutions genuinely listen to them (Gray et al., 2022). One way to listen is to monitor data on student recruitment, retention, and graduation rates, for instance to identify disparities. But to understand students' underlying experience, institutional leaders must probe deeper. Regular surveys, interviews, and focus groups can each reveal vivid, multifaceted perspectives on why certain groups feel included or excluded (Walton & Brady, 2020a; Yeager, Romero, et al., 2016). Different institutional actors may approach this listening process with distinct goals. Senior administrators may focus on identifying structural changes to expand belonging opportunities. Student success practitioners may focus on refining specific programs and support services. Faculty may focus on fostering belonging in their own classrooms.

As a starting point, we recommend regular, campus-wide surveys that measure belonging as well as the predictors outlined in this paper, as they have proven important across a representative variety of institutions and student identity groups. Interested readers can refer to the *SI* for the exact items we used and select those most appropriate for their context (Table S6). It may also be helpful to institutionalize procedures for regular open-ended conversations between key administrators with students about their experiences on campus, whether one-on-one or in small groups, particularly students in underserved groups. They are the experts in the student experience, after all. Such conversations may inform an understanding of survey results and other administrative data. Monitoring social media can also offer real-time insights into the campus environment (e.g., Valandra et al., 2022). This mix of qualitative feedback and quantitative data can uncover specific challenges to belonging and opportunities to foster a more inclusive environment.

Taking Action

With a clearer understanding of students' experience of belonging, institutions can begin to make changes that will matter for student groups not yet well-served. In this section, we describe a range of evidence-based practices, grounded in the four classes of institutional factors that we found predict belonging affordances.⁶ Certainly, it is important to learn what specific changes will be helpful on any given campus, rather than to assume that what worked in one setting will automatically work in another (McPartlan et al., 2020). As there is limited space here, we encourage readers interested in a given solution to follow the references to learn more deeply about that approach.

⁶ While the data we reported are correlational, the extensive experimental and longitudinal research we've reviewed suggest that these relationships are at least partially causal. Yet third variables are possible, as is reciprocal causality, where improved belonging may itself reinforce the factors we've identified.

Before we delve into evidence-based practices to expand belonging affordances, we emphasize three points. First, expanding belonging affordances may not, on its own, enhance students' academic progress: Institutions may also need to cultivate a campus culture that recognizes belonging concerns as normal for all students and as improving with time (Walton et al., 2023). This can include direct communications to students about belonging, but *how* institutions talk about belonging matters. Effective messaging does not mean simply proclaiming, "You belong here" (Walton, 2021). Such a statement can imply that students *should* already feel they belong, and, if they don't yet, that's their fault. Rather, it's critical to clearly communicate to students that belonging is a *process* (see Demszky et al., under review). This idea should be communicated consistently and genuinely embraced (Jayakumar & Museus, 2012; Museus et al., 2018; Walton & Brady, 2020), including in how institutions welcome students to college (Walton et al., 2023; Yeager, Walton, et al., 2016) and elsewhere in campus life, such as in classrooms, residences, interactions with faculty, or relationships with peers. For instance, one series of studies found that peer-to-peer group conversations about belonging embedded in introductory science courses—affirming that belonging concerns are normal and can improve—eliminated gender and racial-ethnic achievement gaps in those physics and biology classrooms (Binning et al., 2020).

Second, to be effective, any intervention must speak to students' experiences within their context (Kaplan, 2023; Kaplan et al., 2020). An approach that is effective for one group in one context may not have the same impact for another group or in another setting (Walton & Wilson, 2018; Yeager & Walton, 2011).

Third, these are not 'set-it-and-forget it' solutions. That doesn't work in personal relationships, and it won't work for students' relationship with their school. These solutions are,

rather, ongoing processes of engaging with students and creating, maintaining, and strengthening a campus culture that includes them.

Factor 1: Increase Diverse Representation on Campus

While the Supreme Court has recently prohibited the use of race in college admissions in the United States (*Students for Fair Admissions, Inc. V. President and Fellows of Harvard College*, 2023), our data clearly show that greater representation of an identity group on campus predicts greater belonging affordances for that group. The implication is that maintaining and increasing an adequate presence of historically excluded racial-ethnic and social class groups on campus is one important way to make belonging affordances more equitable. It is also the case that, in some circumstances, taking group identity into account can be necessary to promote merit in university admissions (Erman & Walton, 2014; Logel et al., 2012; Walton et al., 2013; Walton & Spencer, 2009).

Institutions in the United States now face an increasingly complex legal landscape. Indeed, recent federal guidance has cautioned against considering race in institutional decision-making broadly (Trainor, 2025), though this interpretation has yet to be tested in court and institutions may choose to challenge it. It remains to be seen how previously established approaches to increasing diversity, such as outreach programs targeting underrepresented communities, partnering with schools in diverse districts, and waiving application fees for students in financial need, among other efforts, will be interpreted by the current administration and adjudicated by the court system. Nonetheless, it is clear that, from a student experience perspective, diversity on campus matters.

As already discussed, however, increasing representation is not a magic bullet. It is just the first step, as our data show.

Factor 2: Cultivate an Inclusive Culture

Increase Sincerity, Consistency, and Accountability in Inclusion. Our data reveal that students' perceptions of how sincere an institution's efforts are to promote racial-ethnic and social-class inclusion strongly predict belonging affordances. How can institutions best embody this sincerity in practice? One issue is how institutions talk about their values. For instance, while equal treatment is a fundamental value, when institutions advocate only for colorblind values they may seem insincere in their commitment to diversity, particularly if they are not yet diverse (Purdie-Vaughns et al., 2008). Simple colorblindness can also feel to students of color like a willful erasure or ignorance of their distinct identities and experiences (Celeste et al., 2019; Markus et al., 2000; Wilton et al., 2015). A more effective approach can be to articulate a multicultural philosophy that explicitly recognizes and values the diverse social and cultural backgrounds of all students, including majority-group students (Jansen et al., 2015; Plaut, 2014; Ryan et al., 2007; Stevens et al., 2008). This can reduce belonging gaps between students of color and White students (Celeste et al., 2019). One study found that advocating multicultural values, even in a brief statement, narrowed racial achievement gaps in GPA over two years (Birnbaum et al., 2021). It also matters *how* institutions advocate for diversity. While many institutions emphasize the instrumental benefits of diversity—such as in enhancing competitiveness, or the benefits of learning in diverse contexts—these rationales tend to resonate more with White students (Starck et al., 2021) and can alienate students from marginalized communities (Georgeac & Rattan, 2023). Emphasizing the inherent moral value of diversity can be more effective in fostering a sense of belonging among students from marginalized groups.

Another common pitfall is when institutions vocally commit to diversity but fail to follow through (Ponce de Leon et al., 2024). Superficial efforts, like using diverse images in promotional materials without real strategies for increasing diversity (Pippert et al., 2013), or making public

statements condemning racist incidents without implementing relevant policy changes (Cole & Harper, 2017), are readily seen as insincere (Derricks et al., 2023; Spoor et al., 2014; Valandra et al., 2022) and can erode belonging among marginalized student groups (Kroeper, Williams, et al., 2022; Wilton et al., 2020). Instead, evidence suggests accountability is key for institutions to be seen as sincerely embracing diversity (Leslie, 2019; Ragland & Sommers, 2024; Varty, 2022). For example, Wilton et al. (2020) found that tangible diversity markers, like diverse organizational charts or employee testimonials about climate, are more effective than vague statements about diversity in fostering feelings of inclusion. Similarly, Kroeper et al. (2022) showed that, compared to organizations that merely highlighted gender diversity in promotional materials, organizations with policies and practices in place for recruiting and retaining more women were seen as more sincerely dedicated to diversity, reducing belonging uncertainty among women. These findings collectively emphasize the need for sincere, actionable commitments to diversity, equity, and inclusion.

Reduce Identity Threat. Our data indicate that identity threat predicts reduced belonging affordances. To mitigate these threats, institutions may begin by measuring and understanding the specific threats present on their own campus (Kroeper et al., under review). Then, institutions can take steps to remedy them (Kennedy & Brauer, 2024). For example, institutions can affirm diverse “ways of being,” rather than expecting students to conform to a cultural default (Cheryan & Markus, 2020; Covarrubias et al., 2016; Stephens et al., 2019; Williams et al., 2021). One field experiment found that a panel discussion surfacing the differences in first- and continuing-generation students’ experiences in coming to college remedied the social-class achievement gap over the first year of college (Stephens et al., 2014). In another study, a brief reading-and-writing exercise that conveyed that it is possible to be both independent and interdependent in college

strongly raised grades among first-generation and racial-ethnic minority students over the first year (Yeager et al., 2016, Experiment 3 “cultural fit” intervention). Institutions can also incorporate academic programs and student groups of particular relevance to diverse students, addressing the issues they care about and who they aspire to become (e.g., ethnic studies programs and courses; multicultural centers and affinity groups; Bonilla et al., 2021; Fong et al., 2023; Muraki et al., 2024; Santa-Ramirez, 2022), as well as increase the diversity of their faculty, as ingroup role models can signal to students that their group is valued on campus (Pietri et al., 2018, 2019). Teaching practices and existing curricula can also be structured to represent multicultural perspectives, ensuring it is relevant and aligned with the values and goals of a diverse student body (Belanger et al., 2020; Cheryan & Markus, 2020; Harackiewicz et al., 2016; Jehangir, 2010; Ladson-Billings, 1995; Norman et al., 2022; Williams et al., 2021).

Reduce Bias. We found that experiences of bias predict lower belonging affordances, highlighting the need for institutions to reduce bias in their campus communities. Well-communicated procedures for reporting and addressing incidents of bias serve not only as a reactive measure but also as a clear statement of institutional values (Derricks et al., 2023). When biased incidents do occur, it’s important for institutions to respond with direct action, as marginalized students generally prefer that their experiences are actively acknowledged and addressed, rather than ignored or dismissed (Boysen, 2013; Santa-Ramirez, 2022). Psychological research also offers innovative approaches to mitigate bias and establish norms of group-based respect (Okonofua et al., 2022). For instance, Murrar et al. (2020) showed that posters and brief videos that broadcast inclusive peer norms in college classrooms fostered more inclusive behaviors among students, and enhanced feelings of belonging and boosted achievement among students in minoritized groups. Another study found an “Inclusivity Page” included in course syllabi enhanced

classroom experiences for students from marginalized backgrounds and, for younger students, improved GPA years into the future (Campbell et al., 2024). A third study found a multistep program including self-affirmation, which can open people to recognizing and addressing their own biases, combined with strong evidence and stories communicating how girls' and women's STEM ability is often underestimated, led boys to recognize more math and science ability in girls (Cyr et al., 2024).

Factor 3: Expand Opportunities to Develop Strong Relationships

We found that the development of close peer friendships and mentoring relationships on campus predicts greater belonging affordances. How can institutions expand opportunities to build strong relationships on campus?

Facilitating Peer-to-Peer Relationships. A thriving campus community—with diverse, engaged student groups, a range of activities, and vibrant residential life—affords belonging to more students. There is nothing magic about this. Yet, if talking with and surveying students reveals that some student groups have easier access to these opportunities than others, this is an opportunity for change.

We have reviewed evidence that both intra- and intergroup friendships facilitate belonging for underserved students. It can be helpful, then, to consider how the campus environment affords both kinds of friendships. The availability of intragroup friendships depends, first, on an adequate representation of ingroup members on campus (Kumar et al., 2019; Van Gilder et al., 2024). Affinity groups and cultural centers can also help students connect with others who share similar experiences and interests, deepening an understanding of and commitment to their background, community, and identity (Brannon, 2023; Myers et al., 2019; Patton, 2023; Tachine et al., 2017).

