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The purpose of this study was to investigate experiences of prejudice among individuals in African American and Caucasian interracial marriages. This study utilized Q methodology as a means of identifying and understanding the perceptions of experiences of prejudice held by 40 participants (20 couples). A set of 33 statements relating to experiences of prejudice was generated from a thorough literature review relating to African American and Caucasian interracial unions. Each participant was given a set of statements and asked to rank them on a continuum of -4, “most disagree,” to +4, “most agree” according to what they perceived were their experiences since being married. After the Q-sort process, participants responded to a post-sort interview. The specific research question that directed the study was: “What are the experiences of prejudice among individuals in African American and Caucasian interracial marriages?”

The results of the Q-sort were factor analyzed utilizing the PQ Method 2.11 (Schmolck & Atkinson, 2002) software program producing four distinct factors, or groups, relating to experiences of prejudice. The four different groups were identified in
the following way: (a) family and public acceptance; (b) public rejection; (c) public acceptance; and (d) rejection and acceptance.

Each of the four factors revealed distinct experiences of prejudice according to participants’ subjective viewpoints. Understanding there were differences, and some similarities, of perceptions among the individuals in the study, and between spouses, offers considerations for future researchers to pursue these perceptions, and to use this information for the development and training of multicultural counselors.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

In 1960, there were approximately 51,000 African American and Caucasian interracial marriages in the United States; by 1990, these marriages increased to 213,000 (U.S. Census, 1998). In the year 2006, these marriages totaled nearly 403,000 (U.S. Census, 2008). Thus, over the past 46 years, African American and Caucasian interracial marriages increased approximately 800%. In 2006, the U.S. Census reported the total of all marriages in the United States was approximately 59,500,000. Of these marriages, less than 0.68% (403,000) were interracial marriages between African Americans and Caucasians (U.S. Census, 2008).

It is within this small percentage (0.68%) of African American and Caucasian interracial marriages where prejudice is particularly intense (Alcala, 2001; D’Andrea & Daniels, 1999; Foeman & Nance, 1999; Kennedy, 2002; Lewandowski & Jackson, 2001; Porterfield, 1982; Root, 2001; G. A. Yancey, 2001). The union of these two races has been looked upon as an abomination and is often pathologized by many in our society (Chito Childs, 2005a; Gaines et al., 1999; Rosenblatt, Karis, & Powell, 1995). Among the families of these unions, hostilities, divisiveness, fear, and anger are often present (Root, 2001). Lewandowski and Jackson (2001) noted that the unions of African American men and Caucasian women “have been viewed as the most repugnant of all interracial unions” and the “most despised” (p. 290).
African American and Caucasian marriages have had a turbulent history for over 400 years. Beginning in the 17th century, colonists enacted anti-miscegenation laws to keep the races separate under the pretext of maintaining the integrity and purity of the Caucasian (Hibbler & Shinew, 2002; Higginbotham & Kopytoff, 1989; Lipsitz, 1998; Root, 2001). Anti-miscegenation laws invalidated interracial marriage by considering such marriages as acts of fornication or felonious acts (Davidson, 1992; Kalmijn, 1993; Kennedy, 2003; Lewandowski & Jackson, 2001; Qian, 1999; Sollors, 2000; Solsberry, 1994; Tucker & Mitchell-Keman, 1990; G. A. Yancey, 2001).

During the 18th century, anti-miscegenation laws continued to be endorsed throughout the colonies. These laws were not only written to punish African and Caucasian couples who intermarried, but also those who officiated at their marriage ceremony (Johnson, 2003; Kennedy, 2003; Woodson, 1918). Nevertheless, anti-miscegenation laws and punishment did not dissuade many couples from intermarrying, cohabitating, or having children. The children from these mixed unions were referred to as mulattos (Higginbotham & Kopytoff, 1989). To many colonists, mulattos were an additional threat to the maintenance, integrity, and purity of the Caucasian race.

During the second half of the 19th century, the northern states won the Civil War thus ending slavery. However, many states, especially in the south, remained intensely opposed to the African race gaining freedoms once reserved only for the Caucasian race. In 1868, a group of White supremacists in Tennessee formed the Ku Klux Klan. The goal of the Klan was to decrease the freedoms of the African race by enforcing the Black Codes (Jim Crow laws). The Klan also used lynching and various forms of violence to
subjugate Africans into their previous slavery status (Alonso, 2000; Kennedy, 2003; Packard, 2002).

In the early part of the 20th century, resistance to acceptance of African Americans as equals continued to remain strong in many states. The Ku Klux Klan and their followers persisted fervently with their acts of lynching and other forms of violence killing, injuring, and terrorizing many innocent African Americans (R. M. Brown, 1975; Ferber, 1998; Kennedy, 2003; Perkinson, 2000; Sollors, 2000). By the middle of the 20th century, the Klan and other supremacists were inciting riots against school integration, equal rights, employment, housing opportunities, and so forth. There was also strong resistance against granting African Americans the right to vote, especially in the southern states (Ayers, 1993; Blight, 2001).

During the 1960s, interracial marriages between African Americans and Caucasians continued to be a controversial subject. In 1967, Chief Justice Earl Warren announced the decision of the U.S. Supreme Court that marriage is one of the “basic civil rights of man” (Loving v. Virginia, 1967, p. 11). He also declared that the freedom of choice “to marry, or not to marry, a person of another race resides with the individual and cannot be infringed by the State” (p. 11); therefore, anti-miscegenation laws were considered unconstitutional. However, many states ignored the Supreme Court ruling and maintained their anti-miscegenation laws. Slowly, but progressively, these laws were abolished throughout the states over a period of 113 years. The first state to repeal its anti-miscegenation law was Ohio in 1887, and the last state was Alabama in 2000 (Johnson, 2003; Kennedy, 2003; Sollors, 2000).
During the latter part of the 20th century, the Ku Klux Klan and other White supremacists continued acts of violence, and professed that the Caucasian race was superior to all other races. Their beliefs of Caucasian superiority appeared to be supported by Herrnstein and Murray (1994) in their book *The Bell Curve*. Herrnstein and Murray discussed variations in intellectual ability among people and groups. They wrote that African Americans, Latinos, and other races were intellectually, morally, genetically inferior. Herrnstein and Murray encouraged the genetic myth that these races had a smaller brain size as compared to the Caucasian race. Thus, the belief in genetic inferiority, or evolutionary thinking, influenced many to believe the Caucasian race was far superior to all other races (Ferber, 1998; Herrnstein & Murray, 1994; Hudson & Hines-Hudson, 1999; Rushton & Rushton, 2003).

Besides the Ku Klux Klan, some of the more recent supremacist movements such as The Creativity Movement and the American Nazi Party promote evolutionary thinking that all other races are genetically inferior to the Caucasian race (Anti-defamation League). Some Christians have also been indoctrinated with evolutionary and genetically inferior beliefs. They believe “that people of a different color are inferior because they are supposedly closer to the animals” (p. 64); therefore only the Caucasian race has higher intellectual abilities above other races (Ham, 2002).

Chapter I presents the statement of the problem, purpose of this study, research considerations, terminology usage, and a review of the literature. The literature review includes a brief historical perspective of interracial relationships, theories of prejudice, and current research. Chapter II explores the use of Q methodology and its components,
which consists of the correlation matrix, factor analysis, and factor scores (McKeown & Thomas, 1988). Chapter III presents results of this study, and Chapter IV discusses these results and limitations of the study, and provides suggestions for future research.

Statement of the Problem

Regardless of the history of anti-miscegenation laws, current racism, White supremacist groups, religious beliefs, and belief in genetic inferiority, African American and Caucasian interracial marriages in the United States have slowly, but steadily increased. In addition, research reports an increasing acceptance of marriages between African Americans and Caucasians over the past few decades (Kennedy, 2003; Root, 2001; Rosenblatt et al., 1995). However, many people remain against the races mixing. Thus, many interracially married couples are receiving mixed messages from the public indicating rejection and acceptance of their union (Hudson & Hines-Hudson, 1999; Root, 2001).

Research has revealed some interracial couples do not agree about their experiences of prejudice. That is, one partner in the marriage might perceive a situation as an act of prejudice, whereas the other partner does not hold the same perception. For example, in a study by Killian (2002), an African American wife believed her African American boss limited her job opportunities because her husband was Caucasian. However, the Caucasian husband perceived his wife’s situation at work “was about her being pregnant and having a conflict with a particular person” and not because of his skin color (p. 609). Killian noted that some African American partners seemed to have a greater sensitivity to negative reactions by other people than their Caucasian partners.
Killian’s findings support what the African American feminist scholar, bell hooks, noted. Hooks surmised that the Caucasian perspective of racial reality could appear different from the African American perspective (hooks, 1992).

Studies on African American and Caucasian interracial marriages have focused on a wide variety of characteristics. For example, various quantitative studies have focused on interpersonal resource exchange, that is, the exchange of love and respect (Gaines et al., 1999), coping strategies (Foeman & Nance, 1999; Hill & Thomas, 2000), attitudes (Hudson & Hines-Hudson, 1999), support and opposition (Zebroski, 1999), and racial identity (Hill & Thomas, 2000; Kennedy, 2003). Other studies have focused on perceived reactions to interracial marriages (Miller, Olson, & Fazio, 2004), family acceptance (Lewis, 1993; Mills, Daly, & Longmore, 1995), marital satisfaction and dyadic adjustment (Lewandowski & Jackson, 2001; Vazquez, 1996), and marital quality (Leslie & Letiecq, 2004).

Some qualitative researchers have found through focus groups (Root, 2001; St. Jean, 1998), case studies (J. A. Brown, 1987), and narratives (Blakely, 1999; Cook, 1999; Edwards, 2002), that African American and Caucasian interracial couples have experienced diverse reactions from their family and friends. Other researchers have found diverse reactions from individuals or couples within their religious, social, and work lives (Hill & Thomas, 2000; Hibbler & Shinew, 2002; Killian, 2001a, 2001b; Rosenblatt et al., 1995; G. A. Yancey, 2002). Most of these studies included African American and Caucasian interracially married couples and couples who were cohabitating. Despite the variety of research that has been conducted, there appears to be a lack of studies
specifically focused on the experiences of prejudice among individuals in African American and Caucasian interracial marriages. Therefore, the main research question developed for this study was, “What are the experiences of prejudice among individuals in African American and Caucasian interracial marriages?”

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the current study was to obtain experiences of prejudice among individuals in African American and Caucasian interracial marriages. Existing research has garnered views of interracial marriages from individuals, couples, and the general population (Alcala, 2001; Davidson, 1992; Foeman & Nance, 1999; Gaines et al., 1999; Harris & Kalbfleisch, 2000; Hill & Thomas, 2000; Kalmijn, 1993; Kouri & Lasswell, 1993; Leslie & Letiecq, 2004; Miller et al., 2004; Scott, 1987). However, this research may not be inclusive or reflect experiences of prejudice of those who are in a committed relationship with someone of another race.

For this research project, it was important to include a brief historical perspective regarding the development and maintenance of prejudicial attitudes towards African American and especially against the mixing of the African American and Caucasian races. Also equally important for this study was the historical research into how anti-miscegenation attitudes were developed and maintained. In order to understand how these attitudes are maintained, the Social Dominance Theory (SDT) was chosen as the guiding theory for this study.

SDT posits that all human societies tend to be organized as systems of group-based social hierarchies (Sidanius & Pratto, 2001). For the current study, the Caucasian
race is at the top of the hierarchy and the African American race is at the bottom of the
hierarchy. SDT attempts to identify a range of systems that interrelate and support each
other to sustain a group-based social hierarchy. It is a broad-based theory that takes into
account how historical factors influence the maintenance of attitudes and beliefs held by
individuals, groups of peoples, institutions, and so forth. SDT was chosen for the current
study because it is a model that can provide a theoretically sound and broad-spectrum
account of positive and negative attitudes relating to African American and Caucasian
interracial marriages (Fang, Sidanius, & Pratto, 1998).

The current study utilized Q methodology to help shed light on how individuals in
an African American and Caucasian interracial marriage experience prejudice from
family, friends, and others in their work, social, and religious lives. Q methodology is
anchored in a person’s frame of reference, that is, human subjectivity. To measure
subjectivity, each participant in the current study sorted 33 statement cards (Appendix A).
On each card was recorded an experience of prejudice. The participants had to rank order
each card, according to their own experiences, on a scale from -4 (most disagree) to +4
(most agree). The results of the sorts were then factor analyzed. Factor analysis is a
systematic process to study and reach understandings about human subjectivity on a
particular topic (McKeown & Thomas, 1988). The results showed groupings, or families,
of factors relating to specific experiences of prejudice.

Research Considerations

Several considerations guided the current study. Considerations were based on a
review of the literature from professional journals, scholarly books, popular magazines,
and a popular TV talk show, relating to African American and Caucasian interracial relationships. One of the considerations for this study was derived from the prominent African American feminist scholar, bell hooks (1992), who noted that perceptions of racial reality could be very different from a Caucasian’s standpoint when compared to an African American’s standpoint. Therefore, the consideration developed was the possibility there might be racial differences in experiences of prejudice between the African American spouse and the Caucasian spouse.

Paset and Taylor (1991) found some members of these unions believed they received more support from those of their own race and gender. Other research has suggested that African American females were opposed to interracial marriages more so than Caucasian females (Chito Childs, 2005a; Crowder, 2000; Kennedy, 2003; Morris, 2003; Paset & Taylor, 1991). Therefore, another consideration derived from research was if some participants might have experienced more support from someone of their own race and/or gender.

A study by Hibbler and Shinew (2002) found that African American and Caucasian interracially married couples experienced limited social networks due to perceived negative reactions from family, friends, public, or work environment. It was wondered, therefore, if couples in the present study would experience negative reactions that would limit their social lives such as less contact with family members, limited number of friends, limitations in traveling to certain areas, and so forth. These considerations helped to guide the current Q methodology study to reveal if participants
experienced any racial, gender, family, and social differences in acceptance or rejection of their union.