1
2
3
4 It is also important to facilitate spaces for students from diverse backgrounds to come
5
6 together, interact, and build friendships, such as in campus residences and residential programs,
7
8 extracurricular offerings, and classes (Albuja et al., 2024; Shook & Clay, 2012; Watkins et al.,
9
10 2007). In designing these spaces, it can be helpful to consider how students can use them to express
11
12 and share both similarities *and differences* so as to foster deeper understanding and more
13
14 meaningful connections. Indeed, if underrepresented students feel that important aspects of their
15
16 identity go unseen or are unwelcome, they are unlikely to feel fully included (Plaut et al., 2011;
17
18 Sanchez et al., 2022; Schroeder & Fishbach, 2024; Smith et al., 2022; see also Brannon & Walton,
19
20 2013). It can also be important to take intentional steps to help students reappraise the anxiety that
21
22 can arise when talking about differences. One randomized controlled trial offered Black and White
23
24 friends the opportunity to reflect on how experiencing anxiety when talking about race-related
25
26 experiences with friends is normal and, further, it can reflect a mutual commitment to the
27
28 friendship, immediately before the Black friend shared a race-related experience with their White
29
30 friend. As compared to when friends only had this conversation without the friendship-affirming
31
32 reflection, Black friends in the friendship-affirming condition reported feeling more authentic with
33
34 their White friend and closer to them as long as 2-6 months later (Sanchez et al., under review).
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 ***Facilitating Faculty-Student Mentoring Relationships.*** Developing mentor relationships
44
45 with faculty and administrators—where students feel seen, valued, cared for, and believed in—is
46
47 a foundation of student belonging and success (Allen et al., 2018; Chhuon & Wallace, 2014; Kraft
48
49 et al., 2023). Yet, faculty can be less responsive to outreach from students in historically
50
51 marginalized groups (Milkman et al., 2015); first-generation and racial-ethnic minority students
52
53 may not have equal access to institutional knowledge detailing how they can initiate and build
54
55 such relationships (Laiduc & Covarrubias, 2022); and cross-identity mentoring relationships may
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

involve challenges, such as concerns about bias or mistrust (Cohen et al., 1999; Cohen & Steele, 2002).

How can institutions facilitate these relationships? One approach is to establish formal mentoring programs, for instance where students are assigned a faculty mentor. While such programs can be helpful (e.g., Hu & Ma, 2010), top-down approaches can elicit less motivation and commitment from both mentors and mentees than student-initiated relationships (Spencer et al., 2016, 2019; see also Schwartz et al., 2013; for demonstrations of the power of student-initiated or “natural” mentors, see Kraft et al., 2023; Walton et al., 2021). Therefore, in general, we suggest that institutions seek to *facilitate* these relationships. This may involve talking about faculty mentoring as normal and important to both students and faculty; creating ubiquitous spaces for students and faculty to interact closely, whether in small classes, social events (such as invitations for faculty to attend dinners in undergraduate dining halls), or co-teaching opportunities, and supports for student participation and leadership in research or service activities with faculty; and by valuing mentoring in faculty promotion and retention (López et al., 2024).

As with peer friendships, it can be helpful to think about how to facilitate both same-group and cross-group mentor relationships. Indeed, there is strong evidence, albeit earlier in schooling, that students of color fare better when they have same-race teachers (Dee, 2004; Gershenson et al., 2022; Redding, 2019; see also Odle et al., 2023). Minoritized students may also hesitate to approach faculty and administrators who do not share their background, as a consequence of prior experiences with racism and/or concerns about cultural misunderstandings (Van Gilder et al., 2024). Therefore, one way to strengthen relationships is to ensure an adequate racial-ethnic and social class diversity among faculty and administrators on campus.

Yet most faculty members are not members of underrepresented racial-ethnic groups. Therefore, institutions may also offer mentorship training for faculty and administrators that enhances cultural awareness (Byars-Winston et al., 2023; Womack et al., 2020). Such programs help mentors develop awareness of their own identities, understand power dynamics in mentor-mentee relationships, and build skills for navigating identity divides constructively. In a randomized-controlled trial, mentors who received such training reported greater understanding of how their racial-ethnic identity influenced their mentoring and felt more confident mentoring students across diverse groups compared to untrained mentors (Byars-Winston et al., 2023). Corroborating these reports, mentees of trained mentors agreed that their mentors more respectfully addressed race and ethnicity and created opportunities for them to broach these topics too (for other approaches to promote mentor-mentee trust, see also Yeager, 2024; Yeager, Purdie-Vaughns, et al., 2014,).

Factor 4: Expand Productive Learning Opportunities

We find that the development of a sense of purpose, and the belief that the institution recognizes students' potential for intellectual growth, predict greater belonging affordances. Many campuses already provide valuable opportunities for growth and for students to develop a direction that resonates with them, but as our data suggest, there may be a need to expand access to such opportunities to all students. How can institutions build on their current offerings to expand productive learning opportunities?

Facilitating the Development of Purpose. Several factors can interfere with the opportunity students have to develop a sense of direction or purpose in college. First, if curricula omit topics of particular relevance to communities of color, or the achievements of people of color, students from these communities may feel that coursework does not speak to them, their

1
2
3
4 communities, or their values (Bonilla-Silva & Peoples, 2022; Solórzano et al., 2000). This is one
5
6 reason ethnic studies programs and other forms of culturally sustaining pedagogy matter
7
8 (Covarrubias, 2024; Gray et al., 2018; Museus et al., 2018). Second, higher education leaders tend
9
10 to prioritize the development of independent over interdependent values. Yet students from first-
11
12 generation backgrounds tend to value both independent and interdependent values, creating a
13
14 cultural clash that, for instance, makes academic work feel more difficult (Stephens, Townsend, et
15
16 al., 2012). While past research on these dynamics has not explicitly considered purpose, if colleges
17
18 can help students from first-generation backgrounds develop the interdependent values they (also)
19
20 prize, these students may feel that college is more a place for them.
21
22
23
24

25
26 Colleges can implement specific exercises to help students build connections to
27
28 coursework. For instance, inviting students to reflect on how course content in introductory
29
30 biology and chemistry courses is relevant to them and their communities can improve student
31
32 achievement and often narrow achievement gaps along social-class and/or racial-ethnic lines
33
34 (Asher et al., 2023; Diekman et al., 2024; Hecht et al., 2019; Hulleman & Harackiewicz, 2020).
35
36 Similarly, but more broadly, inviting students to reflect on how foundational learning tasks can
37
38 help them address problems that matter to them can enhance motivation on learning tasks and
39
40 performance in math and science courses (Yeager, Henderson, et al., 2014). It is also helpful for
41
42 universities to move away from “find your passion” rhetoric, which implies that interests are *found*
43
44 not *developed*. One study found that a structured exercise to offer students a growth mindset about
45
46 academic interests before college raised interest and performance in math and science classes
47
48 among undergraduates who began college identified more with the humanities and social sciences
49
50 (O’Keefe et al., 2023). These are ways institutions and faculty can help students connect
51
52 coursework with the problems they care about and the kinds of persons they would like to become.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Promoting Growth Mindset Institutional Cultures. To foster growth mindset cultures within an institution, schools can begin by conveying—through words, policy, and practice—that *all* students are seen as capable of progress and success (Fredericks et al., 2021; Kroeper, Fried, et al., 2022; Kroeper, Muenks, et al., 2022; Murphy et al., 2021, 2025). An institution might, for example, encourage faculty to draft syllabus statements that affirm all students’ potential and normalize that learning involves making and (rebounding from) mistakes (Canning et al., 2022; Ozier, 2023). Such messages can be reiterated in interactions with students, especially during critical moments such as after exams. For example, randomized controlled field experiments find that simple emails sent to students throughout a course, affirming a faculty member’s belief in the student’s potential to improve and support for doing so, improve minoritized students’ perceptions of professors, course grades, and even their persistence through college and graduation rates (Canning et al., 2024; Carrell & Kurlaender, 2023). Providing numerous opportunities for practice and consistent, actionable feedback on student work also communicates that growth is expected and valued (Kroeper, Fried, et al., 2022). Reflective assignments that encourage students to track their learning progress can be integrated into curricula too (Black & Wiliam, 2009), so that final grades better reflect progress *and* mastery—ensuring that students are recognized for sustained improvement, not just initial understanding.

IV. Limitations and Future Directions

In this paper, we identified four institutional factors that predict belonging affordances across diverse institutional contexts and identity groups: (1) greater in-group representation, (2) more inclusive cultures, (3) greater opportunities for strong relationships, and (4) greater opportunities for productive learning. However, several limitations should be noted to help guide future research. First, our analyses are exploratory and, although suggestive, do not establish causal

relationships between these factors and belonging affordances. Future research using experimental or longitudinal designs could provide stronger evidence for how specific institutional practices—or combinations of practices—shape opportunities to belong. Second, while our use of LIGs allows for a detailed analysis of belonging affordances across identity groups, data collection constraints across institutions, combined with statistical power considerations, limited our ability to further disaggregate student groups. However, meaningful differences likely exist within these broad categories. For example, research suggests considerable variation in how Asian students experience college, depending on their ethnic backgrounds (e.g., East Asian vs. Southeast Asian vs. Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander; Lieng et al., 2024). Further, as LIGs in this study were defined by race/ethnicity and social class, future research, with sufficient power, could examine how belonging affordances vary across and within additional identity dimensions—such as gender, sexuality, or international student status—as well as at the intersection of these identities.

V. Conclusion

We began this paper by contrasting two students, Jaylen and Jordan. While Jaylen enjoyed a wonderful place in her college, Jordan struggled to belong. Throughout this paper, we've explored *what institutions can do* to create environments where more students feel like Jaylen, belonging and connected, and fewer feel like Jordan, isolated and unsupported.

Using novel data from the College Transition Collaborative's massive trial of the social-belonging intervention, a trial including 22 institutions that broadly represent colleges and universities in the United States, we found that opportunities to belong vary systematically both across and within institutions and identity groups. Some identity groups are systematically afforded greater opportunities to belong (e.g., White students, continuing-generation students) than others (e.g., Black and Asian students, first-generation students). These results suggest that

Jaylen's experience is more likely among continuing-generation students and by White students, and Jordan's among first-generation college students and students of color. However, we also observed considerable variability across post-secondary contexts: belonging experiences do not reduce to specific identity characteristics. The question, then, is *what institutions can do* to better serve their students, whomever they are, in developing a sense of belonging at their institution. Importantly, while all institutions successfully fostered opportunities for belonging for some student groups, none did so for all identity groups it served. All institutions can build on their success to reach more students.

Drawing on past research and theory, we identified and quantified four classes of institutional factors that predict belonging affordances at the identity-group level. Institutions can target these factors to expand opportunities for belonging: (1) increasing the representation of students from diverse groups; (2) cultivating an inclusive culture by sincerely committing to equity and inclusion, addressing biases, and mitigating identity threats; (3) expanding opportunities for students to develop strong relationships with peers and with faculty; and (4) broadening opportunities for productive learning experiences, so all students find relevance and purpose in their academic endeavors, in settings that encourage and value growth.

Expanding opportunities for belonging for students from all groups is something higher education leaders can do. It will take two broad steps. The first involves listening to and learning from students. They are the experts in the student experience. The second involves proactively expanding belonging opportunities, particularly for those student groups that are not yet well served, at least in part by focusing on the four opportunities described here. In so doing, higher education institutions can realize the equity and excellence they seek to achieve and ensure that every student, regardless of their background, can have an experience like Jaylen's.

References

- Akcinar, E. N., Carr, P. B., & Walton, G. M. (2011). Interactions with men and whites matter too. *Psychological Inquiry*, 22(4), 247–251.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1047840X.2011.625606>
- Albuja, A. F., Gaither, S. E., Sanchez, D. T., & Nixon, J. (2024). Testing intergroup contact theory through a natural experiment of randomized college roommate assignments in the United States. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, No Pagination Specified- No Pagination Specified. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspa0000393>
- Alderman, D. H., & Rose-Redwood, R. (2020). The classroom as “toponymic workspace”: Towards a critical pedagogy of campus place renaming. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 44(1), 124–141. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03098265.2019.1695108>
- Allen, K., Kern, M. L., Vella-Brodrick, D., Hattie, J., & Waters, L. (2018). What schools need to know about fostering school belonging: A meta-analysis. *Educational Psychology Review*, 30(1), 1–34. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-016-9389-8>
- Asher, M. W., Harackiewicz, J. M., Beymer, P. N., Hecht, C. A., Lamont, L. B., Else-Quest, N. M., Priniski, S. J., Thoman, D. B., Hyde, J. S., & Smith, J. L. (2023). Utility-value intervention promotes persistence and diversity in STEM. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 120(19), e2300463120. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2300463120>
- Astin, A. W., & Bayer, A. E. (1971). Antecedents and consequents of disruptive campus protests. *Measurement and Evaluation in Guidance*, 4(1), 18–30.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00256307.1971.12022476>

- Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, *117*(3), 497–529. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.117.3.497>
- Belanger, A. L., Joshi, M. P., Fuesting, M. A., Weisgram, E. S., Claypool, H. M., & Diekmann, A. B. (2020). Putting belonging in context: Communal affordances signal belonging in STEM. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *46*(8), 1186–1204. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167219897181>
- Benner, A. D., & Wang, Y. (2017). Racial/ethnic discrimination and adolescents' well-being: The role of cross-ethnic friendships and friends' experiences of discrimination. *Child Development*, *88*(2), 493–504. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12606>
- Berger, J. B., & Milem, J. F. (1999). The role of student involvement and perceptions of integration in a causal model of student persistence. *Research in Higher Education*, *40*(6), 641–664. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1018708813711>
- Bettencourt, G. M. (2021). “I belong because it wasn’t made for me”: Understanding working-class students’ sense of belonging on campus. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *92*(5), 760–783. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2021.1872288>
- Binning, K. R., Doucette, D., Conrique, B. G., & Singh, C. (2024). Unlocking the benefits of gender diversity: How an ecological-belonging intervention enhances performance in science classrooms. *Psychological Science*, 09567976231221534. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09567976231221534>
- Binning, K. R., Kaufmann, N., McGreevy, E. M., Fotuhi, O., Chen, S., Marshman, E., Kalender, Z. Y., Limeri, L., Betancur, L., & Singh, C. (2020). Changing social contexts to foster

- equity in college science courses: An ecological-belonging intervention. *Psychological Science*, *31*(9), 1059–1070. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797620929984>
- Birnbaum, H. J., Stephens, N. M., Townsend, S. S. M., & Hamedani, M. G. (2021). A diversity ideology intervention: Multiculturalism reduces the racial achievement gap. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, *12*(5), 751–759. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550620938227>
- Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (2009). Developing the theory of formative assessment. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, *21*(1), 5–31. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11092-008-9068-5>
- Bolger, N., Zuckerman, A., & Kessler, R. C. (2000). Invisible support and adjustment to stress. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *79*(6), 953–961. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.79.6.953>
- Bonilla, S., Dee, T. S., & Penner, E. K. (2021). Ethnic studies increases longer-run academic engagement and attainment. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *118*(37), e2026386118. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2026386118>
- Bonilla-Silva, E., & Peoples, C. E. (2022). Historically white colleges and universities: The unbearable whiteness of (most) colleges and universities in America. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *66*(11), 1490–1504. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00027642211066047>
- Bowman, N. A., Logel, C., Lacosse, J., Canning, E. A., Emerson, K. T. U., & Murphy, M. C. (2023). The role of minoritized student representation in promoting achievement and equity within college STEM courses. *AERA Open*, *9*, 23328584231209957. <https://doi.org/10.1177/23328584231209957>

- Bowman, N. A., Logel, C., LaCosse, J., Jarratt, L., Canning, E. A., Emerson, K. T. U., & Murphy, M. C. (2022). Gender representation and academic achievement among STEM-interested students in college STEM courses. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 59(10), 1876–1900. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21778>
- Boysen, G. A. (2013). Confronting math stereotypes in the classroom: Its effect on female college students' sexism and perceptions of confronters. *Sex Roles*, 69(5–6), 297–307. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-013-0287-y>
- Brady, S. T., Cohen, G. L., Jarvis, S. N., & Walton, G. M. (2020). A brief social-belonging intervention in college improves adult outcomes for Black Americans. *Science Advances*, 6(18), eaay3689. <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.aay3689>
- Brannon, T. N. (2023). Pride-and-prejudice perspectives of marginalization can advance science and society. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 32(1), 73–80. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09637214221121818>
- Brannon, T. N., & Lin, A. (2021). “Pride and prejudice” pathways to belonging: Implications for inclusive diversity practices within mainstream institutions. *American Psychologist*, 76(3), 488–501. <https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000643>
- Brannon, T. N., Markus, H. R., & Taylor, V. J. (2015). “Two souls, two thoughts,” two self-schemas: Double consciousness can have positive academic consequences for African Americans. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 108(4), 586–609. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0038992>
- Brannon, T. N., & Walton, G. M. (2013). Enacting cultural interests: How intergroup contact reduces prejudice by sparking interest in an out-group's culture. *Psychological Science*, 24(10), 1947–1957. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797613481607>

- 1
2
3
4 Browman, A. S., & Destin, M. (2016). The effects of a warm or chilly climate toward
5
6 socioeconomic diversity on academic motivation and self-concept. *Personality and*
7
8 *Social Psychology Bulletin*, 42(2), 172–187. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167215619379>
9
10
- 11 Brown, T. M., & Rodríguez, L. F. (2009). School and the co-construction of dropout.
12
13 *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 22(2), 221–242.
14
15 <https://doi.org/10.1080/09518390802005570>
16
17
- 18 Byars-Winston, A., Rogers, J. G., Thayer-Hart, N., Black, S., Branchaw, J., & Pfund, C. (2023).
19
20 A randomized controlled trial of an intervention to increase cultural diversity awareness
21
22 of research mentors of undergraduate students. *Science Advances*, 9(21), eadf9705.
23
24 <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.adf9705>
25
26
- 27 Campbell, M. R., Kennedy, K. R., Miller, A., & Brauer, M. (2024). A brief pro-diversity social
28
29 marketing intervention improves grades and well-being of students from marginalized
30
31 groups. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*.
32
33
- 34 Campbell, T. A., & Campbell, D. E. (1997). Faculty/student mentor program: Effects on
35
36 academic performance and retention. *Research in Higher Education*, 38(6), 727–742.
37
38 <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1024911904627>
39
40
- 41 Campbell, T. A., & Campbell, D. E. (2007). Outcomes of mentoring at-risk college students:
42
43 Gender and ethnic matching effects. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*,
44
45 15(2), 135–148. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13611260601086287>
46
47
48
- 49 Canning, E. A., LaCosse, J., Kroeper, K. M., & Murphy, M. C. (2020). Feeling like an imposter:
50
51 The effect of perceived classroom competition on the daily psychological experiences of
52
53 first-generation college students. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 11(5),
54
55 647–657. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550619882032>
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 Canning, E. A., Muenks, K., Green, D. J., & Murphy, M. C. (2019). STEM faculty who believe
5
6 ability is fixed have larger racial achievement gaps and inspire less student motivation in
7
8 their classes. *Science Advances*, *5*(2), eaau4734. <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.aau4734>
9
10
11 Canning, E. A., Ozier, E., Williams, H. E., AlRasheed, R., & Murphy, M. C. (2022). Professors
12
13 who signal a fixed mindset about ability undermine women's performance in STEM.
14
15 *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, *13*(5), 927–937.
16
17 <https://doi.org/10.1177/19485506211030398>
18
19
20
21 Canning, E. A., White, M., & Davis, W. B. (2024). Growth mindset messages from instructors
22
23 improve academic performance among first-generation college students. *CBE—Life*
24
25 *Sciences Education*, *23*(2), ar14. <https://doi.org/10.1187/cbe.23-07-0131>
26
27
28 Carey, R. M., Stephens, N. M., Townsend, S. S. M., & Hamedani, M. G. (2022). Is diversity
29
30 enough? Cross-race and cross-class interactions in college occur less often than expected,
31
32 but benefit members of lower status groups when they occur. *Journal of Personality and*
33
34 *Social Psychology*, *123*(5), 889–908. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspa0000302>
35
36
37
38 Carini, R. M., Kuh, G. D., & Klein, S. P. (2006). Student engagement and student learning:
39
40 Testing the linkages. *Research in Higher Education*, *47*(1), 1–32.
41
42 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-005-8150-9>
43
44
45 Carr, P. B., & Walton, G. M. (2014). Cues of working together fuel intrinsic motivation. *Journal*
46
47 *of Experimental Social Psychology*, *53*, 169–184.
48
49 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2014.03.015>
50
51
52 Carrell, S. E., & Kurlaender, M. (2023). My professor cares: Experimental evidence on the role
53
54 of faculty engagement. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy*, *15*(4), 113–141.
55
56 <https://doi.org/10.1257/pol.20210699>
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 Carter, E. R., Brady, S. T., Murdock-Perriera, L. A., Gilbertson, M. K., Ablorh, T., & Murphy,
5
6 M. C. (2019). The racial composition of students' friendship networks predicts
7
8 perceptions of injustice and involvement in collective action. *Journal of Theoretical*
9
10 *Social Psychology, 3*(1), 49–61. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jts5.27>
11
12
13
14 Celeste, L., Baysu, G., Phalet, K., Meeussen, L., & Kende, J. (2019). Can school diversity
15
16 policies reduce belonging and achievement gaps between minority and majority youth?
17
18 Multiculturalism, colorblindness, and assimilationism assessed. *Personality and Social*
19
20 *Psychology Bulletin, 45*(11), 1603–1618. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167219838577>
21
22
23
24 Chang, M. J., Sharkness, J., Hurtado, S., & Newman, C. B. (2014). What matters in college for
25
26 retaining aspiring scientists and engineers from underrepresented racial groups. *Journal*
27
28 *of Research in Science Teaching, 51*(5), 555–580. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21146>
29
30
31 Cheryan, S., & Markus, H. R. (2020). Masculine defaults: Identifying and mitigating hidden
32
33 cultural biases. *Psychological Review, 127*(6), 1022–1052.
34
35 <https://doi.org/10.1037/rev0000209>
36
37
38 Cheryan, S., Plaut, V. C., Davies, P. G., & Steele, C. M. (2009). Ambient belonging: How
39
40 stereotypical cues impact gender participation in computer science. *Journal of*
41
42 *Personality and Social Psychology, 97*(6), 1045–1060. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0016239>
43
44
45 Chhuon, V., & Wallace, T. L. (2014). Creating connectedness through being known: Fulfilling
46
47 the need to belong in U.S. high schools. *Youth & Society, 46*(3), 379–401.
48
49 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0044118X11436188>
50
51
52
53 Clark, R., Anderson, N. B., Clark, V. R., & Williams, D. R. (1999). Racism as a stressor for
54
55 African Americans: A biopsychosocial model. *American Psychologist, 54*(10), 805–816.
56
57 <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.54.10.805>
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- Cohen, G. L., & Garcia, J. (2008). Identity, belonging, and achievement: A model, interventions, implications. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *17*(6), 365–369.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8721.2008.00607.x>
- Cohen, G. L., & Steele, C. M. (2002). A barrier of mistrust: How negative stereotypes affect cross-race mentoring. In J. Aronson (Ed.), *Improving Academic Achievement* (pp. 303–327). Academic Press. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-012064455-1/50018-X>
- Cohen, G. L., Steele, C. M., & Ross, L. D. (1999). The mentor’s dilemma: Providing critical feedback across the racial divide. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *25*(10), 1302–1318. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167299258011>
- Cohen, L. L., & Swim, J. K. (1995). The differential impact of gender ratios on women and men: Tokenism, self-confidence, and expectations. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *21*(9), 876–884. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167295219001>
- Cole, E. R., & Harper, S. R. (2017). Race and rhetoric: An analysis of college presidents’ statements on campus racial incidents. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, *10*(4), 318–333. <https://doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000044>
- Covarrubias, R. (2024). On being accepted: Interrogating how university cultural scripts shape personal and political facets of belonging. *Educational Psychology Review*, *36*(4), 136. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-024-09970-2>
- Covarrubias, R., Herrmann, S. D., & Fryberg, S. A. (2016). Affirming the interdependent self: Implications for Latino student performance. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, *38*(1), 47–57. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01973533.2015.1129609>

- Covarrubias, R., Laiduc, G., Quinteros, K., & Arreaga, J. (2023). Lessons on servingness from mentoring program leaders at a Hispanic Serving Institution. *Journal of Leadership, Equity, and Research*, 9(2), 75–91.
- Covarrubias, R., Laiduc, G., & Valle, I. (2022). What institutions can learn from the navigational capital of minoritized students. *Journal of First-Generation Student Success*, 2(1), 36–53.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/26906015.2022.2065109>
- Cyr, E. N., Kroeper, K. M., Bergsieker, H. B., Dennehy, T. C., Logel, C., Steele, J. R., Knasel, R. A., Hartwig, W. T., Shum, P., Reeves, S. L., Dys-Steenbergen, O., Litt, A., Lok, C. B., Ballinger, T., Nam, H., Tse, C., Forest, A. L., Zanna, M., Staub-French, S., ... Spencer, S. J. (2024). Girls are good at STEM: Opening minds and providing evidence reduces boys' stereotyping of girls' STEM ability. *Child Development*, 95(2), 636–647.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.14007>
- Dasgupta, N., Scircle, M. M., & Hunsinger, M. (2015). Female peers in small work groups enhance women's motivation, verbal participation, and career aspirations in engineering. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 112(16), 4988–4993.
<https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1422822112>
- Datnow, A., Hubbard, L., & Mehan, H. (2002). *Extending educational reform*. Taylor & Francis.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203993965>
- Davis, M., Dias-Bowie, Y., Greenberg, K., Klukken, G., Pollio, H. R., Thomas, S. P., & Thompson, C. L. (2004). "A fly in the buttermilk": Descriptions of university life by successful Black undergraduate students at a predominately White southeastern university. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 75(4), 420–445.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2004.11772266>

Deci, E. L., Vallerand, R. J., Pelletier, L. G., & Ryan, R. M. (1991). Motivation and education: The self-determination perspective. *Educational Psychologist*, 26(3–4), 325–346.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.1991.9653137>

Dee, T. S. (2004). Teachers, race, and student achievement in a randomized experiment. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 86(1), 195–210.