Terminology

The term *African* is used relating to historical events up to 1868. After 1868, when Africans became U.S. citizens, the term *African American* is used. During the early 1970s to the late 1980s, the majority of African Americans preferred the term *Black*. However, in 1988, a Black leader, Ramona H. Edelin, president of the National Urban Coalition, proposed that the term *African American* replace the term *Black* (Smith, 1992). The new terminology, *African American*, was well received and is in popular use today. Therefore, *African American* is the term used in this study more so than the term *Black*. The terms mulatto, *Negro, colored, Black*, and *White* are used where necessary in order to preserve the accuracy of quotes and terminology such as “Black Codes.”

The term *prejudice* is used in this study as an umbrella term that encompasses *racism* (prejudice against someone because of his or her race) and other forms of discrimination. However, the term *racism* is used where necessary in order to preserve the accuracy of quotes. The terms *stereotypes* and *myths* are used interchangeably signifying unfounded false beliefs or prejudicial attitudes.

Review of the Literature

This literature review is divided into four sections. The first section is a succinct historical perspective describing how the roots of prejudice and racism developed in the United States since the beginning of slavery. Also of equal importance is the history of
the development and implementation of anti-miscegenation laws and various other laws that restricted freedoms of the African American race.

The second section of the literature review discusses current research on interracial relationships relating to attitudes and polls, and stereotypes and myths. The third section briefly discusses theories of prejudice: Critical Race Theory, Symbolic Racism Theory, and a detailed discussion of Social Dominance Theory (SDT) that is the guiding theory for this study. The fourth section is a review of current research of interracial couples’ experiences of prejudice.

*Historical Perspective*

1600-1699

In 1607, the Colony of Jamestown, Virginia, was founded for the conversion of Christians and for commerce (Alonso, 2000; Carter, 1991; S. W. Yancey, 2002). Before the arrival of Africans, colonists used Native Americans and Caucasian indentured servants to work in the fields and homes. Indentured servants were usually contracted to work for their owners from four to seven years. Caucasian servants were usually poor men and women working to pay off debts or were bonded to a landowner who paid for their passage to the New World. Other servants were British criminals serving out their prison sentences in the colonies (Sylvester, 1998).

In 1619, a Dutch slave-trade ship, owned by the Dutch East India Company, arrived in Jamestown. The cargo was 20 African men, women, and children who were traded to the colonists for food (Bernard, 1985; Carter, 1991; Miles, Davis, Ferguson-Roberts, & Giles, 2001; Sylvester, 1998). Africans arriving in the New World were
considered as indentured servants and were treated equally with Caucasian indentured servants (D’Souza, 1995; Sylvester, 1998). At the end of their servitude, both Africans and Caucasians became free men and women. Eventually the freed servants were able to own property, buy slaves, intermarry, have families, and become free tradesmen (Collier & Collier, 1998; D’Souza, 1995; Rothenberg, 1998; Sylvester, 1998). It is believed between the years 1619 to 1640 was the only times in U.S. history that the African and Caucasian races intermingled freely, married freely, and were treated as equals in all areas of life (Woodson, 1918; S. W. Yancey, 2002).

By 1640, the need for servants grew due to demands to increase tobacco, cotton, and other crops. The settlers wanted cheap labor, so they began enacting laws to enslave the African race. Maryland was the first state to enforce slavery in 1640 and shortly thereafter was followed by Massachusetts in 1641. Massachusetts declared bondage was legal servitude according to its legislative Body of Liberties (Miles et al., 2001; Sylvester, 1998). With bondage considered legal servitude, African indentured servants were permanently considered as chattel slaves who could be bought and sold at the discretion of their masters. Chattel slaves could no longer claim their freedom at the end of their contracted servitude. However, Caucasian indentured servants gained their freedom at the end of their servitude. Since chattel slaves had no freedoms, this facilitated the slave trade to become so profitable that the African slaves were called “Black Gold” (Feelings, 1995; Sylvester, 1998).

In 1660, a Virginia statute stated that baptized Indians, and free Negroes, were not allowed to purchase Christian Caucasian servants. Freed Negroes were only allowed to
purchase those of their own race. If a Negro were allowed to purchase a Caucasian, this would permit a Negro to rule over a Caucasian. This statute kept the Caucasian race from being subordinate to Africans, Indians, or any other race (S. W. Yancey, 2002).

_Curse of Ham._ To encourage and justify the reasons for slavery, the colonists believed in various myths. One such myth professed that blackness was a curse from God as interpreted by the colonists from the Old Testament in the book of Genesis 9:23-27. These verses relate the story of Noah and his three sons: Shem, Ham, and Japheth. Noah was drunk and his son, Ham, saw him naked. Ham told his two brothers, Shem and Japeth, to carry their father’s garments to his tent. They were to walk backwards (in order not to see their father’s nakedness) and to cover their sleeping father’s body. Noah awoke and was angry that Ham saw his nakedness and so cursed Ham’s son, Canaan. Noah said, Cursed by Canaan! The lowest of slaves will he be to his brothers. He [Noah] also said, “Blessed be the Lord, the God of Shem! May Canaan be the slave of Shem. May God extend the territory of Japheth, may Japheth live in the tents of Shem, and may Canaan be his slave.” (Holy Bible, New International Version, 1984; p. 6)

The colonists rationalized that the children of Ham were condemned to blackness and enslavement because darkness, or blackness of skin, was interpreted as a punishment from God (Brow, 1973; Haynes, 2003; Root, 2001; Saks, 2000).

_Anti-miscegenation laws._ In 1661, Maryland colonists were worried about free Caucasian women intermarrying with free African men. Many freeborn women were from wealthy families, or they were indentured servants freed at the completion of their
contract. The African men were former slaves or freed indentured servants. Therefore, in order to keep the two races from mixing, Maryland was the first state to enact an anti-miscegenation law proclaiming it was a crime for free Caucasian women to marry free African men (Saks, 2000; Sollors, 2000; S. W. Yancey, 2002; Zabel, 1965). Shortly thereafter, other states followed by enacting anti-miscegenation laws.

However, laws did not stop intermarriage, cohabitation, or the procreation of mixed-race children. The mixed-race children were called mulatto and were considered a physically inferior product of Africans and Caucasians who married or cohabitated (Hickman, 1997). It is believed that the mulatto race began in the Chesapeake Bay region of Jamestown, Virginia, and Maryland (Packard, 2002; Woodson, 1918; S. W. Yancey, 2002). Mulattos were looked upon as African and not as Caucasian. They were restricted in status and treated like slaves even if they were free (Hickman, 1997).

As the demand for slaves grew, many of the slave masters forced their Caucasian female indentured servants to marry African slaves in order to procreate children for slavery (Sollors, 2000; Woodson, 1918; S. W. Yancey, 2002). Maryland enacted a slavery law in 1664 that helped slave owners gain free slave labor. The law declared if a freeborn Caucasian woman, or Caucasian woman servant, married an African slave she would become a servant of her husband’s master until her husband’s death. Their mixed-race children would remain slaves for life. However, Maryland repealed this statute 17 years later, in 1681, declaring that Caucasian women could retain their free status and their children would be free. The intent of this repeal was to stop slave masters from
prostituting or coercing Caucasian women into marrying Africans for the procreation of slaves (Sollors, 2000; Woodson, 1918; S. W. Yancey, 2002; Zabel, 1965).

1700-1799

*Anti-miscegenation laws.* In 1705, Massachusetts enacted a law that stated if a mulatto or a Negro man had sexual intercourse with an “English woman, or a woman of any other Christian nation” (Higginbotham & Kopytoff, 1989, p. 49) he was to be sold out of Massachusetts. If an English man had sexual intercourse with a mulatto or Negro woman, he was to be whipped and the Negro or mulatto woman was to be sold out of the province (Woodson, 1918).

Between the years, 1700 and 1741, anti-miscegenation laws were passed in Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Virginia, and North Carolina (Alonso, 2000; Johnson, 2003; Kennedy, 2003). In Virginia, if a minister officiated at the marriage of a Caucasian with an African, or mulatto, the minister was fined 10,000 pounds of tobacco payable to the parish or church. The Caucasian person marrying an African could be sent to prison, without bail, for six months and pay 10 pounds to the parish or even be banned from the state of Virginia (Higginbotham & Kopytoff, 1989; Woodson, 1918). A Virginia statute against miscegenation also referred to mulatto children as an “abominable mixture and spurious issue” showing disdain many colonists had for the children coming from an interracial union (Woodson, 1918, p. 344).

In 1780, Pennsylvania repealed its anti-miscegenation law. With the repeal of this law, African and Caucasian interracial couples were moving to Pennsylvania to enjoy the new freedom to intermarry without being punished (Woodson, 1918). With the repeal of
the anti-miscegenation law in Pennsylvania, and couples uniting whether or not there were laws in other states, there was an increase in mulatto children from these unions. Colonists were becoming worried about blurring the color line and wanted to define who was Caucasian and who was African. Therefore, the one-drop rule was effected.

One-drop rule. In 1705, Virginia passed the first law defining who was African and who was Caucasian. The law stated that a person, who had one-eighth or more of African blood, tracing their heritage back to African great-grandparents, was considered mulatto and was legally African (Finkelman, 1992; Root, 2001; S. W. Yancey, 2002). Various colonies began employing the “one-drop rule” that considered a person “Negro” or “colored” if any one had, or was even suspected of having, any trace of African ancestry (D’Souza, 1995; Hickman, 1997; Johnson, 2003; Kennedy, 2003; Root, 2001). The “one-drop” rule also kept mulatto children from inheriting any wealth or property their biological Caucasian father owned. It also prevented mulattos from enjoying other Caucasian privileges such as professional work, freedom to travel, and so forth (S. W. Yancey, 2002).

In 1785, the state of Virginia repealed the 1705 statute and ruled that a person having one-eighth Negro blood was considered legally White. This was the only time in Virginia law that a mulatto was legally considered White. Those with one-fourth or more of African blood were considered legally mulatto and therefore considered on the African side of the color line (Higginbotham & Kopytoff, 1989). It was not until the 20th century, in 1924, that Virginia again repealed its 1785 statute and reverted to the “one-drop rule.” This meant, in order to be declared legally White, one had to have no trace of African
blood. If someone had even one African great-grandparent, that individual was still considered mulatto and African (Johnson, 2003; Packard, 2002).

1800-1899

Other laws against equality. Between the years, 1800 and 1825 there was an escalation of African and Caucasian races intermarrying or cohabitating (Kennedy, 2003). Many colonists feared intermarrying was putting the African race on equal footing with the Caucasian race. Therefore, colonists created other laws to separate and subordinate the African race. For example, most states began to enact laws to prevent anyone from teaching slaves how to read or write. By 1835, most states made it a crime to educate slaves (Rothenberg, 1998; Spring, 1997).

Many states began to create laws to keep the African race from testifying against Caucasians in a court of law. By 1850, California passed laws not permitting Africans, mulattos, or Indians to testify in court against any Caucasian person (Zabel, 1965). In Ohio, many citizens feared if Africans testified against Caucasians, the races would have equal status to testify against each other. Citizens also feared if the African race had the right to vote, that would appear to be equal with the Caucasian race. Many citizens believed that the appearance of equality between the races could possibly lead to intermarriage (Kennedy, 2003).

Sympathizers for the Africans’ right to vote made their opinions known. In 1845, the editor of the Cleveland America declared the injustice of Africans and mulattos not having the right to vote. The editor wrote about the previous President of the United States, Thomas Jefferson, who served from 1801-1809. Jefferson was believed to have
had a son with Sally Hemmings who was an African servant in the Jefferson family. Jefferson’s son was not allowed to vote because he was considered of African descent. The editor stated that Jefferson, as previous President, had worked very hard to establish freedom for the United States, yet his son did not have the right to vote or bear witness in court (Woodson, 1918).

The African race was also denied United States citizenship. As a case in point, in 1854, a slave named Dred Scott moved from Missouri to the free states with his master. Mr. Scott wanted to be declared free because he was living on free soil. The case went to the Supreme Court in which the court ruled that Africans, slave or free, were not citizens of the United States (Sylvester, 1998).

In 1861, at the outset of the Civil War, Union and Confederate soldiers opposed Africans from joining their forces. However, by August 1862, they finally received the endorsement of Congress to serve in the Civil War. However, African soldiers received less than 50% of Caucasian soldier’s wages (Miles et al., 2001). The following year, in 1863, the Emancipation Proclamation established freedom for all slaves living in the states of rebellion and it also gave Africans the right to join the military (Miles et al.).

In May 1863, the War Department established the Bureau of Colored Troops. Thousands of freed slaves joined the Union army to fight for freedom. Some Africans remained in the south and fought along with their masters in the Confederate army. Approximately 186,000 African soldiers fought for freedom. By the end of the war, in 1865, 38,000 African soldiers had died and 24 African soldiers received the
Congressional Medal of Honor (Sylvester, 1998). However, they were not considered citizens of the United States nor did they have any voting rights.

Finally, in 1865 a number of freedoms were beginning to be established for the African race by adding new amendments to the U.S. Constitution. The 13th Amendment of 1865 abolished involuntary servitude and slavery. In 1866, the first Civil Rights Acts were established. In 1868, the 14th Amendment declared that Africans in America were citizens of the United States (Rothenberg, 1998; Sylvester, 1998).

In 1870, the 15th Amendment declared all men had the right to vote. However, this amendment was met with strong resistance (Blight, 2001). In 1890, many legal barriers were established by the Mississippi constitutional convention to restrain African Americans, and poor Caucasians, from their right to vote. One such barrier was the literacy test. Mississippi established a literacy test that required a person to read or recite from memory sections of the state’s constitution. Administrators of the literacy test were Caucasian and would find reason to fail most of the African prospective voters. On the other hand, they would pass most of the Caucasian prospective voters (Fairclough, 2001; Lewis, 1993; Packard, 2002).