<https://doi.org/10.1162/003465304323023750>

Deil-Amen, R., & Rosenbaum, J. E. (2003). The social prerequisites of success: Can college structure reduce the need for social know-how? *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 586(1), 120–143.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0002716202250216>

Demszky, D., Williams, C. L., Brady, S. T., Subrahmanya, S., Gaudiello, E., Walton, G. M., & Eichstaedt, J. C. (under review). *Computational language analysis reveals that process-oriented thinking about belonging aids the college transition.*

Dennehy, T. C., & Dasgupta, N. (2017). Female peer mentors early in college increase women's positive academic experiences and retention in engineering. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 114(23), 5964–5969. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1613117114>

Derricks, V., Pietri, E. S., Dinh, T., & Johnson, I. R. (2023). Examining the context and content of organizational solidarity statements on Black Americans' expectations of identity safety. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 01461672231208508.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/01461672231208508>

Destin, M. (2020). Identity research that engages contextual forces to reduce socioeconomic disparities in education. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 29(2), 161–166.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721420901588>

- 1
2
3
4 Diekman, A. B., Brown, E. R., Johnston, A. M., & Clark, E. K. (2010). Seeking congruity
5
6 between goals and roles: A new look at why women opt out of science, technology,
7
8 engineering, and mathematics careers. *Psychological Science*, *21*(8), 1051–1057.
9
10 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797610377342>
11
12
13
14 Diekman, A. B., Joshi, M. P., White, A. D., Tran, Q.-A. N., & Seth, J. (2024). Purpose reflection
15
16 benefits minoritized students' motivation and well-being in STEM. *Scientific Reports*,
17
18 *14*(1), Article 1. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-023-50302-1>
19
20
21 Drake, J. K. (2011). The role of academic advising in student retention and persistence. *About*
22
23 *Campus*, *16*(3), 8–12. <https://doi.org/10.1002/abc.20062>
24
25
26 Ellis, J. M., Powell, C. S., Demetriou, C. P., Huerta-Bapat, C., & Panter, A. T. (2019).
27
28 Examining first-generation college student lived experiences with microaggressions and
29
30 microaffirmations at a predominately White public research university. *Cultural Diversity*
31
32 *and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, *25*(2), 266–279. <https://doi.org/10.1037/cdp0000198>
33
34
35
36 Ellsworth, D., Harding, E., Law, J., & Pinder, D. (2022). *Racial and ethnic equity in US higher*
37
38 *education*. McKinsey & Company. [https://www.mckinsey.com/industries/education/our-](https://www.mckinsey.com/industries/education/our-insights/racial-and-ethnic-equity-in-US-higher-education#/)
39
40 [insights/racial-and-ethnic-equity-in-US-higher-education#/
41
42](https://www.mckinsey.com/industries/education/our-insights/racial-and-ethnic-equity-in-US-higher-education#/)
43 Emerson, K. T. U., & Murphy, M. C. (2014). Identity threat at work: How social identity threat
44
45 and situational cues contribute to racial and ethnic disparities in the workplace. *Cultural*
46
47 *Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, *20*(4), 508–520.
48
49 <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0035403>
50
51
52
53 Emerson, K. T. U., & Murphy, M. C. (2015). A company I can trust? Organizational lay theories
54
55 moderate stereotype threat for women. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*,
56
57 *41*(2), 295–307. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167214564969>
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- Erman, S., & Walton, G. M. (2014). Stereotype threat and antidiscrimination law: Affirmative steps to promote meritocracy and racial equality in education. *Southern California Law Review*, *88*(2), 307–378.
- Fisher, A. J., Mendoza-Denton, R., Patt, C., Young, I., Eppig, A., Garrell, R. L., Rees, D. C., Nelson, T. W., & Richards, M. A. (2019). Structure and belonging: Pathways to success for underrepresented minority and women PhD students in STEM fields. *PLOS ONE*, *14*(1), e0209279. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0209279>
- Fong, C. J., Adelugba, S. F., Garza, M., Pinto, G. L., Gonzales, C., Zarei, P., & Rozek, C. S. (2024). A scoping review of the associations between sense of belonging and academic outcomes in postsecondary education. *Educational Psychology Review*, *36*(4), 138. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-024-09974-y>
- Fong, C. J., Owens, S. L., Segovia, J., Hoff, M. A., & Alejandro, A. J. (2023). Indigenous cultural development and academic achievement of tribal community college students: Mediating roles of sense of belonging and support for student success. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, *16*(6), 709–722. <https://doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000370>
- Fredericks, A., Engerman, K., & McKayle, C. M. (2021). Providing the opportunity to learn: Unpacking the role of mindsets and leadership in broadening participation in STEM at HBCUs. *American Journal of Applied Psychology*, *10*(5), 110. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ajap.20211005.12>
- Freeman, T. M., Anderman, L. H., & Jensen, J. M. (2007). Sense of belonging in college freshmen at the classroom and campus levels. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, *75*(3), 203–220. <https://doi.org/10.3200/JEXE.75.3.203-220>

- Fryberg, S. A., & Markus, H. R. (2007). Cultural models of education in American Indian, Asian American and European American contexts. *Social Psychology of Education, 10*(2), 213–246. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-007-9017-z>
- Garces, L. M., & Jayakumar, U. M. (2014). Dynamic diversity: Toward a contextual understanding of critical mass. *Educational Researcher, 43*(3), 115–124. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X14529814>
- Gehlbach, H., Brinkworth, M. E., King, A. M., Hsu, L. M., McIntyre, J., & Rogers, T. (2016). Creating birds of similar feathers: Leveraging similarity to improve teacher–student relationships and academic achievement. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 108*(3), 342–352. <https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000042>
- Gelman, A. (2015). The connection between varying treatment effects and the crisis of unreplicable research: A bayesian perspective. *Journal of Management, 41*(2), 632–643. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206314525208>
- Georgeac, O. A. M., & Rattan, A. (2023). The business case for diversity backfires: Detrimental effects of organizations’ instrumental diversity rhetoric for underrepresented group members’ sense of belonging. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 124*(1), 69–108. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspi0000394>
- Gershenson, S., Hart, C. M. D., Hyman, J., Lindsay, C. A., & Papageorge, N. W. (2022). The long-run impacts of same-race teachers. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy, 14*(4), 300–342. <https://doi.org/10.1257/pol.20190573>
- Gilbertson, M. K., Brady, S. T., Ablorh, T., Logel, C., & Schnitker, S. A. (2022). Closeness to God, spiritual struggles, and wellbeing in the first year of college. *Frontiers in Psychology, 13*. <https://www.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.742265>

- 1
2
3
4 Gillen-O’Neel, C. (2021). Sense of belonging and student engagement: A daily study of first-
5
6 and continuing-generation college students. *Research in Higher Education*, 62(1), 45–71.
7
8 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-019-09570-y>
9
10
11 Good, C., Rattan, A., & Dweck, C. S. (2012). Why do women opt out? Sense of belonging and
12
13 women’s representation in mathematics. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*,
14
15 102(4), 700–717. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0026659>
16
17
18
19 Goodenow, C. (1993). Classroom belonging among early adolescent students: Relationships to
20
21 motivation and achievement. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, 13(1), 21–43.
22
23 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0272431693013001002>
24
25
26 Gopalan, M., & Brady, S. T. (2019). College students’ sense of belonging: A national
27
28 perspective. *Educational Researcher*, 0013189X19897622.
29
30 <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X19897622>
31
32
33 Graham, S., Kogachi, K., & Morales-Chicas, J. (2022). Do I fit in: Race/ethnicity and feelings of
34
35 belonging in school. *Educational Psychology Review*, 34(4), 2015–2042.
36
37 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-022-09709-x>
38
39
40
41 Gray, D. L., Ali, J. N., McElveen, T. L., & Sealy, M. (2022). The cultural significance of “we-
42
43 ness”: Motivationally influential practices rooted in a scholarly agenda on Black
44
45 education. *Educational Psychology Review*, 34(4), 1985–2013.
46
47 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-022-09708-y>
48
49
50
51 Gray, D. L., Hope, E. C., & Matthews, J. S. (2018). Black and belonging at school: A case for
52
53 interpersonal, instructional, and institutional opportunity structures. *Educational*
54
55 *Psychologist*, 53(2), 97–113. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2017.1421466>
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 Green, D. J., Kroeper, K. M., & Murphy, M. C. (2024). Cuing disparities: The consequences of
5
6 race-based social stressors for academic achievement. *Journal of Community & Applied*
7
8 *Social Psychology, 34*(1), e2747. <https://doi.org/10.1002/casp.2747>
9
10
- 11 Hahn, P. R., Murray, J. S., & Carvalho, C. M. (2020). Bayesian regression tree models for causal
12
13 inference: Regularization, confounding, and heterogeneous effects (with discussion).
14
15 *Bayesian Analysis, 15*(3), 965–1056. <https://doi.org/10.1214/19-BA1195>
16
17
- 18 Hallinan, M. T. (2008). Teacher influences on students' attachment to school. *Sociology of*
19
20 *Education, 81*(3), 271–283. <https://doi.org/10.1177/003804070808100303>
21
22
- 23 Harackiewicz, J. M., Canning, E. A., Tibbetts, Y., Priniski, S. J., & Hyde, J. S. (2016). Closing
24
25 achievement gaps with a utility-value intervention: Disentangling race and social class.
26
27 *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 111*(5), 745–765.
28
29 <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000075>
30
31
- 32 Hausmann, L. R. M., Schofield, J. W., & Woods, R. L. (2007). Sense of belonging as a predictor
33
34 of intentions to persist among African American and White first-year college students.
35
36 *Research in Higher Education, 48*(7), 803–839. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-007-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-007-9052-9)
37
38
39
40
41
42 9052-9
- 43 Hecht, C. A., Bryan, C. J., & Yeager, D. S. (2023). A values-aligned intervention fosters growth
44
45 mindset–supportive teaching and reduces inequality in educational outcomes.
46
47 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 120*(25), e2210704120.
48
49 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2210704120>
50
51
- 52 Hecht, C. A., Dweck, C. S., Murphy, M. C., Kroeper, K. M., & Yeager, D. S. (2023). Efficiently
53
54 exploring the causal role of contextual moderators in behavioral science. *Proceedings of*
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 *the National Academy of Sciences*, 120(1), e2216315120.
5
6 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2216315120>
7
8
- 9 Hecht, C. A., Harackiewicz, J. M., Priniski, S. J., Canning, E. A., Tibbetts, Y., & Hyde, J. S.
10
11 (2019). Promoting persistence in the biological and medical sciences: An expectancy-
12 value approach to intervention. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 111(8), 1462–1477.
13
14 <https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000356>
15
16
- 17 Hoffman, M., Richmond, J., Morrow, J., & Salomone, K. (2002). Investigating “sense of
18 belonging” in first-year college students. *Journal of College Student Retention: Research,*
19 *Theory & Practice*, 4(3), 227–256. <https://doi.org/10.2190/DRYC-CXQ9-JQ8V-HT4V>
20
21
22
23
- 24 Hu, S., & Ma, Y. (2010). Mentoring and student persistence in college: A study of the
25 Washington State Achievers Program. *Innovative Higher Education*, 35(5), 329–341.
26
27 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-010-9147-7>
28
29
30
- 31 Hulleman, C., & Harackiewicz, J. (2020). The utility-value intervention. In G. M. Walton & A. J.
32 Crum (Eds.), *Handbook of Wise Interventions*. Guilford Publications.
33
34
35
- 36 Hurtado, S., Alvarez, C. L., Guillermo-Wann, C., Cuellar, M., & Arellano, L. (2012). A model
37 for diverse learning environments. In J. C. Smart & M. B. Paulsen (Eds.), *Higher*
38 *Education: Handbook of Theory and Research: Volume 27* (pp. 41–122). Springer
39 Netherlands. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-2950-6_2
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
- 48 Hurtado, S., & Carter, D. F. (1997). Effects of college transition and perceptions of the campus
49 racial climate on Latino college students’ sense of belonging. *Sociology of Education*,
50 70(4), 324–345. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2673270>
51
52
53
54
- 55 Hurtado, S., Milem, J., Clayton-Pedersen, A., & Allen, W. (1999). *Enacting diverse learning*
56 *environments: Improving the climate for racial/ethnic diversity in higher education*.
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, One Dupont Circle, N.