Mississippi also established a “grandfather clause” which guaranteed any man the right to vote and exemption from the literacy test. However, this clause meant that if an African male voted prior to 1867, or his grandfather had voted prior to 1867, then he could be exempted from taking the literacy test. Mississippi lawmakers knew that former slaves and their sons could not establish previous voting records before 1867. Therefore, they were not eligible for the “grandfather clause” opportunity. Other southern states
soon followed Mississippi’s lead knowing that the federal government was negligent in enforcing voting (Packard, 2002).

Southern lawmakers incorporated strict residency and property requirements, and established poll taxes that African Americans could not afford to pay (Hirsh, Kett, & Trefil, 2002). Lawmakers also knew that some African Americans had records of committing petty crimes or misdemeanors that would eliminate their right to vote (Fairclough, 2001; Lewis, 1993; Packard, 2002). By 1910, most African Americans were not eligible to vote in the southern states (Fairclough, 2001).

*Ku Klux Klan.* The end of the Civil War in 1865 brought in a new era of Reconstruction. However, that era was short lived. In 1866, the Ku Klux Klan was formed in Pulaski, Tennessee, intending to end Reconstruction by not permitting the equal rights afforded to the African race. The Klan and White supremacists in the southern colonies developed the Black Codes (Jim Crow laws) in order to reestablish forms of slavery (Alonso, 2000; R. M. Brown, 1975; Chafe et al., 2001; Fairclough, 2001; Miles et al., 2001; Rable, 1984; Rothenberg, 1998; Saks, 2000; Williamson, 1986).

Towards the end of the 19th century, the Klan and southern White supremacists increased their acts of lynching and other forms of violence against the African American race (R. M. Brown, 1975; Rable, 1984; Williamson, 1986). Between the years 1880 and 1930 mass mob lynching accounted “for 35 percent of Black lynching in Georgia and 49 percent in Virginia” (Holden-Smith, 1996, p. 31). White southern society believed “that lynching was a necessary evil . . . to keep the Negro beast” in his place (Kennedy, 2003, p. 193).
An African American man could be legally lynched if a Caucasian female only claimed, without proof, that she was raped or just looked upon by him (Kennedy, 2003). Lynching became spectator events and drew from hundreds to thousands of Caucasian participants (Holden-Smith, 1996). In the late 19th century and early 20th century, as the violence increased, African Americans began migrating to the northern states to avoid the brutality. This period was known as the Great Migration (Chafe et al., 2001).

Anti-miscegenation laws. In 1858, the subject of miscegenation became a prominent political topic. Abraham Lincoln, a Republican and an attorney, was running for the U.S. Senate against Stephen A. Douglas, a Democrat. Lincoln stated that he believed that a nation that was half free and half slave could not endure this division (Ferenbacher, 1989). In 1864, Lincoln entered the presidential election race against George McClellan. Since miscegenation of the races was a sensitive issue, David G. Croly, a Democrat and editor of the New York Daily Graphic, published a pamphlet, relating to miscegenation, a few months before the presidential election. The pamphlet was written as a hoax supporting the miscegenation of the African and Caucasian races. Croly hoped the pamphlet would negatively affect Lincoln’s presidential campaign by persuading people not to vote for Lincoln. However, the pamphlet was used by those favoring miscegenation thereby benefiting Lincoln’s campaign (Alonso, 2000; Kaplan, 1994; Kennedy, 2003; Saks, 2000).

In 1865, the Constitutional Convention met in Alabama to outlaw African and Caucasian interracial marriages. The law declared that interracial marriages were “null and void ab initio, and mak[e] the parties to any such marriage subject to criminal
prosecutions” (Wallenstein, 1994, p. 28). Therefore, if an African person married a Caucasian person, a felony was committed (J. A. Brown, 1987; Kalmijn, 1993; Kennedy, 2003; Root, 2001; Wallenstein, 1994).

In 1869, the Supreme Court of Georgia declared that social equality between the races did not exist:

[Social] equality does not in fact exist, and never can. The God of nature made it otherwise, and no human law can produce it, and no human tribunal can enforce it. There are gradations and classes throughout the universe. From the tallest archangel in Heaven, down to the meanest reptile on earth, moral and social inequalities exist, and must continue to exist through all eternity. . . . The amalgamation of the races is not only unnatural, but is always productive of deplorable results. Our daily observation shows us, that the offspring of these unnatural connections are generally sickly and effeminate, and that they are inferior in physical development and strength, to the full blood of either race.

(Scott v. State of Georgia, 1869)

1900-1990

Anti-miscegenation laws. In 1901, Alabama was strongly opposed to interracial marriages and stated in its constitution that future legislatures “shall never pass any law to authorize or legalize any marriage between any White person and a negro, or a descendant of a negro” (Kennedy, 2003, p. 254). As early as 1913, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) protested bills that were
against interracial marriages. During the same year Wyoming was the last state to enact laws against miscegenation (Kennedy, 2003).

In 1924, the state of Virginia introduced the Act to Preserve Racial Integrity (Sollors, 2000), requiring citizens applying for a marriage license to complete a registration certificate with the Virginia State Registrar of Vital Statistics. The certificate purposefully included information on racial composition. This Act declared it unlawful for any Caucasian person to marry anyone other than a Caucasian person. The Act stated a Caucasian person was someone who had only Caucasian blood and no trace of any other blood (Sollors).

Violence and resistance. Mob violence, police brutality, and lynching continued into the first half of the 20th century. It was not until 1946 that President Harry Truman was made aware of the seriousness of the situation and was determined to do something. He established the President’s Committee on Civil Rights (PCCR) that formulated the report *To Secure These Rights*. This report was the impetus for establishing federal laws against lynching, poll taxes, enforcing voting rights, and the establishment of a permanent Civil Rights Commission. However, it took another 18 years to secure the Civil Rights Act in 1964 (Fairclough, 2001).

In the 1950s, the Ku Klux Klan and other White supremacists were still active in enforcing Jim Crow laws. However, African Americans were now resisting acts of prejudice and mistreatment. For example, African Americans were not allowed to sit with Caucasians in coffee shops. Therefore, African Americans protested by having sit-ins in which they remained seated at the coffee counter areas designated for Whites only. They
also protested segregation of the races at bowling alleys, hotels, and theaters (Fairclough, 2001).

In 1955, Rosa Parks, an African American woman in Montgomery, Alabama, refused to give her seat up to a White man and sit at the back of a bus designated for “Blacks only.” She maintained a seat in the front of the bus, designated for “Whites only” and was arrested by the police. When the story was made public, the African American community formed a successful 381-day bus boycott. Not long after the bus boycott the Supreme Court outlawed bus segregation (Fairclough, 2001; Miles et al., 2001).

On September 25, 1957, nine African American students were being integrated into Little Rock Central High School, an all-Caucasian school, in Arkansas. However, White supremacists and their supporters encouraged riots against integration at Central High. The riots became so dangerous that President Eisenhower sent 1,000 paratroopers, from the U.S. Army’s 101st Airborne Division, to control the riotous crowds in order to permit the African American students to enter the all White high school. The Arkansas National Guard was called into active service along with Army troops. Soldiers without bayonets were patrolling the school halls. By Friday of that week, the situation was almost normal (The Tiger, 1997).

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. During the 1950s and 1960s, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., an African American, was a strong leader and crusader for peace. His personal experiences with prejudice, insights to the existing inequality of African American rights, and influential leadership enabled him to bring together African Americans and Caucasians to work towards peace and equality (Haskins, 1977). Dr. King and other civil
rights supporters were also fighting for the right to vote which was guaranteed, in 1870, by the 15th Amendment but had been restrained by lawmakers for years (Blight, 2001; Fairclough, 2001).

In 1963, Dr. King led a march of 250,000 civil rights supporters to the Lincoln Memorial in Washington, DC. It was at this march he made his famous speech, *I Have a Dream*. The efforts of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and others eventually led President Johnson to sign the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act in 1965. The Voting Rights Act was subtitled: *An act to enforce the Fifteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States* (Packard, 2002). This act eliminated the barriers of literacy tests, poll taxes, and other requirements that held back African Americans and poor Caucasians from their right to vote.

Dr. King sought peaceful ways to bring equality to all. However, in 1968, in Memphis, Tennessee, King was assassinated by James Earl Ray. Shortly after his death, riots broke out in Seattle, Washington, DC, Baltimore, Chicago, and many other cities across the United State. Yet amidst all of the racial turmoil between the two races, there were African American and Caucasian interracial couples who wanted to be together. One such couple was Richard Loving and his wife, Mildred

*Loving v. Virginia*. Richard Loving, a Caucasian man, and his wife, Mildred, who was part African American and part Cherokee Indian, were married in Washington, DC, on June 2, 1958, and returned to Virginia to live (Pratt, 2003). Seven weeks after they married, the couple was arrested for committing a felony [interracial marriage] which was “against the peace and dignity” of the state of Virginia (Alonso, 2000, p. 89). Their
marriage was against Virginia’s Racial Integrity Act of 1924 evasion statute. This statute stated that it was illegal for an African American and Caucasian interracial couple to leave the state of Virginia in order to marry in another state, and then return to live in Virginia. At their trial, the Lovings were sentenced to one year in prison unless they would leave the state and never return together for a period of 25 years (*Loving v. Virginia*, 1967). Therefore, the Lovings moved to Washington, DC, and started a family. After a few years, they secretly moved back home and were protected by family and friends from the law (Alonso, 2000).

In 1963, the Lovings contacted the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) and were assigned two defense attorneys, Cohen and Hirschkop. The goal of the attorneys was to have the state of Virginia reverse its decision against the Lovings. However, they met many legal barriers. One such barrier occurred at their hearing in 1965 when Judge Bazile stated:

> Almighty God created the races White, black, yellow, malay and red, and he placed them on separate continents. And but for the interference with his arrangement, there would be no cause for such marriages. The fact that he separated the races shows that he did not intend for the races to mix. (*Loving v. Virginia*, 1967)

The Lovings then took their case to the U.S. Supreme Court. Cohen and Hirschkop skillfully argued that anti-miscegenation laws relegated the African American to second-class citizenship (Alonso, 2000). They stated that the Virginia Racial Integrity Act of 1924 (*An Act to Preserve Racial Integrity*, n.d.), prohibiting interracial marriages,
was originally entitled *A Bill to Preserve the Integrity of the White Race*. This Act was a product of racist attitudes and written to the effect that the Caucasian race was superior to the African American race. The two attorneys also stated that Virginia laws reminded them of Nazi Germany’s laws against the Jews during World War II (Alonso, 2000; Pratt, 2003).

On June 12, 1967, U.S. Supreme Court Chief Justice Warren stated that Virginia had violated the U.S. Constitution by preventing the Lovings to marry. The Lovings had been denied the Due Process Clause of the 14th Amendment of 1868, which stated marriage was a freedom, a basic civil right of man, not based on any race. The Supreme Court ruled anti-miscegenation was unlawful and the Lovings were free to live together as husband and wife (*Loving v. Virginia*, 1967).

**Summary of Historical Perspective**

African Americans have had a turbulent history since the 1600s. They have struggled to be free from slavery and to achieve equality in all areas of life. This brief historical review conveyed various forms of prejudice, laws restricting equal rights, and violence to keep the African American race in a subordinate position. Also discussed was a brief history of anti-miscegenation laws and the struggles to repeal those laws.

**Interracial Relationships**

African American men seen with Caucasian women have sparked hatred and violence from White supremacists and others who do not like seeing the races mix. For example, in 1980, a Caucasian man, Joseph Paul Franklin, shot and killed two young African American men who were jogging with two Caucasian women. Franklin, a
member of the Ku Klux Klan, stated that he shot them because they were race mixing. Franklin’s rationalization of his deed was, “Had they not been race mixing, you know, it would have been a totally different story” (Alonso, 2000, p. 93).

In 1996, a principal of an integrated high school in Alabama ruled that interracial couples could not attend their high school prom together. This story was made public and sparked controversy because there were many who accepted the mixing of the races. As a result, the school principal was removed from his position and interracial couples were allowed to attend their own high school prom (Alonso, 2000).

In the year 2000, presidential candidate George W. Bush visited Bob Jones University in South Carolina. Bob Jones, a private university, advocated a policy against interracial dating. Due to Bush’s visit, the public became aware this. As a result, public pressure from those approving of interracial dating forced the university to reverse its policy. Nevertheless, the university required written permission from parents for their child to interracially date (Johnson, 2003; Kennedy, 2002), possibly indicating the apprehension on the part of the administration.

The Class of 2007 at Turner County High School, in Ashburn, Georgia, had their first integrated prom. Traditionally they always had two proms on the same night at different locations. One prom was for the Caucasian students and the other for the African American students. At the beginning of the school year, four senior class officers inspired the idea of a prom where everyone was invited. A 19-year-old senior stated, “This is history, baby, this is history. Somebody had to do it. Why couldn’t it be us?” Another student commented, “The school is making changes—and they’re long
overdue.” At least two thirds of the upper-class students purchased tickets. African Americans outnumbered the Caucasians at the prom. However, many Caucasians had attended their own private party a week before the integrated prom (Associated Press, 2007).

On June 26, 2008, in Cullman County of Birmingham, Alabama, a home of an African American and Caucasian couple was spray-painted with graffiti stating, “Black is Death,” and a swastika painted above it (Faulk, 2008). According to The Birmingham News, the letter “W” was painted to the left of the swastika and the letter “P” was painted to the right. A research analyst for the Intelligence Project at Southern Poverty Law Center said that the letters “W” and “P” stood for White power. Lamar Jones, African American, his wife, Caucasian, and his stepdaughter moved into their home two months prior. Jones commented to the news reporter that, “Just to see this is unbelievable. . . . People shouldn’t have to go through this. I should be able to choose where I want to live without having to deal with all this drama” (p. 1).