<https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED430514>

Hurtado, S., Milem, J. F., Clayton-Pedersen, A. R., & Allen, W. R. (1998). Enhancing campus climates for racial/ethnic diversity: Educational policy and practice. *The Review of Higher Education*, 21(3), 279–302.

Hurtado, S., & Ruiz Alvarado, A. (2015). *Discrimination and bias, underrepresentation, and sense of belonging on campus* [Report]. HERI.

<https://vtechworks.lib.vt.edu/handle/10919/83064>

Hussain, M., & Jones, J. M. (2021). Discrimination, diversity, and sense of belonging: Experiences of students of color. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 14(1), 63–71.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000117>

Inwood, J. F. J., & Martin, D. G. (2008). Whitewash: White privilege and racialized landscapes at the University of Georgia. *Social & Cultural Geography*, 9(4), 373–395.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/14649360802033882>

Jansen, W. S., Otten, S., & van der Zee, K. I. (2015). Being part of diversity: The effects of an all-inclusive multicultural diversity approach on majority members' perceived inclusion and support for organizational diversity efforts. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*,

18(6), 817–832. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430214566892>

Jayakumar, U. M., & Museus, S. D. (2012). Mapping the intersection of campus cultures and equitable outcomes among racially diverse student populations. In S. D. Museus & U. M. Jayakumar (Eds.), *Creating Campus Cultures: Fostering Success Among Racially Diverse Student Populations* (pp. 1–27). Routledge.

- Jehangir, R. (2010). Stories as knowledge: Bringing the Lived experience of first-generation college students into the academy. *Urban Education, 45*(4), 533–553.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085910372352>
- Jenkins, D. A., Tichavakunda, A. A., & Coles, J. A. (2021). The second ID: Critical race counterstories of campus police interactions with Black men at Historically White Institutions. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 24*(2), 149–166.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2020.1753672>
- Johnson, J. M., Scott, S., Phillips, T., & Rush, A. (2022). Ivy issues: An exploration of black students' racialized interactions on Ivy League campuses. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education. https://doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000406*
- Kahu, E. R., Ashley, N., & Picton, C. (2022). Exploring the complexity of first-year student belonging in higher education: Familiarity, interpersonal, and academic belonging. *Student Success, 13*(2), 10–20. <https://doi.org/10.3316/informit.544244789917082>
- Kanter, R. M. (1977). Some effects of proportions on group life: Skewed sex ratios and responses to token women. *American Journal of Sociology, 82*(5), 965–990.
<https://doi.org/10.1086/226425>
- Kaplan, A. (2023). A framework for approaching policy-oriented educational psychology research. *Educational Psychologist, 58*(4), 229–243.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2023.2253301>
- Kaplan, A., Cromley, J., Perez, T., Dai, T., Mara, K., & Balsai, M. (2020). The role of context in educational RCT findings: A call to redefine “evidence-based practice.” *Educational Researcher, 49*(4), 285–288. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X20921862>

- 1
2
3
4 Kardosh, R., Sklar, A. Y., Goldstein, A., Pertzov, Y., & Hassin, R. R. (2022). Minority salience
5
6 and the overestimation of individuals from minority groups in perception and memory.
7
8 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *119*(12), e2116884119.
9
10 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2116884119>
11
12
- 13
14 Keels, M., Durkee, M., & Hope, E. (2017). The psychological and academic costs of school-
15
16 based racial and ethnic microaggressions. *American Educational Research Journal*,
17
18 *54*(6), 1316–1344. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831217722120>
19
20
- 21 Keller, J., & Sekaquaptewa, D. (2008). Solo status and women’s spatial test performance: The
22
23 role of individuation tendencies. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *38*(6), 1044–
24
25 1053. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.490>
26
27
- 28 Kennedy, K. R., & Brauer, M. (2024). Inclusive teaching practices and other strategies to
29
30 promote equity and belonging. In C. A. Sanderson & R. Totton (Eds.), *Teaching Social*
31
32 *Psychology*. Edward Elgar Publishing, Inc.
33
34 [https://www.elgaronline.com/edcollchap/book/9781035327133/book-part-](https://www.elgaronline.com/edcollchap/book/9781035327133/book-part-9781035327133-14.xml)
35
36 [9781035327133-14.xml](https://www.elgaronline.com/edcollchap/book/9781035327133/book-part-9781035327133-14.xml)
37
38
39
- 40 Kraft, M. A., Bolves, A. J., & Hurd, N. M. (2023). How informal mentoring by teachers,
41
42 counselors, and coaches supports students’ long-run academic success. *Economics of*
43
44 *Education Review*, *95*, 102411. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2023.102411>
45
46
47
- 48 Kroeper, K. M., Fried, A. C., & Murphy, M. C. (2022). Towards fostering growth mindset
49
50 classrooms: Identifying teaching behaviors that signal instructors’ fixed and growth
51
52 mindset beliefs to students. *Social Psychology of Education*, *25*(2), 371–398.
53
54
55 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-022-09689-4>
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Kroeper, K. M., Hernandez-Colmenares, A., Green, D. J., Williams, H. E., Kuzdal, A., Ospina, J., Moore, C. A., Agarwal, G., Heckler, A. F., Crocker, J., Fujita, K., Murphy, M. C., & Spencer, S. J. (under review). *How do you measure a threat in the air? Testing the universal, dynamic, and multifaceted nature of social identity threat.*

Kroeper, K. M., Hildebrand, L. K., Jiang, T., Hernandez-Colmenares, A., Brown, K., Wilk, A. V., Spencer, S. J., Heckler, A. F., & Fujita, K. (2025). The recursive cycle of perceived mindset and psychological distress in college. *Social Psychological and Personality Science, 16*(1), 15–26. <https://doi.org/10.1177/19485506241247384>

Kroeper, K. M., Muenks, K., Canning, E. A., & Murphy, M. C. (2022). An exploratory study of the behaviors that communicate perceived instructor mindset beliefs in college STEM classrooms. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 114*, 103717. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2022.103717>

Kroeper, K. M., & Murphy, M. C. (2017). Supporting college and career readiness through social psychological interventions. In K. L. McClarty, K. D. Mattern, & M. N. Gaertner (Eds.), *Preparing Students for College and Careers* (1st ed., pp. 142–152). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315621975-13>

Kroeper, K. M., Williams, H. E., & Murphy, M. C. (2022). Counterfeit diversity: How strategically misrepresenting gender diversity dampens organizations' perceived sincerity and elevates women's identity threat concerns. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 122*(3), 399–426. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspi0000348>

Krusemark, S. (2012). The campus as stage: A qualitative study of the hypervisibility and invisibility of African American female identity in the built campus environment. *Journal of Research on Women and Gender, 4*, 25–51.

- 1
2
3
4 Kumar, R., McKether, W., & Adams, A. (2019, April). Belongingness uncertainty: A
5
6 comparative study of African-American engineering students' experiences at PWI and
7
8 HBCU. *Annual Meeting Program American Educational Research Association*.
9
10 American Educational Research Association. [https://par.nsf.gov/biblio/10162666-](https://par.nsf.gov/biblio/10162666-belongingness-uncertainty-comparative-study-african-american-engineering-students-experiences-pwi-hbcu)
11
12 [belongingness-uncertainty-comparative-study-african-american-engineering-students-](https://par.nsf.gov/biblio/10162666-belongingness-uncertainty-comparative-study-african-american-engineering-students-experiences-pwi-hbcu)
13
14 [experiences-pwi-hbcu](https://par.nsf.gov/biblio/10162666-belongingness-uncertainty-comparative-study-african-american-engineering-students-experiences-pwi-hbcu)
15
16
17
18
19 LaCosse, J., Canning, E. A., Bowman, N. A., Murphy, M. C., & Logel, C. (2020). A social-
20
21 belonging intervention improves STEM outcomes for students who speak English as a
22
23 second language. *Science Advances*, 6(40), eabb6543.
24
25
26 <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.abb6543>
27
28
29 LaCosse, J., Murphy, M. C., Garcia, J. A., & Zirkel, S. (2021). The role of STEM professors'
30
31 mindset beliefs on students' anticipated psychological experiences and course interest.
32
33 *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 113(5), 949–971.
34
35
36 <https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000620>
37
38
39 Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). But that's just good teaching! The case for culturally relevant
40
41 pedagogy. *Theory Into Practice*, 34(3), 159–165.
42
43
44 <https://doi.org/10.1080/00405849509543675>
45
46
47 Laiduc, G., & Covarrubias, R. (2022). Making meaning of the hidden curriculum: Translating
48
49 wise interventions to usher university change. *Translational Issues in Psychological*
50
51 *Science*, 8(2), 221–233. <https://doi.org/10.1037/tps0000309>
52
53
54 Langhout, R. D., Drake, P., & Rosselli, F. (2009). Classism in the university setting: Examining
55
56 student antecedents and outcomes. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 2(3), 166–
57
58 181. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0016209>
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 Leslie, L. M. (2019). Diversity initiative effectiveness: A typological theory of unintended
5
6 consequences. *Academy of Management Review*, *44*(3), 538–563.
7
8
9 <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2017.0087>
10
- 11 Levin, S., Van Laar, C., & Foote, W. (2006). Ethnic segregation and perceived discrimination in
12
13 college: Mutual influences and effects on social and academic life. *Journal of Applied*
14
15 *Social Psychology*, *36*(6), 1471–1501. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0021-9029.2006.00068.x>
16
17
18
- 19 Lewis, C., Bruno, P., Raygoza, J., & Wang, J. (2019). Alignment of goals and perceptions of
20
21 computing predicts students’ sense of belonging in computing. *Proceedings of the 2019*
22
23 *ACM Conference on International Computing Education Research*, 11–19.
24
25
26 <https://doi.org/10.1145/3291279.3339426>
27
- 28 Lewis, J. A., Mendenhall, R., Ojiemwen, A., Thomas, M., Riopelle, C., Harwood, S. A., &
29
30 Browne Hunt, M. (2021). Racial microaggressions and sense of belonging at a
31
32 historically White university. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *65*(8), 1049–1071.
33
34
35 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764219859613>
36
37
- 38 Lewis, K. R., & Shah, P. P. (2021). Black students’ narratives of diversity and inclusion
39
40 initiatives and the campus racial climate: An interest-convergence analysis. *Journal of*
41
42 *Diversity in Higher Education*, *14*(2), 189–202. <https://doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000147>
43
44
- 45 Lieng, N., Morín, J. L., Huynh, Q.-L., & Oh, J. S. (2024). *A framework for more intentional and*
46
47 *equity-minded race data disaggregation* (169). Association for Institutional Research.
48
49
50 <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED664659>
51
52
- 53 Limeri, L. B., Asif, M. Z., Bridges, B. H. T., Esparza, D., Tuma, T. T., Sanders, D., Morrison, A.
54
55 J., Rao, P., Harsh, J. A., Maltese, A. V., & Dolan, E. L. (2019). “Where’s my mentor?!”
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- Characterizing negative mentoring experiences in undergraduate life science research.
CBE—Life Sciences Education, 18(4), ar61. <https://doi.org/10.1187/cbe.19-02-0036>
- Locks, A. M., Hurtado, S., Bowman, N. A., & Oseguera, L. (2008). Extending notions of campus climate and diversity to students' transition to college. *The Review of Higher Education*, 31(3), 257–285.
- Lockwood, P., & Kunda, Z. (1997). Superstars and me: Predicting the impact of role models on the self. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73(1), 91–103.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.73.1.91>
- Logel, C., Le Forestier, J. M., Witherspoon, E. B., & Fotuhi, O. (2021). A social-belonging intervention benefits higher weight students' weight stability and academic achievement. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 12(6), 1048–1057.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550620959236>
- Logel, C. R., Walton, G. M., Spencer, S. J., Peach, J., & Mark, Z. P. (2012). Unleashing latent ability: Implications of stereotype threat for college admissions. *Educational Psychologist*, 47(1), 42–50. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2011.611368>
- Logel, C., Walton, G. M., Spencer, S. J., Iserman, E. C., von Hippel, W., & Bell, A. E. (2009). Interacting with sexist men triggers social identity threat among female engineers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 96(6), 1089–1103.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0015703>
- Loo, C. M., & Rolison, G. (1986). Alienation of ethnic minority students at a predominantly White university. *The Journal of Higher Education*.
<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/00221546.1986.11778749>

- López, C. M., Kelly, K., Maloles, C., Avila, K., & Nolasco, C. (2024). Critical approaches to mentorship: Creating access and equity for undergraduate research experiences. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000531>
- Lord, C. G., & Saenz, D. S. (1985). Memory deficits and memory surfeits: Differential cognitive consequences of tokenism for tokens and observers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *49*(4), 918–926. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.49.4.918>
- Mallett, R. K., Mello, Z. R., Wagner, D. E., Worrell, F., Burrow, R. N., & Andretta, J. R. (2011). Do I belong? It depends on when you ask. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, *17*(4), 432–436. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0025455>
- Markus, H. R., Steele, C. M., & Steele, D. M. (2000). Colorblindness as a barrier to inclusion: Assimilation and nonimmigrant minorities. *Daedalus*, *129*(4), 233–259. JSTOR.
- McGuire, W. J., McGuire, C. V., Child, P., & Fujioka, T. (1978). Salience of ethnicity in the spontaneous self-concept as a function of one's ethnic distinctiveness in the social environment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *36*(5), 511–520. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.36.5.511>
- McPartlan, P., Solanki, S., Xu, D., & Sato, B. (2020). Testing basic assumptions reveals when (not) to expect mindset and belonging interventions to succeed. *AERA Open*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2332858420966994>
- Mendoza-Denton, R., & Page-Gould, E. (2008). Can cross-group friendships influence minority students' well-being at historically White universities? *Psychological Science*, *19*(9), 933–939. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2008.02179.x>
- Milkman, K. L., Akinola, M., & Chugh, D. (2015). What happens before? A field experiment exploring how pay and representation differentially shape bias on the pathway into

organizations. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, *100*(6), 1678–1712.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000022>

Miller, A. L., Williams, L. M., & Silberstein, S. M. (2019). Found my place: The importance of faculty relationships for seniors' sense of belonging. *Higher Education Research & Development*, *38*(3), 594–608. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2018.1551333>

Morales, E. M. (2014). Intersectional impact: Black students and race, gender and class microaggressions in higher education. *Race, Gender & Class*, *21*(3/4), 48–66.

Moss-Racusin, C. A., Dovidio, J. F., Brescoll, V. L., Graham, M. J., & Handelsman, J. (2012). Science faculty's subtle gender biases favor male students. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *109*(41), 16474–16479. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1211286109>

Muenks, K., Canning, E. A., LaCosse, J., Green, D. J., Zirkel, S., Garcia, J. A., & Murphy, M. C. (2020). Does my professor think my ability can change? Students' perceptions of their STEM professors' mindset beliefs predict their psychological vulnerability, engagement, and performance in class. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1037/xge0000763>

Muenks, K., Kroeper, K. M., Canning, E. A., & Murphy, M. C. (2024). Instructor mindset beliefs and behaviors: How do students and instructors perceive them? *Social Psychology of Education*, *27*(6), 2883–2899. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-024-09948-6>

Muenks, K., Sievers, J., Kroeper, K. M., & Canning, E. A. (in press). Exploring effects of mixed mindset messages from instructors. *Motivation Science*. <https://doi.org/10.1037/mot0000381>

Muragishi, G. A., Aguilar, L., Carr, P. B., & Walton, G. M. (2023). Microinclusions: Treating women as respected work partners increases a sense of fit in technology companies.

- Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, No Pagination Specified-No Pagination Specified. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspi0000430>
- Muraki, E. J., Atay, E. J., Chadwick, L., van der Wijk, G., Mori, C. M., Murry, A. T., & Exner-Cortens, D. (2024). Affinity and allyship groups to advance inclusion in postsecondary institutions: A systematic scoping review. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, No Pagination Specified-No Pagination Specified. <https://doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000543>
- Murphy, M. C., Emerson, K. T. U., Kroeper, K. M., & Green, D. J. (2025). The evolution of mindset research: Forging connections across individuals, situations, and cultures. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*.
- Murphy, M. C., Fryberg, S., Brady, L., Canning, E. A., & Hecht, C. (2021). Global mindset initiative paper 1: Growth mindset cultures and teacher practices. *SSRN*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3911594>
- Murphy, M. C., Gopalan, M., Carter, E. R., Emerson, K. T. U., Bottoms, B. L., & Walton, G. M. (2020). A customized belonging intervention improves retention of socially disadvantaged students at a broad-access university. *Science Advances*, *6*(29), eaba4677. <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.aba4677>
- Murphy, M. C., Kroeper, K. M., & Ozier, E. M. (2018). Prejudiced places: How contexts shape inequality and how policy can change them. *Policy Insights from the Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *5*(1), 66–74. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2372732217748671>
- Murphy, M. C., Richeson, J. A., Shelton, J. N., Rheinschmidt, M. L., & Bergsieker, H. B. (2013). Cognitive costs of contemporary prejudice. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, *16*(5), 560–571. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430212468170>

- Murphy, M. C., Steele, C. M., & Gross, J. J. (2007). Signaling threat: How situational cues affect women in math, science, and engineering settings. *Psychological Science, 18*(10), 879–885. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2007.01995.x>
- Murphy, M. C., & Taylor, V. J. (2012). The role of situational cues in signaling and maintaining stereotype threat. In M. Inzlicht & T. Schmader (Eds.), *Stereotype Threat: Theory, Process, and Application* (pp. 17–33). Oxford University Press.
- Murphy, M. C., & Zirkel, S. (2015). Race and belonging in school: How anticipated and experienced belonging affect choice, persistence, and performance. *Teachers College Record, 117*, 1–40. <https://doi.org/10.1177/016146811511701204>
- Murrar, S., Campbell, M. R., & Brauer, M. (2020). Exposure to peers' pro-diversity attitudes increases inclusion and reduces the achievement gap. *Nature Human Behaviour, 1*–9. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-020-0899-5>
- Museus, S. D., Yi, V., & Saelua, N. (2018). How culturally engaging campus environments influence sense of belonging in college: An examination of differences between White students and students of color. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 11*(4), 467–483. <https://doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000069>
- Myers, K., Trull, L. H., Bryson, B. J., & Yeom, H. S. (2019). Affinity groups: Redefining brave spaces. *Journal of Baccalaureate Social Work, 24*(1), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.18084/1084-7219.24.1.1>
- Norman, J. B., Fuesting, M. A., Geerling, D. M., Chen, J. M., Gable, S. L., & Diekman, A. B. (2022). To pursue or not to pursue STEM? Faculty behavior enhances student involvement in STEM roles by signaling role-specific support. *Social Psychological and Personality Science, 13*(2), 583–594. <https://doi.org/10.1177/19485506211035003>

1
2
3
4 Odle, T., Gottfried, M., Miller, T., & Andrews, R. (2023). Who's matched up? Access to same-
5
6 race instructors in higher education. *SSRN Electronic Journal*.

7
8
9 <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4478744>

10
11 Offidani-Bertrand, C., Velez, G., Benz, C., & Keels, M. (2022). "I wasn't expecting it": High
12
13 school experiences and navigating belonging in the transition to college. *Emerging*
14
15 *Adulthood*, 10(1), 212–224. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2167696819882117>

16
17
18 O'Keefe, P. A., Dweck, C. S., & Walton, G. M. (2018). Implicit theories of interest: Finding
19
20 your passion or developing it? *Psychological Science*, 29(10), 1653–1664.

21
22
23 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797618780643>

24
25
26 O'Keefe, P. A., Horberg, E. J., Dweck, C. S., & Walton, G. M. (2023). A growth-theory-of-
27
28 interest intervention increases interest in math and science coursework among liberal arts
29
30 undergraduates. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 115(6), 859–876.

31
32
33 <https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000798>

34
35
36 Okonofua, J. A., Harris, L. T., & Walton, G. M. (2022). Sideline bias: A situationist approach
37
38 to reduce the consequences of bias in real-world contexts. *Current Directions in*
39
40 *Psychological Science*, 09637214221102422.

41
42
43 <https://doi.org/10.1177/09637214221102422>

44
45
46 Ornstein, A. (2019). Wealth, legacy and college admission. *Society*, 56(4), 335–339.

47
48
49 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12115-019-00377-2>

50
51 Ostrove, J. M., & Long, S. M. (2007). Social class and belonging: Implications for college
52
53 adjustment. *The Review of Higher Education*, 30(4), 363–389.

54
55
56 Ozier, E. M. (2023). *Motives matter: Communicating STEM faculty mindset beliefs through*
57
58 *course syllabi* [Indiana University].

<https://www.proquest.com/openview/2bcfe8379918eeabfcbdbe5d12a37500/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750&diss=y>

Palmer, R., & Gasman, M. (2008). “It takes a village to raise a child”: The role of social capital in promoting academic success for African American men at a Black college. *Journal of College Student Development*, 49(1), 52–70.

Paradies, Y., Ben, J., Denson, N., Elias, A., Priest, N., Pieterse, A., Gupta, A., Kelaher, M., & Gee, G. (2015). Racism as a determinant of health: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLOS ONE*, 10(9), e0138511. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0138511>

Patton, L. D. (Ed.). (2023). *Culture centers in higher education: Perspectives on identity, theory, and practice*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003443971>

Pettigrew, T. F. (1998). Intergroup contact theory. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 49, 65–85. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.49.1.65>

Pietri, E. S., Drawbaugh, M. L., Lewis, A. N., & Johnson, I. R. (2019). Who encourages Latina women to feel a sense of identity-safety in STEM environments? *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 84, 103827. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2019.103827>

Pietri, E. S., Johnson, I. R., & Ozgumus, E. (2018). One size may not fit all: Exploring how the intersection of race and gender and stigma consciousness predict effective identity-safe cues for Black women. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 74, 291–306. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2017.06.021>

Pippert, T. D., Essenburg, L. J., & Matchett, E. J. (2013). We’ve got minorities, yes we do: Visual representations of racial and ethnic diversity in college recruitment materials. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, 23(2), 258–282. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08841241.2013.867920>