On August 7, 2008, in Oroville, California, an African American and Caucasian interracially married couple woke up to find five of the family’s vehicles had been vandalism. The cars were covered with racially discriminatory language. They previously had other cards stolen and one vandalized. They have two children with disabilities and need the cars for their special needs children. An African American neighbor said he tries to ignore racial slurs but it does ruin his day. He said a thing like this happening is like a pink elephant that is in the room but everyone acts as if they do not see it; these things need to be talked about (Weston, 2008).
The mixture of African American and Caucasian interracial couples is still abhorred by many today. Many interracial couples continue to experience rejection from their immediate family, friends, coworkers, and society who believes their union is violating a societal taboo (Chito Childs, 2005a; Crowder, 2000; Guimond, Dambrun, Michinov, & Duarte, 2003; Harris & Kalbfleisch, 2000; Hibbler & Shinew, 2002; Root, 2001). The following is a brief review of attitudes and polls, and stereotypes and myths regarding these unions.

**Attitudes and Polls**

Hudson and Hines-Hudson (1999) developed an attitudinal assessment form to explore racial attitudes and patterns of interracial interactions. They surveyed 260 African Americans and Caucasians between the years 1993 and 1996. Their assessment tested knowledge about Africa and African Americans, frequency of interracial interactions, and old beliefs that persist, such as “biological” racism—that is, intelligence is inherited. The results of their attitude assessment scale led Hudson and Hines-Hudson to suggest that the United States is not a two-nation union of African Americans and Caucasians as some may think. Instead, the authors theorized that the United States is a three-nation union. The first nation is a large separate nation in which Caucasians experience little contact with and have no acceptance of African Americans. In the United States, Caucasians know little about African Americans and fear them, and denigrate persons of color. The second nation is a smaller segregated nation in which African Americans have little contact or experience with Caucasians. They know little about the Caucasian race, and tend to denigrate themselves. There is little acceptance and contact between the races.
The third nation is an even smaller nation in which Caucasians, African Americans, and others of color live in desegregation.

Hudson and Hines-Hudson’s (1999) three-nation theory explained different levels of acceptance between the two races. Their theory suggests that African American and Caucasian inter racially married couples, and cohabitating couples, are living amidst acceptance and rejection simultaneously. Their findings suggested that African Americans and Caucasians were dramatically influenced by attitudes grounded in stereotypes that were centuries old. However, those Caucasians who had more knowledge about African American culture, history, and frequent interactions with African Americans had less negative racial stereotypes towards the African American race than those Caucasians who had little or no knowledge. They also found when both races interacted frequently, stereotypes and negative attitudes on both sides decreased.

In a 2001 joint study by the Washington Post, Kaiser Family Foundation, and Harvard University (Washington Post, 2001), 86% of African American respondents said their families would welcome a Caucasian person as a family member. The 2001 joint study revealed 55% of Caucasian respondents said that their families would welcome an African American family member.

In June of 2007, a Gallup Minority Rights and Relations survey was updated. The survey asked Americans if they “approve or disapprove of marriages between Blacks and Whites” (Gallup News Service, 2007, p. 1). The 2007 survey revealed that 75% of Whites approved of marriages between Blacks and Whites. This is a 14% increase from their 1997 survey, which revealed Whites had a 61% approval rate. Blacks had an 85%
approval rating, which is an 8% increase over their 1997 survey in which Blacks had a 77% approval rating.

The Gallup 2007 study also revealed that the approval rate among 18- to 49 year-olds was higher (85%) than the 50+ age group approval rate (67%). Root (2001) hypothesized that as Americans age, the negative trends will continue to decrease, and trends towards acceptance of interracial marriages will continue to increase. Root also noted that a high rate of intermarriage is a sign of assimilation and that the minority group’s differences are diminishing from the dominant society.

In a focus group with African American college women, Chito Childs (2005a) found the women believed that African Americans involved interracially with Caucasians were considered “less Black” and stated that “Blacks need to come together, those who do date interracially are traitors” (p. 551). The college women stated they believed African Americans who marry Caucasians were escaping into the Caucasian world and betraying their own families and communities. One of the college women expressed, “I just don’t know how or why someone could ever get over the racism of Whites to date a White person” (p. 551). One of the participants stated she was raised to be proud of who she was and to “never want to be with anyone but a strong Black man.” Her mother told her she “just does not trust White people” (p. 550).

Some of the women in the group revealed that African American women are angry because there are few educated African American men and those men seem to choose Caucasian women. African American women are upset with what appears to be different standards of beauty relating to physical attractiveness and skin color. Some of
the women expressed that Caucasian women are looked upon as more attractive than African American women are. One of the participants stated, “White guys are used to White girls who don’t have a big butt” (Chito Childs, 2005a, p. 553). Another participant stated, “Black men can be dark skinned and they are still valued . . . light skin for women is valued, which makes Black women devalued” (p. 553).

Stereotypes and Myths

The following presents some of the findings and comments from G. A. Yancey’s (2002) study relating to nine stereotypes, and Foeman and Nance’s (1999) review of the literature identifying five areas of mythology relating to African American and Caucasian interracial couples. Yancey’s nine stereotypes are presented first followed by Foeman and Nance’s five myths.

G. A. Yancey (2002) formulated nine stereotypes from his academic research as a sociologist relating to African American and Caucasian interracial couples. Yancey stated, “For me, as a sociologist, it is my job to examine and debunk . . . stereotypes” (p. 51). He commented that humans tended to stereotype in order to elevate their group and consider themselves superior to other groups.

The first stereotype suggested that interracial relationships are about being rebellious. Many people believe individuals who are involved in interracial relationships do so to rebel against their parents or other authority figures. However, rebellious relationships usually do not last and rebellion is not the reason interracial relationships are formed. Interracial relationships are usually formed because of love and companionship (Lewis, Yancey, & Bletzer, 1997).
The second stereotype suggested that most interracial couples are comprised of a Caucasian woman and a minority man. G. A. Yancey (2002) mentioned that more Caucasian men are in interracial relationships (such as Caucasian men with Hispanic or Asian women) than are Caucasian women. However, Yancey commented that of all African American and Caucasian interracial marriages, approximately 65% consist of African American men with Caucasian women. Yancey’s findings correspond closely to a recent U.S. Census (2002) report indicating that 74% of all African American and Caucasian interracial marriages were comprised of an African American man and a Caucasian woman.

The third stereotype suggested that African American and Caucasian interracially married couples would not be welcomed anywhere. G. A. Yancey (2002) mentioned this stereotype probably emanated from slavery days when White racial purity was professed and anti-miscegenation laws were enacted. However, he discussed his own experiences of being welcomed by family members, friends, social, and church organizations. Yancey stated that support for interracial families is growing. For example, interracial support groups can be found on web sites for interracial families such as the Interracial Family Circle (www.interracialfamilycircle.org) and those dating interracially can find support information from LovingYou (www.lovingyou.com/content/groups/interracial).

The fourth stereotype suggested only desperate people choose interracial relationships. K. Davis (1941) found a tendency supporting this stereotype because it suggested that poor Caucasian women [considered desperate because of poverty] could not attract Caucasian middle-class men so they enter into interracial relationships.
However, G. A. Yancey (2002) argued that that stereotype is not true because other social science research (Gadberry & Dodder, 1993) has indicated Caucasians who marry minorities tended to be at the same economic level and shared similar educational resources as their partner.

The fifth stereotype suggested interracial relationships are driven by sexual curiosity sometimes referred to as *Jungle Fever* derived from the movie of the same name. The movie, *Jungle Fever*, pertained to an affair between a Caucasian woman and an African American man whose relationship was based on sexual curiosity. Research by Lewis and Yancey (1995) contradicted the *Jungle Fever* stereotype by revealing African American and Caucasian couples come together for companionship, personal attraction, and compatibility, which are the same reasons same-race couples unite.

The sixth stereotype suggested that members in an interracial relationship do not have problems with racism. However, G. A. Yancey (2002) pointed out that racism is the norm in the United States. He also noted that marrying someone from another race does not remove racism from within that individual.

The seventh stereotype suggested that interracial children would suffer. G. A. Yancey (2002) referred to his 1996 research noting that biracial children have a slight racial identity conflict yet they enjoy multiple cultures more so than other children do. Biracial children are not subject to more negative psychological effects than other children are just because they are biracial. However, he did not present examples as to what the negative psychological effects were.
The eighth stereotype suggested that race does not matter in an African American and Caucasian interracial marriage. G. A. Yancey (2002) commented he personally has experienced challenges and rewards as an African American interracially married man. He believed that only 5% of interracial marriages have issues that are race related and that 95% of issues do not relate to race. Yancey stated, “But to ignore the racial identity of one’s partner is to ignore a vital part of that person” (p. 48). As racial issues continue to exist and disturb our society, we cannot ignore that some racial issues may also exist within interracial relationships. Yancey also noted Caucasians who intermarry become sensitive to racial issues as they become aware of their own racial privileges.

The ninth stereotype stated that a person in an interracial marriage is a “sellout” to his or her own race. That is, if someone has left their own race to join the other race, they are “selling out.” G. A. Yancey (2002) mentioned that some African Americans fear interracial unions may weaken their racial unification in confronting White society politically. There is also a fear among some Blacks that biracial children, trying to pass as Caucasians, may minimize the racial concerns of minorities.

Foeman and Nance (1999) researched the literature relating to African American and Caucasian interracial relationships, married or cohabitating, and the dynamics that some people believe occur when an interracial couple attempts to form an intimate bond. The researchers identified five myths surrounding these relationships. The first myth relates to a belief of Caucasians that African Americans have a strong sex drive. Foeman and Nance stated they have not found support in the literature relating to the myth that African Americans have a strong sex drive.
The second myth states that African Americans marry Caucasians to gain a higher socio-economic status. Foeman and Nance (1999) found there are African American men with higher education levels who have married Caucasian women with lower education levels. They also found that social class, background, and educational levels are very similar between many African American and Caucasian interracial couples. Foeman and Nance concluded that similar educational and economic levels might increase the prospect of African Americans and Caucasians uniting.

The third myth implies that an African American and Caucasian interracial marriage is the expression of a neurotic conflict. Foeman and Nance (1999) found in a study by Davidson (1992), that some Caucasians might marry African Americans in order to punish their parents, to make a social statement, or as an act of defiance. Foeman and Nance also pointed out that beliefs such as rebellion against parents or “acting out” have existed for generations. They also found in a study by Porterfield (1982), that there is no scientific evidence to support the idea that African American and Caucasian married couples are rebellious or psychologically unstable.

The fourth myth is the belief in genetic inferiority. Foeman and Nance (1999) mentioned research by Herrnstein and Murray (1994) that professed the belief in genetic inferiority of African Americans because they have smaller brains and are intellectually inferior to Caucasians. The fifth myth refers to the psychological problems of interracial children because biracial individuals do not have strong self-identities. Bi-racial individuals are viewed as social outcasts existing between the two cultures of African American and Caucasian. They cannot develop a whole sense of self because they cannot
get close enough to either culture. However, Foeman and Nance did find literature indicating some individuals have, and others possible can, successfully combine both cultures.

Summary of Interracial Relationships

Acceptance of African American and Caucasian interracial marriages has slowly progressed; nevertheless, these couples still experience various forms of prejudice. Stereotypes and myths have been formed due to the development of many negative belief systems against these interracial unions. In order to help explain the maintenance of these negative belief systems various theories of prejudice were considered for the current study.

Theories of Prejudice

This researcher hoped that an appropriate theory would help explain why and how prejudicial attitudes towards African American and Caucasian interracial couples are developed and how they are maintained in the United States today. Theories about prejudice initially considered were the Critical Race Theory, Symbolic Racism Theory, and Social Dominance Theory.

Critical Race Theory

Critical Race Theory (CRT) was developed by minority law professors in the early 1980s in order to understand and to improve the status of minorities with respect to law and society (Delgado, 1995; Olmstead, 1998). CRT focuses on how speech communication and conduct influences prejudice. For example, Critical Race theorists believe “that language names, institutes and enforces an almost universal belief in the
mental and moral superiority of Whites in the United States” (Olmstead, p. 327). Racist language used in public speeches can cause prejudice such as the racist rhetoric of White supremacists. Critical Race Theorists also note that rhetoric can be used to influence and solve racism such as speeches on pacifism. Critical Race theorists use “rhetorical ideas as both its ideological base and methodology” (Olmstead, p. 324).

Among the most influential Critical Race theorists of traditional civil rights discourse was Derek Bell. In the 1970s, Bell worried that the accomplishments of the civil rights era of the 1960s could possibly collapse or lose effectiveness in the 1970s. He challenged the civil rights philosophical position stating it had a colorblind approach to social justice. Bell (1993) argued that Caucasians only promote advances for African Americans when it was for the self-interest of Caucasians. Bell also disputed racial patterns in American law by stating the Constitution’s writers chose rewards of property over justice. Richard Delgado, a Critical Race theorist, believed the minority voice must be heard in order to understand and learn the perspective of the minority because it is different from the voice of the dominant culture (Delgado, 2001).

Since the civil rights era, Critical Race theorists have concentrated on legal issues and discourses such as those that promote the self-interests of Caucasians or those that promote a colorblind approach to social justice. Important to the current study was the historical background of race relations and anti-miscegenation that CRT does not integrate into its philosophy. Therefore, CRT was not the appropriate theory for this study.
Symbolic Racism Theory

Symbolic Racism Theory (SRT) emerged from the civil rights era with the objective of explaining why there was Caucasian opposition to racial equality (Tarman & Sears, 2005). SRT encompasses four specific themes (Sears & Henry, 2003). The first theme is based on the belief that African Americans have experienced less prejudice and discrimination than they have in the past. The second theme is African Americans are not willing or dedicated to hard work and thus fail to progress. The third theme posits African Americans are demanding and want too much too fast, whereas the fourth theme posits African Americans have acquired more than they ought or deserve to have (Henry & Sears, 2002; Sears & Henry, 2003).