- 1
2
3
4 Plaut, V. C. (2014). Diversity science and institutional design. *Policy Insights from the*
5
6 *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *1*(1), 72–80. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2372732214550164>
7
8
9 Plaut, V. C., Garnett, F. G., Buffardi, L. E., & Sanchez-Burks, J. (2011). “What about me?”
10
11 Perceptions of exclusion and Whites’ reactions to multiculturalism. *Journal of*
12
13 *Personality and Social Psychology*, *101*(2), 337–353. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0022832>
14
15
16 Plummer, D. L., Allison, J., Stone, R. T., & Powell, L. (2016). Patterns of Adult Cross-Racial
17
18 Friendships: A Context for Understanding Contemporary Race Relations. *Cultural*
19
20 *Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology*, *22*(4), 479–494.
21
22
23 <https://doi.org/10.1037/cdp0000079>
24
25
26 Ponce de Leon, R., Carter, J. T., & Rosette, A. S. (2024). Sincere solidarity or performative
27
28 pretense? Evaluations of organizational allyship. *Organizational Behavior and Human*
29
30 *Decision Processes*, *180*, 104296. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2023.104296>
31
32
33 Purdie-Vaughns, V., Steele, C. M., Davies, P. G., Ditlmann, R., & Crosby, J. R. (2008). Social
34
35 identity contingencies: How diversity cues signal threat or safety for African Americans
36
37 in mainstream institutions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *94*(4), 615–
38
39 630. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.94.4.615>
40
41
42
43 Ragland, K. P., & Sommers, S. R. (2024). Can I see myself there? How Black potential
44
45 applicants use diversity cues to learn about graduate program climate. *Journal of*
46
47 *Experimental Psychology: General*, No Pagination Specified-No Pagination Specified.
48
49
50 <https://doi.org/10.1037/xge0001571>
51
52
53 Rattan, A., Savani, K., Komarraju, M., Morrison, M. M., Boggs, C., & Ambady, N. (2018).
54
55 Meta-lay theories of scientific potential drive underrepresented students’ sense of
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- belonging to science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM). *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 115(1), 54–75. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspi0000130>
- Raudenbush, S. W., & Bryk, A. S. (2002). *Hierarchical linear models: Applications and data analysis methods*. SAGE.
- Redding, C. (2019). A teacher like me: A review of the effect of student–teacher racial/ethnic matching on teacher perceptions of students and student academic and behavioral outcomes. *Review of Educational Research*, 89(4), 499–535. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654319853545>
- Robinson, S. J. (2013). Spoketokenism: Black women talking back about graduate school experiences. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 16(2), 155–181. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2011.645567>
- Rolón-Dow, R., Covarrubias, R., & Guerrón Montero, C. (2022). Shallow inclusion: How Latinx students experience a Predominantly White Institution “doing diversity work.” *Journal of Leadership, Equity, and Research*, 8(2), 135–157.
- Rubin, M., Evans, O., & Wilkinson, R. B. (2016). A longitudinal study of the relations among university students’ subjective social status, social contact with university friends, and mental health and well-being. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 35(9), 722–737. <https://doi.org/10.1521/jscp.2016.35.9.722>
- Rude, J., & Herda, D. (2010). Best friends forever? Race and the stability of adolescent friendships. *Social Forces*, 89(2), 585–607. <https://doi.org/10.1353/sof.2010.0059>
- Sanchez, K. L., Kalkstein, D. A., Hirschi, Q., Corrington, A., Pinedo, A., Brannon, T. N., Stewart, D., Hard, B. M., Harrington, H. M., Templeton, E., & Walton, G. M. (under

review). *Uncomfortable because we care: A friendship-affirming appraisal of race talk strengthens Black-White friendships over time.*

Sanchez, K. L., Kalkstein, D. A., & Walton, G. M. (2022). A threatening opportunity: The prospect of conversations about race-related experiences between Black and White friends. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 122*(5), 853–872.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/pspi0000369>

Sanchez, M. E. (2019). Perceptions of campus climate and experiences of racial microaggressions for Latinos at Hispanic-Serving Institutions. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education, 18*(3), 240–253. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1538192717739351>

Santa-Ramirez, S. (2022). A sense of belonging: The people and counterspaces Latinx undocu/DACAmented collegians use to persist. *Education Sciences, 12*(10), Article 10.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci12100691>

Schroeder, J., & Fishbach, A. (2024). Feeling known predicts relationship satisfaction. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 111*, 1–15.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2023.104559>

Schwartz, S. E. O., Rhodes, J. E., Spencer, R., & Grossman, J. B. (2013). Youth initiated mentoring: Investigating a new approach to working with vulnerable adolescents. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 52*(1), 155–169.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-013-9585-3>

Shelton, J. N., Turetsky, K. M., & Park, Y. (2023). Responsiveness in interracial interactions. *Current Opinion in Psychology, 53*, 101653.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2023.101653>

- 1
2
3
4 Shook, N. J., & Clay, R. (2012). Interracial roommate relationships: A mechanism for promoting
5
6 sense of belonging at university and academic performance. *Journal of Experimental*
7
8 *Social Psychology, 48*(5), 1168–1172. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2012.05.005>
9
10
11 Shook, N. J., & Fazio, R. H. (2008). Interracial roommate relationships: An experimental field
12
13 test of the contact hypothesis. *Psychological Science, 19*(7), 717–723.
14
15
16 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2008.02147.x>
17
18
19 Slaten, C. D., Elison, Z. M., Lee, J.-Y., Yough, M., & Scalise, D. (2016). Belonging on campus:
20
21 A qualitative inquiry of Asian international students. *The Counseling Psychologist, 44*(3),
22
23 383–410. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000016633506>
24
25
26 Slaten, C. D., Yough, M. S., Shemwell, D. A., Scalise, D. A., Elison, Z. M., & Hughes, H. A.
27
28 (2014). Eat, sleep, breathe, study: Understanding what it means to belong at a university
29
30 from the student perspective. *Excellence in Higher Education, 5*(1), Article 1.
31
32 <https://doi.org/10.5195/ehe.2014.117>
33
34
35
36 Smith, E. N., Yeager, D. S., Dweck, C. S., & Walton, G. M. (2022). An organizing framework
37
38 for teaching practices that can “expand” the self and address social identity concerns.
39
40 *Educational Psychology Review, 34*(4), 2197–2219. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-022-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-022-09715-z)
41
42 [09715-z](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-022-09715-z)
43
44
45
46 Smith, W. A., Mustaffa, J. B., Jones, C. M., Curry, T. J., & Allen, W. R. (2016). ‘You make me
47
48 wanna holler and throw up both my hands!’: Campus culture, Black misandric
49
50 microaggressions, and racial battle fatigue. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in*
51
52 *Education, 29*(9), 1189–1209. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2016.1214296>
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Solórzano, D., Ceja, M., & Yosso, T. (2000). Critical race theory, racial microaggressions, and campus racial climate: The experiences of African American college students. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 69(1/2), 60–73.

Spencer, R., Gowdy, G., Drew, A. L., & Rhodes, J. E. (2019). “Who knows me the best and can encourage me the most?”: Matching and early relationship development in youth-initiated mentoring relationships with system-involved youth. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 34(1), 3–29. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0743558418755686>

Spencer, R., Tugenberg, T., Ocean, M., Schwartz, S. E. O., & Rhodes, J. E. (2016). “Somebody who was on my side”: A qualitative examination of youth initiated mentoring. *Youth & Society*, 48(3), 402–424. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0044118X13495053>

Spoor, J. R., Jetten, J., & Hornsey, M. J. (2014). Overplaying the diversity card: When a superordinate group overrepresents the prevalence of a minority group. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 17(2), 161–177. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430213497063>

Starck, J. G., Sinclair, S., & Shelton, J. N. (2021). How university diversity rationales inform student preferences and outcomes. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 118(16), e2013833118. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2013833118>

Steele, C. M., Spencer, S. J., & Aronson, J. (2002). Contending with group image: The psychology of stereotype and social identity threat. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 34, 379–440. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601\(02\)80009-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(02)80009-0)

Stellino, M. (2020, September 11). College students push for race and ethnic studies classes to be required. *The Hechinger Report*. <https://hechingerreport.org/college-students-push-for-race-and-ethnic-studies-classes-to-be-required-but-some-campuses-resist/>

Stephens, N. M., Fryberg, S. A., Markus, H. R., Johnson, C. S., & Covarrubias, R. (2012).

Unseen disadvantage: How American universities' focus on independence undermines the academic performance of first-generation college students. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *102*(6), 1178–1197. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0027143>

Stephens, N. M., Hamedani, M. G., & Destin, M. (2014). Closing the social-class achievement gap: A difference-education intervention improves first-generation students' academic performance and all students' college transition. *Psychological Science*, *25*(4), 943–953. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797613518349>

Stephens, N. M., Hamedani, M. G., & Townsend, S. S. M. (2019). Difference matters: Teaching students a contextual theory of difference can help them succeed. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *14*(2), 156–174. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691618797957>

Stephens, N. M., Markus, H. R., & Fryberg, S. A. (2012). Social class disparities in health and education: Reducing inequality by applying a sociocultural self model of behavior. *Psychological Review*, *119*(4), 723–744. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029028>

Stephens, N. M., Townsend, S. S. M., Markus, H. R., & Phillips, L. T. (2012). A cultural mismatch: Independent cultural norms produce greater increases in cortisol and more negative emotions among first-generation college students. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *48*(6), 1389–1393. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2012.07.008>

Stevens, F. G., Plaut, V. C., & Sanchez-Burks, J. (2008). Unlocking the benefits of diversity: All-inclusive multiculturalism and positive organizational change. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, *44*(1), 116–133. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886308314460>

Strayhorn, T. L. (2018). *College students' sense of belonging: A key to educational success for all students* (2nd ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315297293>

- 1
2
3
4 Strayhorn, T. L. (2023). Widening the aperture on college students' sense of belonging: A
5
6 critical ecological perspective. In T. Lowe (Ed.), *Advancing Student Engagement in*
7
8 *Higher Education: Reflection, Critique and Challenge*. Taylor & Francis.
9
10
11 Stubblebine, A. M., Gopalan, M., & Brady, S. T. (2024). Who feels like they belong? Personality
12
13 and belonging in college. *PLOS ONE*, *19*(1), e0295436.
14
15
16 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0295436>
17
18
19 Students for Fair Admissions, Inc. v. President and Fellows of Harvard College, 20–1199
20
21 (Supreme Court of the United States June 29, 2023).
22
23
24 Tachine, A. R., Cabrera, N. L., & Yellow Bird, E. (2017). Home away from home: Native
25
26 American students' sense of belonging during their first year in college. *The Journal of*
27
28 *Higher Education*, *88*(5), 785–807. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2016.1257322>
29
30
31 Taylor, S. E., Fiske, S. T., Etcoff, N. L., & Ruderman, A. J. (1978). Categorical and contextual
32
33 bases of person memory and stereotyping. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*,
34
35 *36*(7), 778–793. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.36.7.778>
36
37
38 Thébaud, S., & Charles, M. (2018). Segregation, stereotypes, and STEM. *Social Sciences*, *7*(7),
39
40 Article 7. <https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci7070111>
41
42
43 Thelamour, B., George Mwangi, C., & Ezeofor, I. (2019). “We need to stick together for
44
45 survival”: Black college students' racial identity, same-ethnic friendships, and campus
46
47 connectedness. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, *12*(3), 266–279.
48
49
50 <https://doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000104>
51
52
53 Tinto, V. (1988). Stages of student departure: Reflections on the longitudinal character of student
54
55 leaving. *The Journal of Higher Education*.
56
57
58 <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/00221546.1988.11780199>
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- Trail, T. E., Shelton, J. N., & West, T. V. (2009). Interracial roommate relationships: Negotiating daily interactions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 35(6), 671–684.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167209332741>
- Trainor, C. (2025). *Dear Colleague Letter*. Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights.
<https://www.ed.gov/media/document/dear-colleague-letter-sffa-v-harvard-109506.pdf>
- Trawalter, S., Hoffman, K., & Palmer, L. (2021). Out of place: Socioeconomic status, use of public space, and belonging in higher education. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 120(1), 131–144. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspi0000248>
- Valandra, Fields, L., Sebree, W., & Sober, W. (2022). Navigating an anti-Black campus climate: #black@pwi. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 1–18.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2022.2088720>
- Van Gilder, B. J., Amacher, A., & Ault, M. K. (2024). Whiteness, marginalization, and exclusion: An analysis of Tongan students’ experiences in U.S. institutions of higher education. *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication*, 17(1), 56–82.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/17513057.2023.2285767>
- Varty, C. (2022). *I’ll believe it when I see it: Widespread use of organizational diversity statements undermines perceived sincerity and organizational attraction* [York University]. <http://hdl.handle.net/10315/40752>
- Walton, G. M. (2021, November 9). Stop telling students, “You belong!” *Education Week*.
<https://www.edweek.org/leadership/opinion-stop-telling-students-you-belong/2021/11>
- Walton, G. M., & Brady, S. T. (2017). The many questions of belonging. In A. Elliot, C. S. Dweck, & D. S. Yeager (Eds.), *Handbook of Competence and Motivation* (2nd ed., pp. 272–293). Guilford Press.