SRT also evolved partially from parents teaching fears, anxieties, and/or negative beliefs about the African American race to their children. These learned negative beliefs are called the “anti-Black affect” because they were learned in childhood and carried over into the adult years. According to McConahay and Hough’s study (as cited in Sears & Henry, 2003), the “anti-Black affect” encompasses “racial anxiety and antagonism,” and “unacknowledged, negative feelings toward blacks” (p. 260). The “anti-Black affect” can also include feelings of uneasiness when around Blacks, disgust, anger, or contempt. SRT also evolved partially from a conservative and a traditional American moral philosophy the importance of Protestant work ethic which parents have also passed on to their children (Kinder & Sears, 1981; Sears & Henry, 2003; Sears, van Laar, Carrillo, & Kosterman, 1997).
SRT and CRT were not broad enough theories for the current study because they did not encompass historical factors that have contributed to the development and maintenance of beliefs, stereotypes, and attitudes against African Americans and against miscegenation. Needed for the current study was a theory that included a variety of elements to help explain long-standing prejudice and what factors contribute to its maintenance. Therefore, the one theory deemed appropriate, as the guiding theory for the current study was the Social Dominance Theory (SDT).

**Social Dominance Theory**

Social Dominance Theory (SDT) suggests that all human societies tend to be organized as systems of group-based social hierarchies (Sidanius & Pratto, 2001). SDT is a broad-based theory that attempts to identify a range of these systems that interrelate and support each other to sustain a group-based social hierarchy. These hierarchies are constructed of one or a number of dominant groups that are at the topmost of the hierarchy and one or a number of subordinate groups at the bottom of the hierarchy social structure.

SDT utilizes components of psychology, sociology, and political science to explain how group-based hierarchical systems maintain their structures in light of psychological, intergroup, and institutional processes (Sidanius, 1994; Sidanius, Levin, & Pratto, 1996; Sidanius & Pratto, 2001). SDT also attempts to explain why people form and maintain attitudes and beliefs concerning prejudice, oppression, and racism. That is, it seeks to find individual and group characteristics or attitudes that sustain specific social situations. For the current study, the specific social situation is antimiscegenation.
between the African American and Caucasian races. According to Fang et al. (1998), SDT is a model that is “capable of providing a theoretically coherent and general explanation of miscegenation attitudes” (p. 290).

SDT describes social hierarchies (high and low status groups) which people tend to form by developing their social customs, supportive activities, and various other networking systems. The higher status group, hegemonic or dominant group, supports the position that subordinate group members are inferior and deserve to be in their lower status (Sidanius et al., 1996; Sidanius & Pratto, 2001). Some characteristics of hegemonic groups consist of those possessing a larger portion of wealth and material goods, obtaining higher social status and political authority, and having more opportunities for acquiring a higher quality of education.

Some characteristics of subordinate groups consist of lower socio-economic-status, little or no political power, and employment in low-status jobs, and few opportunities to obtain quality education (Heaven & Connors, 2001; Pratto, Stallworth, & Sidanius, 1997; Quist & Resendez, 2002; Sidanius, 1994). In order to keep subordinate groups in their lower status, SDT suggests some dominant group members legitimize discrimination by promoting or maintaining inequalities and encouraging others to follow their behaviors (Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994).

Social Dominance Orientation. In order to explain the formation and maintenance of support for orientation towards a group-based social hierarchy, SDT uses a construct called Social Dominance Orientation (SDO). SDO is “the desire to establish and maintain anti-egalitarian and hierarchical relations between social groups” (Levin, Sidanius,
Rabinowitz, & Federico, 1998, p. 377). SDO relates to a variety of legitimizing sociopolitical postures, social attributions, beliefs, and social functions. These postures, attributes, and so forth, can give the impression of credibility and support for the dominant group and anti-egalitarian interactions among social groups (Fang et al., 1998; Pratto et al., 1994; Quist & Resendez, 2002).

The process of SDO explains how inequalities are maintained and are supported outside and within the dominant group. For example, White supremacist groups have preached that the Caucasian race is the superior race and that African Americans are genetically inferior. They justify their ideologies by focusing on historical prejudice, religious proscriptions, evolutionary behavior, and so forth (Ferber, 1998; Foeman & Nance, 1999; Hudson & Hines-Hudson, 1999; Pratto et al., 1994; Rushton & Rushton, 2003).

Within the paradigm of SDO (see Figure 1), stereotypes, myths, ideologies, or beliefs are called Legitimizing Myths (LMs). LMs are defined as “values, attitudes, beliefs, causal attributions, and ideologies “that provide moral and intellectual justification for social practices that either increase, maintain, or decrease levels of social inequality among social groups” (Sidanius & Pratto, 2001, p. 104). There are two types of LMs (see Figure 1). The first is called Hierarchy-Enhancing Legitimizing Myths, or HE-LMs, and the second is called Hierarchy-Attenuating Legitimizing Myths, or HA-LMs (Pratto et al., 2000; Sidanius, 1994; Sidanius et al., 1996; Sidanius & Pratto, 2001).

The first type of myths, HE-LMs, can help one group sustain dominance over another group. The second type of myths, HA-LMs, can influence group equality by
Figure 1. Social Dominance Orientation Chart

Social Dominance Orientation

Legitimizing Myths (LMs)

Hierarchy Enhancing (anti-egalitarian)
The Caucasian race is genetically superior
Interracial marriage is not natural
Those who intermarry are traitors to their races

Hierarchy Attenuating (egalitarian)
One race is not superior to any other race
Interracial marriage is ok
All races are created equal and should be treated equally

Discrimination
Aggregated individual—from individuals
Aggregated institutional—from institutions or public
Behavioral Asymmetry—from self or one’s own group
increasing unity between hegemonic and subordinate groups (Quist & Resendez, 2002; Sidanius & Pratto, 2001; Sidanius, Pratto, van Laar, & Levin, 2004). Some LMs sustained over a period can be accepted to be the truth. For example, there is a long-standing myth that African Americans date and marry Caucasians in order to gain in status socially and economically (Foeman & Nance, 1999).

HE-LMs justify the practices that support the dominant social hierarchy. HE-LMs are also the techniques that legitimize discrimination which promote or maintain group inequality (Pratto et al., 1994). For example, it was against the law to teach reading and writing to African Americans. Belief systems such as the Curse of Ham, and the importance of the races not mixing, were encouraged in order to maintain White racial purity.

Another example of HE-LMs are the beliefs of White supremacists groups who promote the Caucasian race as being the superior race above all other races (Ferber, 1998). For example, a tactic the American Nazi Party (ANP) uses to promote their beliefs is by offering free flyers to support their racist ideals through their website (www.americannaziparty.com). Their motto states, “We must secure the existence of our people and a future for White children” (American Nazi Party, n.d.).

White supremacist, Matt Hale, leader of the Creativity Movement, professes that the Caucasian race is the finest achievement of nature. Any non-Whites (darker skin) and Jews are considered to be of the Mud race. He believes that the African American race is at the bottom level of humans in evolution, just slightly above chimpanzees and monkeys. He also promotes the belief that interracial marriage is one of the reasons why
America is becoming more depraved along with drug addiction and pornography (Anti-defamation League, n.d.).

Attitudes and beliefs that promote equality and reduce the structure of a dominant social hierarchy are Hierarchy-Attenuating Legitimizing Myths (HA-LMs) such as the belief that all men are created equal (see Figure 1). This belief for equality was fought for during the Civil War in 1865 thus abolishing slavery. Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr., and his supporters in the 1950s and 1960s worked to create a society where all men were created equal. Dr. King’s work helped to expose inequalities and fought for desegregation, the right to vote, and so forth.

Another example of a HA-LM important to the current study is the belief that all men should be free to marry whomever they want to marry as in the landmark Supreme Court case of 1967, 

_Loving v. Virginia_. An African American and Caucasian inter racially married couple fought for their right to live together as man and wife. They won their case and the Supreme Court declared all anti-miscegenation laws to be repealed. The Supreme Court based its decision on the belief that marriage is a basic right of man.

Sidanius and Pratto (2001) posited that three processes partly regulated by LMs drive dominant and subordinate groups. These processes are aggregated individual discrimination, aggregated institutional discrimination, and behavioral asymmetry (see Figure 1). The first process, aggregated individual discrimination, addresses overt and subtle acts of discrimination that one individual enacts against another individual (Sidanius & Pratto). For example, a Caucasian mother warned her daughter, “You better watch out, because you might have little Black kids running around the house some day”
(St. Jean, 1998, p. 405). However, notice that the Caucasian mother did not warn her
daughter against having little White kids running around the house. Another example of
aggregated individual discrimination is individuals in public disapprovingly stare or
making taunting comments towards interracial couples (Chito Childs, 2005b; Root, 2001;
G. A. Yancey, 2002).

The second process, aggregated institutional discrimination, is discrimination
practiced by a social institution such as schools, hospitals, retail outlets, and so forth.
Some examples are real estate agencies refusing to rent or sell to African Americans or
interracial couples or retail stores refusing to hire African Americans or offering only
lower wage positions. In addition, some churches have been refusing to accept
interracially married couples as congregational members. Another form of aggregated
institutional discrimination is called “unofficial terror” (Sidanius & Pratto, 2001, p. 42).
As a case in point, the Ku Klux Klan developed their own “unofficial” laws and lynched
over 3,000 African Americans between the years 1882 through 1927 (Alonso, 2000;
Kennedy, 2003; Packard, 2002).

The third process is the behavioral asymmetry hypothesis that posits members of
the subgroup do not act in their own best interests but help support the dominant group.
For example, during the Civil War, the Confederates were against abolishing slavery and
African American soldiers fought on the side of the Confederates. Today, there are
African Americans who are demeaned by their own race if they attend better schools and
are mixing more with Caucasian. In addition, some African Americans are accused of
stepping out of their own race when socializing, dating, or marrying outside their race.
Sidanius and Pratto (2001) developed a variety of scales to measure individual’s psychological orientation towards group dominance. Each scale is comprised of a set of statements to which the respondent either agrees or disagrees. These scales measure social dominance orientation in reference to social policies, ethnic prejudice, racism, sexism, Protestant work ethic, and so forth. The scales can reveal which people are high in SDO, that is, those in favor of group inequality, and people who are low in SDO, that is, those in favor of group equality. By using their SDO scales, Sidanius and Pratto found that Caucasians have higher levels of racism than African Americans. They also found that men were more sexist than women were. Various other findings have shown that people who are oriented towards positions of power, such as police or attorneys, scored high on SDO. Those individuals oriented towards positions of less power and authority such as social workers or nurses, scored low on SDO. For a detailed description of the various SDO scales, see Sidanius and Pratto (2001).

Summary of Theories of Prejudice

SRT and CRT were theories considered for the current study. However, neither theory was broad enough to encompass a variety of factors that could explain the maintenance of longstanding prejudicial attitudes against antimuscegenation. Therefore, the one theory deemed appropriate as the guiding theory for the current study was the Social Dominance Theory (SDT).

Informed and guided by SDT the current study was designed to capture the presence or absence of prejudicial views. A construct within the SDT theory is called Social Dominance Orientation (SDO). As explained by Sidanius et al. (1996), SDO is a
“general positive orientation towards group dominance” (p. 385). Those high in SDO use hierarchy enhancing legitimizing myths (HE-LMs) to give support to their beliefs (group dominance). Those low in SDO use hierarchy attenuating legitimizing myths (HA-LMS) to give support to their beliefs (group equality). Three processes that influence dominant and subordinate groups are aggregated individual discrimination, aggregated institutional discrimination, and behavioral asymmetry.

Current Research

The following review presents current research concerning African American and Caucasian interracial couples, married and cohabitating. This is not an exhaustive list of research, but it is representative of their experiences of prejudice. The current review consists of research by: Chito Childs (2002, 2005a, 2005b), Hibbler and Shinew (2002), Killian (2002), Rosenblatt et al. (1995), St. Jean (1998), G. A. Yancey (2002), and S. W. Yancey (2002). Also included in this review are excerpts from a popular talk show, hosted by Dr. Phil McGraw, relating to prejudice and African American and Caucasian interracial couples (Stewart, 2003, 2004, 2005).

Interracial Couples’ Experiences of Prejudice

Chito Childs (2005b) interviewed 15 heterosexual African American and Caucasian interracial couples. All 15 couples were in a committed relationship of which nine were married and six were cohabitating. Eleven of the couples consisted of Caucasian women with African American men. Four of the couples were Caucasian men with African American women. Eleven of the Caucasian participants experienced some family members not permitting the African American partner into their home. Six of the
couples mentioned they had no, or limited, contact with their families who were against their union. Chito Childs noted, “White families chose to marginalize the White member of their family rather than accept a black individual into their primary group” (p. 123).

In Chito Childs’ (2005b) study, three of the Caucasian participants related that their relationship with an African American partner increased their awareness of prejudice. For example, a Caucasian male participant stated that

> Usually for White people they do not think about race and I think that being in an interracial relationship and marriage that I have become more aware of my Whiteness. . . . I’m sensitive to the fact that I’m a Caucasian male. (p. 22)

Another respondent, a Caucasian woman, stated that until she became involved with an African American male she was “clueless . . . I guess I was really ignorant to racism” (p. 30). A female Caucasian participant noted, “Whites and blacks respond to me differently than before [when she was single]” (p. 6). According to Chito Childs, these individuals believed that they would not have had these experiences, nor had become aware of racism, had they been in a same race relationship.

Four of the couples in Chito Childs’ (2005b) study believed that prejudice was not a problem whereas five other couples stated they were constantly made aware of others’ views of them as an interracially married couple. An African American male participant stated, “It doesn’t matter if we’re at the car wash, the market, the club, somebody is going to look or make a comment under their breath” (p. 40). Chito Childs noted that the remaining six couples’ stories were ambivalent. That is, they stated although their relationships with others were normal they were being perceived differently by others.
Some individual participants mentioned encountering various problems in the workplace. For example, they experienced coworkers making derogatory comments because their partner was of another race. Some expressed experiencing opposition, overtly and subtly, because they were in an interracial union. Others stated they would not even mention the race of their partners at their place of employment for fear of experiencing some form of prejudice (Chito Childs, 2005b).

In their religious lives, Chito Childs (2005b) found that some of the couples received unconditional acceptance where they attended church. Yet other couples experienced some opposition from members of the church or from church officials. Other couples stated they were more comfortable in predominantly African American churches rather than predominantly Caucasian churches.

Chito Childs’ (2005b) study also revealed couples experiencing anger from African American women who were against African American and Caucasian interracial relationships. For example, a Caucasian woman, who was married to an African American man, revealed that “I’ve had women [black] pissed off . . . they have to put their anger somewhere so they put it toward the White woman” (p. 97). Another Caucasian woman mentioned she and her African American husband had many problems from African American girls who stared or said nasty things to them. An African American male related he was told by an African American woman: “What are you doing with that [White woman] or what’s wrong with your own color, what’s wrong with our own kind?” (p. 96). One Caucasian wife stated that she had experienced opposition from some African American women but not from all.
Chito Childs (2002) found that some families, African American and Caucasian, had problems accepting a mixed marriage, yet other families were accepting. One of the Caucasian participants stated she had her family’s support but her grandmother did not come to the wedding because she did not approve of interracial marriages. Another participant mentioned that she might never know her relatives’ true feelings about her interracial relationship. Another participant stated her mother cried during the whole wedding and that her tears were not tears of joy. The same participant stated that after her divorce her mom was happier that she was no longer with an African American man.

Some of the Caucasian participants experienced concerns about raising children from their families. One concern was the children’s skin color might be too dark. A participant related someone suggesting to her that an abortion would be best rather than having a biracial baby. On the other hand, a participant had support from her Caucasian family. When her first baby was born, they stated they could not “believe how beautiful he is” (Chito Childs, 2002, p. 155). Most of the couples stated they were raised to accept others, yet some of their families showed opposition with their decision to marry someone of another race. Chito Childs also found most of the couples believed that African American families were more accepting of interracial marriages than Caucasian families.

A study by Hibbler and Shinew (2002) discussed leisure preferences of six African American and Caucasian interracially married couples. Of the six couples, two of the couples were married for 16 years and the other 4 couples were married two, four, seven, or nine years. Five of the couples consisted of an African American male with a
Caucasian female partner and one couple was a Caucasian male with an African American female spouse. Hibbler and Shinew used a qualitative design of in-depth interviewing with each couple. They interviewed each individual separately, and then interviewed each couple together. The duration of each interview was 90 minutes.

Hibbler and Shinew (2002) used member checks to establish trustworthiness and authenticity and completed follow-up interviews with home visits and phone calls. The interviews and member checks were completed over an 8-month time period. An interview protocol was used to give a semi-structure format. This protocol consisted of 19 guiding questions within the areas of interracial relationships, race, societal issues, gender, socioeconomic class, family, social network, and leisure. However, Hibbler and Shinew did not include what the 19 questions were in their 2002 research article.

Hibbler and Shinew (2002) found that one major theme emerged from their study. That is, the couples had limited social networks due to perceived negative social reactions to their union. Limitations of social networks were found in three areas: family, leisure, and work. Quite often couples dealt with prejudice from within their own families. For example, Nikki, a Caucasian female, stated that her dad alienated her from the family when she told him that she was marrying an African American man. He told her “you should have married your own race” (p. 145).

Some couples expressed experiencing social isolation after disapproving family members withdrew from them. Paul, an African American, commented that when things were bad it had strengthened their marital relationship. He also commented,
It was horrifying for me. The family thing [rejection] and it made us rely on ourselves . . . much more than maybe we would have if my family had been very supportive . . .we know we weren’t getting a whole lot of support from very many other people. (p. 147)

All six couples reported numerous examples of prejudice within their social leisure lives. These experiences affected how they discerned in which activities to participate. One couple expressed they “could not be assured of safety, and thus elected to withdraw [travel plans] and remain at home or develop an alternative leisure plan” (p. 149). Another couple stated they had fear of traveling in the southern states. As a case in point, Bob, an African American, was planning his honeymoon and stated, “Well, we can’t go South . . . Because it’s not going to go over well down there” (p. 150). Other participants disclosed they would call family members before making a trip to ask if they thought they might encounter problems.

Most of the couples had a constant concern for safety and comfort because they had experienced prejudice in public places. Phil, an African American male, stated, I am always in protective mode . . . you might be relaxed [looking at his White wife] but I am not ‘cause I’m always making decisions, looking around, making certain that nobody’s running up on us . . . I’m very cautious that way . . . in today’s climate I’m concerned with racist mentality. (Hibbler & Shinew, 2002, p. 150)

Many of the couples stayed closer to home for their leisure activities in order to avoid negative experiences from the public. Hibbler and Shinew (2002) concluded fear of
being met with hostility and other negative experiences was difficult for the couples and that “racism was an important leisure constraint” (p. 152) for them.

Problems in the work place were also discussed. One of the participants, Cori, a Caucasian engineer, brought her African American boyfriend (Phil) into her place of employment to show him the factory. Cori related that she was called into an executive’s office and told she was “causing a disruption” and that her boyfriend should leave the factory (Hibbler & Shinew, 2002, p. 147). After the experience with her boss, she was ostracized at work by co-workers, which eventually caused her to quit her job. Other participants stated they also experienced being ostracized at their work place. Participants commented they were cautious about letting coworkers know about their interracial marriage for fear of some form of reprisal. Hibbler and Shinew concluded the interracially married couples did believe they were socially cut off in various aspects of their lives. The couples had little feelings of comfort from within their families, places of employment, and social leisure activities. Hibbler and Shinew surmised racism and race appeared to be the major cause of their social isolation.

Killian (2002) completed an exploratory study of semi-structured in-depth interviews with 10 African American and Caucasian interracially married couples who had been married for a minimum of one year. Seven couples were African American males with Caucasian female partners; three couples were African American females with Caucasian male partners. Killian conducted two separate interview sessions; one session was with each individual and the other session was with each couple. The duration of each interview was approximately 1.5 to 2 hours. The interview sessions
explored the couples’ family histories, life experiences together, and the predominant and subordinate discourses used in navigating through racial and ethnic differences.

Killian (2002) found some spouses had differing viewpoints of experiences of prejudice. For example, an African American male stated that his Caucasian wife “wouldn’t want to face the truth [racial incident due to being a mixed couple] . . . she has her own way of thinking and a lot of things she is ignorant to” (p. 603). The Caucasian wife responded, “I just don’t think that way. I don’t see it as the truth [racial]” and the husband stated, “Yeah, we view things a lot differently” (p. 603).

In another situation, a Caucasian male partner did not think his African American wife’s situation at work was racially biased. She tried to explain to him that when co-workers found out he was Caucasian they called her “the White man’s woman” (p. 609). She also lost the respect of some co-workers because they thought she sold out. Her husband said he did not think her problems had to do with his being Caucasian, but instead it was someone at work she did not like. His wife explained that it was true she did not like someone at work, but in reference to others at work, she stated, “I felt I had a good reading of how they would react, and I didn’t want Ian [husband] to have any problems” (p. 609).

One couple revealed worrying about danger while traveling and would not drive far from the interstate. Another couple mentioned it was safer to sit on separate sides of the bus at night so they would not look like they were together. This was their method of protecting each other in a certain section of town.
Killian (2002) found 9 of the 10 African American partners mentioned their Caucasian partners were less perceptive to negative public reactions; most of the Caucasian partners admitted that that was true. Some of the Caucasian partners said they did not look for negative public reactions or they probably were unaware of them. All 10 couples agreed that the African American spouses were more sensitive and more emotionally affected by negative public reactions than the Caucasian spouses were. Various couples mentioned that the Caucasian partner did not affirm the African American partner’s experience of prejudice. Killian surmised that this lack of affirmation might be demonstrating how some people do or do not understand the numerous ways prejudice conveys itself in daily situations. Killian noted even though some couples experienced differences in perceptions about experiences prejudice, the couples did adjusted to each other.

Rosenblatt et al. (1995) conducted a study by interviewing 21 African American and Caucasian interracially married couples regarding their experiences of prejudice. Research assistants who were also an interracially married couple conducted the interviews. The wife was Caucasian, and her husband was African American. They questioned participants on a range of issues varying from family, children, work, and social lives.

Some of the study participants discussed the difficulty their family members had in accepting their interracial union. For example, when one Caucasian female told her father she was marrying an African American man, her father stated, “I am glad that my own parents are dead so that they don’t have to see the shame that you’ve brought upon
Another Caucasian father said to his daughter who wanted to marry an African American man, “Your mother would turn over in her grave” (p. 74). A Caucasian female related she suffered the loss of parental love when she had made her choice to marry an African American man. When her first daughter was born, she experienced no parental love or acceptance. She realized she would probably never be able to gain her parents’ acceptance.

In the same study, a Caucasian female recalled an incident while visiting her mother-in-law and other African American relatives. All the family members were African American except her. She explained they were saying disparaging things about a Caucasian director of the movie *Glory* that was upsetting to her, but she did not have enough confidence to leave. She mentioned she probably would never be friends with her husband’s mother.

Rosenblatt et al. (1995) found in many African American families that most of the acceptance or rejection about an interracial marriage came from the mother. However, in many Caucasian families, the father played the key role of acceptance or rejection of the marriage. With regard to children, a couple related that both sides of their families worried about their interracial children, the color of the children’s skin, and their future as biracial individuals.

Rosenblatt et al. (1995) found the couples encountered positive and negative experiences relating to their interracial marriage. However, they concluded that even amidst negative experiences, the participants saw themselves as ordinary people leading
ordinary lives. In order to get through adverse events, these couples could abandon unpleasant experiences and proceed to enjoy their lives together.

A study conducted by St. Jean (1998) involved a focus group of 11 African American and Caucasian interracially married couples. Most of the couples related they experienced being stared at, receiving negative comments, racial slurs, and so forth, when out in public together. One of the couples mentioned they overheard, “Look at that nigger and that White trash together.” Another couple mentioned they disliked hearing comments such as “I hope they don’t have children” (p. 405). Some of the Caucasian spouses mentioned that they did not realize how pervasive prejudice was until they were married to an African American person.

Some of the couples in St. Jean’s (1998) study mentioned there were times when they were out in public together that they were confronted by others about their relationship. For example, one African American wife stated she was asked by an African American woman, “What is a White man doing for you that a Black man couldn’t do?” (p. 409). One of the African American husbands stated that African American women “tried to become a wedge between us.” His Caucasian wife stated, “Black females were mean to me. They would call me names” (p. 409).

In work situations, some couples hid the fact that they were in an interracial marriage for fear of being fired by their employers. St. Jean (1998) concluded that these couples were living two separate lives: one private and one public. In their private life, they could be themselves and live a life as a married couple. In their public life, they were experiencing a variety of negative reactions they would not have had if they had
been in a same-race marriage. St. Jean surmised that it was common for these couples to be reminded by “Blacks, Whites, relatives, and non-relatives of the inappropriate nature of their association” (p. 411).

Besides academic research on African American and Caucasian interracial couples, this researcher obtained three transcripts from the Dr. Phil television show (Stewart, 2003, 2004, 2005). The transcripts included guests and audience opinions relating to race, prejudice, and African American and Caucasian interracial unions.

One transcript gave an account of a Caucasian man who was very adamant about races not mixing. He stated,

They can’t help it because they’re Mexican. I can’t help it because I’m White. Someone can’t help it because they’re Black. That’s the way it is. But I said and I still say it that you should stay within your race, and, and there won’t be no problems. . . . I mean to keep everything pure. That’s what I’m talking about. That’s the whole idea of the whole thing. You keep everything pure. (Stewart, 2003, p. 7)

A Caucasian father expressed hatred against African American men because his Caucasian daughter was going to have an African American man’s baby. He stated, “My biggest fear is that the baby is going to be dark, having kinky hair and a large butt” (Stewart, 2005, p. 1). He continued to express that “Blacks should have black babies, and Whites should have White babies. I do not believe the two races should mix. . . . Knowing that a black man was intimate with my daughter absolutely makes my blood
boil” (p. 2). Dr. Phil wanted to know how he justified his racist attitude in his mind. The Caucasian father stated,

That’s what I’ve been taught. . . . That’s how I was raised. . . . My daughter having a black baby is causing me a lot of grief because I don’t know how to deal with it. I was hoping that it would be light skinned so it could maybe pass her off as Latino. (Stewart, 2005, p. 5)

From the audience, a Caucasian mother revealed, “I would feel embarrassed if my daughters dated black men, and I would wonder, ‘Where did I go wrong?’ I don’t consider myself a racist just because I would not like my daughters dating or marrying blacks” (Stewart, 2003, p. 10).

An African American single female member of the audience stated, “I’m tired of being an educated black woman without a man and being alone because black men date White women” (Stewart, 2004, p. 12). An invited guest on the television show, Vay, a single African American female, believed strongly about marrying only African American men; yet she expressed anger towards those men. She believed that there were few educated African American men available and they tended to want Caucasian women. Vay stated, “It’s like black men think, you know, I’ve got this great education, I’ve got this car. Now let me get a White woman, like she’s some kind of trophy” (p. 8). Vay also mentioned that she was suspicious of Caucasian men. She said they “want to experience me” yet they do not want to be seen out in public with her because it is taboo. She also mentioned, if she did date a Caucasian man, she would feel like a betrayal to her own race because “Whites did rape and pillage and oppress my people” (p. 8).
Summary of Current Research

This literature review revealed that many African American and Caucasian interracial couples, married or cohabitating, have suffered various forms of prejudice. Some couples and individuals have experienced racial slurs, problems with employment, bosses, co-workers, rejection by their families, loss of friends, and so forth. Others stated they have not faced, or only to a minor degree, any of these problems. Many Caucasian individuals mentioned they were not aware of their own White privilege status. They did not realize how painful prejudice was until they were involved with an African American partner.

The literature review also revealed that some individual members of an African American and Caucasian interracial marriage, or those cohabitating, had different interpretations of their experiences of prejudice. That is, one partner thought a situation was racially biased, whereas the other partner thought the same situation was not biased. Transcripts from a popular TV talk show revealed deep beliefs against the races mixing.

Summary

Chapter I included a succinct historical perspective of African American and Caucasian relationships since 1619, such as anti-miscegenation laws, and White supremacists’ activities of violence against equality. Also reviewed were some of the various struggles the African American race has faced to gain civil rights, the right to vote, and the freedom to marry interracially.
Recent research of African American and Caucasian relationships included attitudes, polls, stereotypes, and myths relating to interracial marriages. Also included was recent research on the experiences of prejudice by interracial couples.

The Social Dominance Theory (SDT) is the guiding theory for the current study. It gave a theoretical understanding to the development and maintenance of prejudicial beliefs. Within SDT is the construct of Social Dominance Orientation (SDO), which helps explain factors that influence those in favor of equality or inequality. Two such factors are Hierarchy-Attenuating Legitimizing Myths (HA-LMs) and Hierarchy-Enhancing Legitimizing Myths (HA-LMs).

The current study investigated the experiences of prejudice of 20 African American and Caucasian interracially married couples in the Cleveland, Ohio, area. In order to analyze experiences of prejudice in this study, Q methodology was employed. Q methodology is discussed in depth in Chapter II. Results obtained from the current research are in Chapter III. The final chapter, Chapter IV, discusses the findings of the current study. Also discussed are the limitations of the current study and considerations for future research.
CHAPTER II
METHODOLOGY

This study utilized Q methodology to investigate the experiences of prejudice of each partner in African American and Caucasian interracial marriages. Q methodology utilizes a mixture of qualitative methods (i.e., participant interviews) and quantitative methods (i.e., factor analysis) to examine human subjectivity. Human subjectivity is a person’s perspective about a certain topic (McKeown & Thomas, 1988). Q methodology is based on the premise that subjectivity can be communicated and expressed through the Q sorting activity.

Q Methodology

William Stephenson (1935) introduced Q methodology in 1935 as a variation of factor analysis to make possible the systematic study of human subjectivity. Since its beginnings, Q methodology has been increasingly used for investigations in the social sciences, communications field, medical fields, and other related areas (Addams & Proops, 2000; S. R. Brown, 1980). Q honors individual perspectives and perceptions about the topic at hand. It is concerned “with why and how people believe what they do” (Addams, 2000, p. 34).

Q does not employ a preexisting measuring instrument, such as a multi-choice questionnaire or a true/false inventory that might be used for measuring traits (as in traditional methodology). Q methodology uses a set of statement cards (Q set) as its
measuring instrument. The results are then factor analyzed thus revealing similarities and differences in viewpoints between the participants on the topic of interest.

As Stephenson (1993/1994) stated, Q methodology is “a science for all that is subjective, comparable to all that is objective—for what lies behind the eyes, as well as before them” (p. 4). In order to reveal what lies behind the eyes (i.e., what the participants are thinking about), participants are asked to rank-order a Q set (statement cards) according to their own personal viewpoint. Thus, the Q set provides a systematic way of seeking patterns of responses across individuals revealing the subjective structures (perspectives and attitudes) of the participants (S. R. Brown, 1996).

Q sets are derived from a communication concourse. The communication concourse can be developed from research, personal interviews, written communications (letters, poems, books, etc.), or other representations such as photographs, and so forth. In the current study, the Q set was created from a concourse originating from a thorough literature review relating to African American and Caucasian interracial couples and their experiences of prejudice.

For the current study, the Q set consisted of 33 statement cards. Each statement card had its own distinct stimulus item indicating an experience of prejudice. Participants were asked to read and rank-order each card and to place each card in an area on a Q sort continuum grid. The continuum grid ranged from -4 (most disagree) at one endpoint, a 0 (neutral) at the central point, and +4 (most agree) at the other end point (see Figure 2). The Q sort grid takes the form of a quasi-normal distribution, symmetrical about the
Q sort Grid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Most agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-4 2 items</td>
<td>-3 2 items</td>
<td>-2 4 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1 5 items</td>
<td>0 7 items</td>
<td>+1 5 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+2 4 items</td>
<td>+3 2 items</td>
<td>+4 2 items</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. Q sort Record Grid

middle and narrow at each end. The distribution shape of the grid is designed to accommodate the number of statements chosen for the study.

Each statement card has an identifying number that participants record onto a Q sort answer sheet (see Appendix M) which is a replication of the Q sort grid (see Figure 2). The numbers from the answer sheet are entered into the PQ Method computer software program specifically designed for Q methodology (Schmolck & Atkinson,
The software program factor analyzes the Q sorts revealing the resulting factors, or groupings, and the different viewpoints that exist about the topic at hand.

In Phase II of the current study, each participant sorted a Q set of 33 statement cards (see Appendix A), and then participated in a brief interview relating to their sort. The interview consisted of questions relating to placement of statements at the +4 and -4 ends of the continuum and any other statement that may have had a particular meaning to the participant. The purpose of the interview was to aid the researcher in interpretation of the data from what the participants had to say about their Q sort placements.

Another methodology that could have been used to investigate perceptions of prejudice would have been to survey a random sample of African American and Caucasian interracially married couples. By using a survey method, a questionnaire would have been developed relative to the topic of experiences of prejudice and administered to a sample larger than the one used in the current study. The results of survey research are usually analyzed by traditional applications, such as ANOVA, whereby mean scores would be computed and could then be generalized to a larger population.

Survey methodology was not selected for the current study because the researcher’s goal was not to reduce participant responses to mean scores or to generalize results to a larger population. According to Addams (2000) the objective of Q methodology “is to discover patterns of relationships among individual responses” (p. 24). The patterns of relationships would reveal what the structures of subjectivity would be among a small select group of people, in a specific geographic locale, relating
to their experiences of prejudice. The results of the study can be used to understand experiences of prejudice within a specific population (African American and Caucasian interracially married couples) in a specific geographic area.

Discussed in this chapter are the components of Q methodology and their applications (i.e., communication concourse, Q set, factor analysis, and follow-up interviews). Also discussed are the pilot study, Phase I, and the main study, Phase II. The Kent State University Institutional Review Board approved this study (see Appendices B and C).

Communication Concourse

The communication concourse is a collection of all possible statements, or perspectives, used in any discourse about the topic at hand (Addams, 2000). According to S. R. Brown (1993), the communication concourse “comprises the raw materials for Q methodology” (p. 97). These raw materials can consist of a collection of discourses or statements, photographs, cartoons, political statements, artwork, and so forth. McKeown and Thomas (1988) suggested two types of Q-samples, also referred to as stimulus items, for forming the concourse. The first type of Q-sample is called “naturalistic” and the second type is called “ready-made” (p. 25).

Naturalistic Q-samples can be derived from participants “during the course of an interview as they are naturally expressed” (Addams, 2000, p.21). Personal perspectives, opinions, or perceptions are gathered in the participants’ own words until few or no new perspectives or viewpoints are generated. According to McKeown and Thomas (1988), an advantage of this method is the Q set reflects the opinions of the interviewees who will
also be the participants in the final Q sort. Thus, the sorting process is expedited because
the participants are familiar with the content of the Q sort.

However, McKeown and Thomas (1988) mentioned a major drawback for using
the interviewing process is that it can be an inconvenience to the participants by requiring
more effort and time than they would be willing to dedicate. That is, after the initial
interviewing process is completed with the participants, the researcher develops the
communication concourse. After the concourse is developed, each participant is then
asked to complete a Q sort. After completion of their Q sorts, they are interviewed. For
the current study, this researcher believed that having the participants complete an initial
interview (for formation of the concourse), then later be asked to complete a Q sort, and
then another interview would be a time consuming and possibly a tedious task. In
addition, limiting the concourse development only to those who would be participating in
the study would be limiting the number of voices representing experiences of prejudice
for the formation of the concourse.

The second form of Q-sample is the “ready-made” type. Ready-made Q-samples
are “developed from sources external to the study” (McKeown & Thomas, 1988, p. 26).
For example, ready-made samples can be selected from existing scales such as
conventional rating scales or standardized Q sort. A sub-type of the ready-made sample is
the quasi-naturalistic Q-sample. Quasi-naturalistic samples are from real-world
experiences but, unlike naturalistic samples, they are generated from secondary sources
such as scholarly books, newspapers, research journals, news, and popular magazine
stories, and media outlets such as radio and television shows. This researcher chose the
quasi-naturalistic approach because it permitted the use of secondary sources, which provided a wider variety of voices relating to experiences about prejudice.

Each quasi-naturalistic source was scrutinized to meet a main criterion consisting of three conditions in order for statements to qualify for the communication concourse. The main criterion was the content of all statements needed to pertain to African American and Caucasian interracial unions and their experiences of prejudice. The first condition under the criterion was to collect statements quoted by members of African American and Caucasian interracial unions. The second criterion was to collect statements quoted by family, friends, or other individuals expressing their opinion(s) about interracial unions. The third criterion was to collect statements from the findings of researchers who studied African American and Caucasian interracial couples.

The original intent was to seek secondary sources that focused only on African American and Caucasian interracially married couples. However, there was little to be found because most of the secondary sources included a combination of married, cohabitating, and dating couples. The total number of secondary sources (and their statement numbers) utilized in the formation of the communication concourse was 17 (see Appendix D). The original number of statements that formed the communication concourse was 532 (see Appendix E). In recording statements, some statements were shortened or paraphrased to let the researcher know the type of prejudice being experienced. For example, statement #62 was shortened to “Oreo.” It referred to an African American being called an “Oreo” because of being in a relationship with or had Caucasian people as friends.
After carefully selecting, reviewing, and numbering all statements, the researcher surmised that most experiences of prejudice occurred within the context of the family (parents, siblings, grandparents, etc.), work (co-workers and employers), local religious organizations (church members or religious officials), and other individuals and social groups. From these environments, four domains were then developed and coded: family (F), religion (R), work (W), and other societal groups (S) which consisted of friends, strangers, and the public in general.

The F domain, family, consisted of statements expressed by parents, siblings, grandparents, or other relatives. The W domain, work, consisted of statements expressed by co-workers, and employers. Statements in the R domain, religion, were expressed by religious officials and church members. Statements from the S domain, societal, were expressed by friends, social acquaintances, and other individuals in public places such as retail stores, restaurants, institutions, and so forth. These four domains also included statements expressed by individuals in an African American and Caucasian interracial union.

The following examples are statements from each of the four domains. From the F domain, an uncle was opposed to his niece marrying an African American man. The uncle stated, “I want a Caucasian family. A minority is not going to be in my family” (Stewart, 2003, p. 2). This statement was coded F1 because it was the first statement collected and quoted by a family member. Another example was statement F491, “Mommy’s parents were upset at first when she married a black man” (Weller, 2005, p.
From the work domain, an individual stated she was “ostracized at work [because her boyfriend was Black]” (Hibbler & Shinew, 2002, p. 147). This statement was coded W380. Statement W204 was from a Caucasian man married to an African American woman. He stated, “[At work] I don’t announce the fact that my wife is Black . . . I can hear negative things about Blacks” (St. Jean, 1998, p. 406). Examples from the religious domain, statement R512 was “Tracy’s church refused to have her wedding there” (Morris, 2003, p. 41). Statement R371 was from a Caucasian man who wanted to have his interracial marriage performed at his church. He related that the pastor refused his request by stating, “They [church officials and members] were not ready for us to be married there yet” (Tatlock, 2002, p. 126).

From the societal domain, statement S83 was: “I guess it’s always awareness when you’re out in the public that makes you self-conscious [being an interracial couple]” (Rosenblatt et al., 1995, p. 32). Statement S187 is from an individual who reported they [the couple] had been the target of comments such as, “Look at that nigger and White trash together” (St. Jean, 1998, p. 405). After coding all 532 statements, the next step was to reduce the number of statements to a manageable Q set size.

Formulating the Q set

When formulating a Q set, it should represent a variety of opinions about the topic and yet maintain comprehensiveness, simplicity, a balance of issues, intelligibility, and appropriateness (Stainton Rogers, 1995). It is also important to develop a manageable
sized Q set for the participants to handle comfortably. According to S. R. Brown (1980), a manageable sized Q set is “typically no more than 40, to assure the comprehensiveness of the factors and the reliability of the factor arrays” (p. 92).

Therefore, in order to reduce the size of the concourse, the researcher first identified statements that had similar or duplicate meanings and combined those statements into one statement. For example, the researcher found many similar statements relating to African American and Caucasian interracial couples experiencing stares when in public together (Blakely, 1999; Gaines, 2001; Harris & Kalbfleisch, 2000; Hibbler & Shinew, 2002; Hill & Thomas, 2000; Hohman, 2002; Hudson & Hines-Hudson, 1999; Hughes & Hertel, 1990; Kennedy, 2003; Killian, 2001b; Lewandowski & Jackson, 2001; Lewis, 1993; Norment, 1999; Root, 2001; Rosenblatt et al., 1995; St. Jean, 1998; G. A. Yancey, 2002). Several examples are noteworthy. From Hohman’s (2002) study, the statement coded S288 mentioned, “It is common for interracial couples to receive disapproving stares from strangers” (p. 136). From G. A. Yancey (2002), statement S357 was, “It is true that we have to endure the stares that most interracial couples face” (p. 43). Statement S382 was from an individual in an interracial marriage who stated, “Stares were from upper class people” (Hibbler & Shinew, 2002, p. 148). Because these and many other statements referred to stares, they were merged to form one new statement, “People stare at us a lot when we are out in public together.”

The researcher next considered eliminating statements that were general in nature. For example, statement R434 by Chito Childs (2005b) was, “According to five of the fifteen couples, they or people they knew, had encountered opposition in predominantly
White churches from either religious officials or church members” (p. 62). Statement S39 was, “A recurring theme among these couples was being very ‘careful’ where they go for leisure experiences” (Hibbler & Shinew, 2002, p. 150). A third example, coded S67, was, “Presumably, there are still powerful forces in society that make black-White interracial marriage difficult . . .” (Rosenblatt et al., 1995, p. 5). These statements and other similar ones that did not refer to interracial couple’s experiences of prejudice were considered general statements. General statements were eliminated from the Q set and reserved in another file for future reference.

The researcher decided to retain only those statements that were direct quotes from African American and Caucasian interracial couples relating to their experiences of prejudice. This was important because the participants in the current study were African American and Caucasian interracial couples. Therefore, the researcher decided to eliminate statements quoted from family and friends and set them aside for future reference. The communication concourse was now condensed to 70 statements. However, 70 statements remained too numerous to be considered for a Q set. Therefore, the researcher decided to organize a panel to assist in further reducing the number of statements.

A panel of four peers were recruited all of whom were Ph.D. degree candidates or graduates of a counseling program. The four panel members had training in quantitative and qualitative methodologies. Three of the four members also had training in Q methodology. The panel consisted of one African American male, one African American female, one Asian male, and one Caucasian female. The Caucasian female was also a
member of an African American and Caucasian interracial marriage. Each panel member received a list of the 70 statements, a brief letter explaining the study, and suggestions for reducing the number of statements (see Appendix F). The peers were asked to consider whether the statements relating to all four domains were represented in the concourse and to review the statements for comprehensiveness, intelligibility, and simplicity (Stainton Rogers, 1995). The peers also reviewed each statement for grammar, readability, and proper wording so statements could easily be answered by members of either race or gender no matter what their level of education.

All peer comments were returned and then reviewed with two peers individually and two peers via e-mail. One peer suggested each statement should be written at a reading level easy enough to ensure comprehension. For example, the word “ostracized” in statement 22, of the 70 statements, might be difficult for some participants to comprehend. Therefore, statement 22, which originally read, “I was ostracized at work because of my spouse’s race,” was reworded to state, “I have been treated badly at work because of my spouse’s race.”

The following are two examples of how some statements were combined and some eliminated to create a more manageable sized Q sort. For example, in the 70 statements (see Appendix F) list given to the peer review panel, statements numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 12 all related to having mixed-race children. These six statements were reduced to two statements, numbered 6 and 7 in the revised list (see Appendix G). In addition, the panel suggested eliminating statements 64, 65, 66, and 67, relating to skin color. These statements seemed redundant since the study is already about African
American and Caucasian interracially married couples. After combining, revising, and eliminating statements, the 70 statements were reduced to 42 statements (Appendix G).

Next, the researcher met with her dissertation co-directors to review the 42 statements. The dissertation co-directors offered further refinement such as combining several statements into one statement. For example, statement 31 (of the 42 statements) was, “When traveling, we have to carefully plan and take precautions because we are an interracial couple.” Statement 32 was, “There are times I haven’t wanted to go out in public with my spouse because of how we will be treated.” In addition, statement 33 was, “When we are out together, I feel I have to be in a protection mode because of racism.” These three statements were combined to form the statement that read, “In public, I have to be careful and take precautions because we are an interracial couple.” This statement became statement #29 in the newly revised set of 33 statements (see Appendix H) for the pilot study.

Pilot Study, Phase I

P-Sample

Participants in a Q methodology study are called the P-sample (McKeown & Thomas, 1988). The P-sample population for the pilot study was two African American and Caucasian interracially married couples from the Cleveland, Ohio, area. The role of the pilot study participants was to complete a Q sort, evaluate the entire process, and suggest changes for improving the main study.

The two couples for the pilot study were personally known to the researcher. They met all eligibility criteria for the study, that is, participants must be age 18 or older, be an
African American and Caucasian interracially married couple, be married for no less than one year, and possess sufficient skills to comprehend and complete the Q sorting process. The first couple included an African American male, age 40, with a doctoral degree, and his wife, a Caucasian female, age 44, with a Bachelor’s degree. They had been married for 12 years. The second couple was an African American male, age 58, with 2 years of college, and his Caucasian wife, age 60, a doctoral candidate. They had been married for 32 years.

The Q sorting process took place in the participants’ homes. Participants were told of the purpose of the pilot study and each signed a letter of consent (see Appendix I). They were assured that confidentiality would be maintained as explained in each participant’s letter. They also signed a consent form to participate in a post-sort audiotape interview (see Appendix J). Participants were also given a Participant Information Form requesting information about (a) gender, (b) age, (c) years married, (d) ethnicity, (e) religious affiliation, (f) employment status, (g) combined family income, (h) highest level of education, (i) perception of racial/ethnic composition of current neighborhood, and (j) perceptions of racial/ethnic composition of the neighborhood in which they grew up (see Appendix K).

Conditions of Instruction

The conditions of instruction (COI) are procedures under which participants perform their Q sort. COI were read to each participant prior to the sorting process and each participant was given a copy to refer to during the sorting (see Appendix L). Couples worked individually with their own Q sort, at separate tables, in separate rooms.
and were asked not to converse with one other. According to S. R. Brown (1993), participants may need time to perform the mental task of understanding the variety of statements presented about the issue at hand. Each participant was presented with a set of 33 randomly shuffled statement cards and asked to read each card to become familiar with the content. Next, participants were asked to think about experiences of prejudice since being married and to use their initial impression to sort the cards into three separate piles. One pile was agree statements, another was disagree statements, and a third pile for statements about which they felt neutral or not sure (Addams, 2000). In order for participants to sort their Q set, each was presented with a Q sort grid, indicating a continuum range from -4 to +4, with 0 as the neutral area (see Figure 2).

Participants were instructed to place the disagree pile of cards on the left hand side of the continuum (-4 area), the neutral pile in the central (0 area), and the agree pile to the right (+4 area). They were then instructed to reread each card and distribute each card onto the Q sort grid under the appropriate columns within the +4 to -4 scale. That is, they were to place two cards each under the +4 columns, two cards each under the +3 columns, four cards each under the +2 columns, and so forth (see Figure 2).

Participants were free to ask the researcher questions at any time or to refer to their copy of the COI. Participants were told that the specific vertical order of where to place their statements did not matter (Addams, 2000). They also were told they could change their minds at any time until all sorted statement cards reflected their own personal viewpoints. After participants completed their Q sort, they were asked to record the number of each statement card onto an answer sheet (see Appendix M), a replica of
the Q sort grid. After recording the statement card numbers, a post-sort audiotaped interview was conducted.

**Post-Sort Interview**

For Phase I (pilot study) of the current study, each participant’s post-sort interview was audio taped. The purpose of the post-sort interview was to facilitate understanding the subjective experience(s) of the participants being studied (S. R. Brown, Durning & Selden, 2008). The interview gives participants the opportunity to elaborate why they ranked certain statements the way they did. According to S. R. Brown (1980), the participant “feels most strongly, or is most certain about those statements at the extremes of the distribution [-4, +4] . . . [and] display[s] relative neutrality, or conflict towards those in the center area” (p. 201).

There were four post-sort interview questions:

1. What prompted you to place those particular statements under the -4 marker?
2. What prompted you to place those particular statements under the +4 marker?
3. What prompted you to place those particular statements under the neutral (central) marker?
4. Do you have any other comments you wish to make?

The Q sort pilot study responses to the interview questions and evaluation forms aided the researcher in refining the study for Phase II.

**Participant Evaluation Form and Results**

For the pilot study alone, a questionnaire entitled Participant Evaluation Form (see Appendix N) was administered. Each participant completed an evaluation form
separately from his or her spouse. The Participant Evaluation Form contained nine questions in an effort to supply the researcher with feedback concerning the Q sort process, COI, comprehension of statements, and length of time needed to sort all 33 statements. The specific questions asked of pilot study participants were:

1. Were the instructions clear for sorting the statements?
2. Were the statements in the Q set brief and concise?
3. Were the statements easy to read and understand?
4. Did each statement make sense?
5. Do any statements need reworded or eliminated?
6. Do any changes need to be made to the audio tape post-interview?
7. Can you think of any major issue(s) not incorporated into this Q set?
8. Were you comfortable with the length of time it took to complete the Q set and the post-interview?
9. Do you have any other comments or suggestions?

For the first three questions, all pilot study participants stated the instructions were clear; the statements were brief, concise, and easy to understand. To the fourth question, “Did each statement make sense?” three of the participants replied “yes” and one commented that the “statements that were not part of my experiences were hard to place on a scale.” One male commented he did not experience many of the negative situations of prejudice presented on the statement cards. He said it was hard for him to place some of the negative cards since he had had many experiences that were positive. Another male commented that he experienced many of the negative situations of
prejudice and had a hard time making decisions where to place the cards relating to positive situations. For the fifth question, “Do any statements need reworded or eliminated?” all four of the participants said “no.” With regard to the sixth question, “Do changes need to be made to the audio taped post-interview?” The four participants stated no changes needed to be made.

With regard to the seventh question, “Can you think of any major issue(s) not incorporated into this Q sort?” two participants stated “no.” One participant wrote “perceptions about having children” because he wondered why there was only one statement regarding children. The researcher explained the Q sort’s focus was to seek a variety of experiences by individuals in an interracial marriage and not focus particularly on children. In addition, it was expected that for Phase II (Main study), not all of the participants would have children. Another participant asked about assumptions that people make about the problem of being in an interracial marriage. The researcher explained the focus was on actual experiences of prejudice and not about assumptions other people may have.

For the eighth question, “Were you comfortable with the length of time it took to complete the Q set and the post-interview?” The four participants answered “yes.” The ninth question related to additional comments or suggestions. Three of the participants had no further comments and one participant wrote “well-organized, friendly, good explanations.”

The total amount of time necessary to complete the pilot study was approximately 2 hours. The 2 hours began when the researcher arrived at each participant’s home, and
ended when the researcher left. When the pilot study was completed, the researcher met with her co-directors to discuss the results of the study and to make any necessary modifications. Some minor modifications were made to the Consent Form and COI. In addition, modifications were made to develop an improved Q set for Phase II (see Appendix A). For example, two of the pilot study participants commented that many statements were presented in a negative tone. Therefore, some statements were reworded to have a positive tone. For example, statement #13 of the pilot study was, “I have been told I am a ‘traitor’ to my race or have ‘sold out.’” This was reworded to state, “I can’t really say that I have ever been accused of being a ‘traitor’ or ‘sell out’ to my race.” This became statement #2 in the Q set for Phase II (see Appendix A).

Further modifications involved combining statements. For example, in the Pilot study Q set, statements 8, 9, and 10 referred to the work environment. Thus, they were combined to read, “In any job I have ever had, there has never been a problem with co-workers or bosses due to the fact that my spouse is of a different race.” After modifications were complete, the Phase II Q set resulted in 17 statements written in a negative tone (1, 4, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 21, 24, 26, 28, 31, 32, and 33) and 12 statements written in a positive tone (2, 3, 5, 7, 13, 14, 17, 18, 19, 22, 23, and 27). There were 4 statements having a general or neutral tone (20, 25, 29, and 30). For example, statement #30 was “Sometimes I wish we had more interracial couples as friends.” The newly revised Q set contained 33 statements and offered participants for Phase II a clearer variety of choices because participants have had their own individual viewpoint about experiences of prejudice.
Main Study, Phase II

\textit{P Sample}

Participants for a Q methodology study are referred to as the P-sample (McKeown & Thomas, 1988). According to S. R. Brown (1980), 40 participants are usually sufficient for a Q sort study; therefore, 20 African American and Caucasian interracially married couples (40 participants) were recruited. In order to become a participant in the current study, five qualifications were developed by the researcher. First, each participant had to have been 18 years or older. Second, each participant had to possess sufficient skills to comprehend the Q sorting process. Third, each couple had to have been married for no less than one year. Fourth, within each marriage, one partner had to be African American and the other Caucasian. Fifth, participants had to have experienced some form of prejudice relating to their interracial union since being married.

The researcher believed it was important to have married couples only and not those dating or cohabitating. Marriage signifies a legal and potentially longer lasting commitment and merges families by creating in-laws, whereas dating or cohabitating does not. In addition, the one-year marriage requirement was needed to allow enough time to experience various reactions to their marriage from family, friends, and the public.

Screening couples for experiences of prejudice was important because there could be couples have felt they have not had experiences of prejudice. This could be due to strong family acceptance, geographic location where diverse couples are accepted, and so forth. In order to find out if couples had experienced prejudice, the researcher asked each
couple if they could recall any experiences of prejudice from family, work, religious institutions, or the public in general. Those couples expressing not having any experiences of prejudice did not qualify. For example, a few African American and Caucasian interracially married couples were interested in this study but they stated they could not recall having problems with prejudice. Therefore, the researcher explained that they did not qualify because the study focused on experiences of prejudice.

Participants were recruited personally by the researcher or by announcements on flyers (see Appendix O) that were distributed to friends and acquaintances. Flyers were also posted in the researcher’s local community (churches, bookstore, library), and at two universities in the Cleveland and Kent, Ohio, areas. The “snowball” sampling technique (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982) was also used because it allowed participants to recruit potential participants from among their acquaintances and refer them to the researcher.

Table 1 presents participants’ demographic information comprising gender, age, years married, race, religious affiliation, employment, income, education, present neighborhood racial composition, and neighborhood composition from childhood. As can be seen on Table 1 there are 14 couples consisting of African American males and Caucasian females that represent 70% of this study’s population. There are 6 couples consisting of 6 African American males and 6 Caucasian females that represent 30% of the population. It is coincidental that 70% of this study represents African American males married to Caucasian females because the US Census (2002) report indicated that of all African American and Caucasian indicate that 74% consist of African American men and Caucasian women.
Table 1

Summary of the Participant Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>sex</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>males</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>females</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>females</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>males</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Years Married</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Religious Affiliation</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Employed</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 -39</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 40</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bahai</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 – 69</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11-25 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26-33 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employed Position</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Combined Income</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Completed Education</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$ 40,000 - 75,000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher/educator</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$ 100,000 - 125,000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Associate degree</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$ 50,000 - 175,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Baccalaureate</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary/Admin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$ 280,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Masters Degree</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tradesman</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral Degree</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
Table 1 (continued)

Summary of the Participant Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employed Position</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