- Walton, G. M., & Brady, S. T. (2020a). “Bad” things reconsidered. In *Applications of social psychology: How social psychology can contribute to the solution of real-world problems* (pp. 58–81). Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9780367816407-4>
- Walton, G. M., & Brady, S. T. (2020b). The social-belonging intervention. In G. M. Walton & A. J. Crum (Eds.), *Handbook of Wise Interventions: How Social-Psychological Insights Can Help Solve Problems* (p. 47). Guilford Press.
- Walton, G. M., & Cohen, G. L. (2007). A question of belonging: Race, social fit, and achievement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *92*(1), 82–96.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.92.1.82>
- Walton, G. M., & Cohen, G. L. (2011). A brief social-belonging intervention improves academic and health outcomes of minority students. *Science*, *331*(6023), 1447–1451.
<https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1198364>
- Walton, G. M., Cohen, G. L., Cwir, D., & Spencer, S. J. (2012). Mere belonging: The power of social connections. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *102*(3), 513–532.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0025731>
- Walton, G. M., Logel, C., Peach, J. M., Spencer, S. J., & Zanna, M. P. (2015). Two brief interventions to mitigate a “chilly climate” transform women’s experience, relationships, and achievement in engineering. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *107*(2), 468–485.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0037461>
- Walton, G. M., Murphy, M. C., Logel, C., Yeager, D. S., Goyer, J. P., Brady, S. T., Emerson, K. T. U., Paunesku, D., Fotuhi, O., Blodorn, A., Boucher, K. L., Carter, E. R., Gopalan, M., Henderson, A., Kroeper, K. M., Murdock-Perriera, L. A., Reeves, S. L., Ablorh, T. T.,

- 1
2
3
4 Ansari, S., ... Krol, N. (2023). Where and with whom does a brief social-belonging
5
6 intervention promote progress in college? *Science*, 380(6644), 499–505.
7
8 <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.ade4420>
9
- 10
11 Walton, G. M., Murphy, M. C., & Ryan, A. M. (2015). Stereotype threat in organizations:
12
13 Implications for equity and performance. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology*
14 *and Organizational Behavior*, 2(1), 523–550. [https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032414-111322)
15
16 032414-111322
17
18
19
20
- 21 Walton, G. M., Okonofua, J. A., Remington Cunningham, K., Hurst, D., Pinedo, A., Weitz, E.,
22
23 Ospina, J. P., Tate, H., & Eberhardt, J. L. (2021). Lifting the bar: A relationship-orienting
24 intervention reduces recidivism among children reentering school from juvenile
25 detention. *Psychological Science*, 32(11), 1747–1767.
26
27 <https://doi.org/10.1177/09567976211013801>
28
29
30
31
- 32
33 Walton, G. M., & Spencer, S. J. (2009). Latent ability: Grades and test scores systematically
34 underestimate the intellectual ability of negatively stereotyped students. *Psychological*
35 *Science*, 20(9), 1132–1139. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2009.02417.x>
36
37
38
39
40
- 41 Walton, G. M., Spencer, S. J., & Erman, S. (2013). Affirmative meritocracy. *Social Issues and*
42 *Policy Review*, 7(1), 1–35. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-2409.2012.01041.x>
43
44
45
- 46 Walton, G. M., & Wilson, T. D. (2018). Wise interventions: Psychological remedies for social
47 and personal problems. *Psychological Review*, 125(5), 617–655.
48 <https://doi.org/10.1037/rev0000115>
49
50
51
- 52
53 Walton, G. M., & Yeager, D. S. (2020). Seed and soil: Psychological affordances in contexts
54 help to explain where wise interventions succeed or fail. *Current Directions in*
55 *Psychological Science*, 29(3), 219–226. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721420904453>
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
- Watkins, N. D., Larson, R. W., & Sullivan, P. J. (2007). Bridging intergroup difference in a community youth program. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *51*(3), 380–402.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764207306066>
- Whitten, D., James, A., & Roberts, C. (2020). Factors that contribute to a sense of belonging in business students on a small 4-year public commuter campus in the Midwest. *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory & Practice*, *22*(1), 99–117.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1521025117726520>
- Williams, K. L., Russell, A., & Summerville, K. (2021). Centering blackness: An examination of culturally-affirming pedagogy and practices enacted by HBCU administrators and faculty members. *Innovative Higher Education*, *46*(6), 733–757. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-021-09562-w>
- Wilton, L. S., Bell, A. N., Vahradyan, M., & Kaiser, C. R. (2020). Show don't tell: Diversity dishonesty harms racial/ethnic minorities at work. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 0146167219897149. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167219897149>
- Wilton, L. S., Good, J. J., Moss-Racusin, C. A., & Sanchez, D. T. (2015). Communicating more than diversity: The effect of institutional diversity statements on expectations and performance as a function of race and gender. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, *21*(3), 315–325. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0037883>
- Womack, V. Y., Wood, C. V., House, S. C., Quinn, S. C., Thomas, S. B., McGee, R., & Byars-Winston, A. (2020). Culturally aware mentorship: Lasting impacts of a novel intervention on academic administrators and faculty. *PLOS ONE*, *15*(8), e0236983.
<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0236983>

- 1
2
3
4 Wu, D. J., Thiem, K. C., & Dasgupta, N. (2022). Female peer mentors early in college have
5
6 lasting positive impacts on female engineering students that persist beyond graduation.
7
8 *Nature Communications*, 13(1), Article 1. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-022-34508-x>
9
- 10
11 Yeager, D. S. (2024). *10 to 25: The science of motivating young people: A groundbreaking*
12
13 *approach to leading the next generation—and making your own life easier*. Simon and
14
15 Schuster.
16
17
- 18
19 Yeager, D. S., Hanselman, P., Walton, G. M., Murray, J. S., Crosnoe, R., Muller, C., Tipton, E.,
20
21 Schneider, B., Hulleman, C. S., Hinojosa, C. P., Paunesku, D., Romero, C., Flint, K.,
22
23 Roberts, A., Trott, J., Iachan, R., Buontempo, J., Yang, S. M., Carvalho, C. M., ...
24
25 Dweck, C. S. (2019). A national experiment reveals where a growth mindset improves
26
27 achievement. *Nature*, 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-019-1466-y>
28
29
- 30
31 Yeager, D. S., Henderson, M. D., D’Mello, S., Paunesku, D., Walton, G. M., Spitzer, B. J., &
32
33 Duckworth, A. L. (2014). Boring but important: A self-transcendent purpose for learning
34
35 fosters academic self-regulation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 107(4),
36
37 559–580. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0037637>
38
39
- 40
41 Yeager, D. S., Purdie-Vaughns, V., Garcia, J., Apfel, N., Brzustoski, P., Master, A., Hessert, W.
42
43 T., Williams, M. E., & Cohen, G. L. (2014). Breaking the cycle of mistrust: Wise
44
45 interventions to provide critical feedback across the racial divide. *Journal of*
46
47 *Experimental Psychology: General*, 143(2), 804–824. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0033906>
48
49
- 50
51 Yeager, D. S., Romero, C., Paunesku, D., Hulleman, C. S., Schneider, B., Hinojosa, C., Lee, H.
52
53 Y., O’Brien, J., Flint, K., Roberts, A., Trott, J., Greene, D., Walton, G. M., & Dweck, C.
54
55 S. (2016). Using design thinking to improve psychological interventions: The case of the
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 growth mindset during the transition to high school. *Journal of Educational Psychology*,
5
6
7 108(3), 374–391. <https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000098>


8
9 Yeager, D. S., & Walton, G. M. (2011). Social-psychological interventions in education: They're
10
11 not magic. *Review of Educational Research*, 81(2), 267–301.
12
13
14 <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654311405999>

15
16 Yeager, D. S., Walton, G. M., Brady, S. T., Akcinar, E. N., Paunesku, D., Keane, L., Kamentz,
17
18 D., Ritter, G., Duckworth, A. L., Urstein, R., Gomez, E. M., Markus, H. R., Cohen, G. L.,
19
20 & Dweck, C. S. (2016). Teaching a lay theory before college narrows achievement gaps
21
22 at scale. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 113(24), E3341–E3348.
23
24
25
26 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1524360113>

27
28 Zhao, X., & Biernat, M. (2017). “Welcome to the U.S.” but “change your name”? Adopting
29
30 Anglo names and discrimination. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 70, 59–68.
31
32
33
34 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2016.12.008>


Figures

Figure 1. Percentage of Local-Identity Groups Below vs. Above the “Minimally Adequate” Belonging Affordance Cut-off by Race × Generation Identity Groups.




Note. The “minimally adequate” belonging affordance cut-point, determined by BCF analyses, is set at -0.50 SD, corresponding to the 36th percentile among LIGs. LIGs above this threshold are considered to have medium-to-high opportunities for belonging, while those below are considered low.

Figure 2. *Percentage of Local-Identity Groups Below vs. Above the “Minimally Adequate” Belonging Affordance Cut-off by School.*



Note. The “minimally adequate” belonging affordance cut-point, determined by BCF analyses, is set at -0.50 SD, corresponding to the 36th percentile among LIGs. LIGs above this threshold are considered to have medium-to-high opportunities for belonging, while those below are considered low.

Figure 3. *Percentage of Local-Identity Groups with Medium-to-High Belonging Affordances Within School.*



WHO GETS TO BELONG?

Tables

Table 1. *Four classes of institutional factors that predict belonging for student identity groups on college campuses.*

Factor 1: In-Group Representation	Factor 2: Inclusive (vs. Exclusive) Campus Cultures	Factor 3: Opportunities to Develop Strong Relationships	Factor 4: Opportunities for Productive Learning
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sincere Commitment to Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion • Reduced Social Identity Threats • Reduced Bias and Discrimination 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunities to Develop Strong Peer Relationships • Opportunities to Develop Strong Mentor Relationships 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pathways to Purpose • Growth (vs. Fixed) Mindsets Cultures

WHO GETS TO BELONG?

Table 2. Percentages of LIGs with Medium-to-High (Versus Low) Belonging Affordances.

	Examining Race-Ethnicity and First-Gen. Status Separately	Examining Intersections Between Race-Ethnicity and First-Gen. Status	
		Among First-Gen. LIGs	Among Continuing-Gen. LIGS
By Race-Ethnicity			
Hispanic/Latinx	90%	81%	100%
Black/African/African American	28%	14%	42%
Asian/Asian American	22%	0%	39%
Nat. Am./Nat. Hawaiian/Other Pac. Isl.	54%	45%	59%
White/European American	97%	100%	95%
Other	75%	73%	78%
By Generation Status			
First-Generation	57%	-	-
Continuing Generation	70%	-	-

WHO GETS TO BELONG?

Table 3. *Correlations between Institutional Factors and Belonging Affordances at the LIG-Level*

Institutional Factor	Predictor Description	<i>r</i>	<i>r</i> partial
In-group Representation	Proportional Representation of local identity group on campus.	.585***	-
Inclusive Campus Culture	Sincerity of Commitment to Inclusion: (1-item) “I believe that most people at [school name] genuinely want to make [school name] a more inclusive place with regards to race and class.”	.416***	.229**
	Social Identity Threat: (3-items), e.g., “At [school name], to what extent do you worry that people negatively judge you based on what they think about your racial group?”	-.485***	-.297***
	Stereotype Threat: (1-item) “Do you think other people at your school would be surprised or not surprised if you or people like you succeeded in school?”	-.425***	-.281***
	Level of Biases: (1-item) “To what extent do minority-group students (e.g. racial, ethnic, sexual, religious minorities) experience bias, discrimination, or unfair treatment at [school name]?”	-.314***	-.219***
	Entrenched Inequalities: (1-item) “Inequalities due to race and class are deeply entrenched at [school name].”	-.409***	-.282***
Opportunities for Strong Relationships	Close Peer Friendships: (2-items), e.g., “Thinking back on this past academic year so far, I feel that I have made some close friends at [school name].”	.431***	.331***
	Loneliness: (2-items), e.g., “At [school name], how often do you feel isolated from others?”	-.471***	-.397***
	Faculty/Administrator Mentorship: (2-items), e.g., “Thinking back on this past academic year, have you developed a relationship with a [faculty administrator] mentor at [school name] (formal or informal) that has been helpful to you and your academic and/or personal development?”	.194***	.087
Opportunities for Productive Learning	Purpose: (1-item) “Right now, how much do you feel that your life at [school name] has a sense of direction or meaning to it?”	.488***	.493**
	Institutional Fixed Mindset: (2-items), e.g., “So far, it seems that most people at [school name] seem to believe that students can’t really change how intelligent they are.”	-.381***	-.270***

Note. Partial correlations are adjusted for in-group representation on campus at the local identity group level. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$



[Click here to access/download](#)

Supplementary Materials (will NOT be printed)

3. Supplementary Information_3.5.25.docx

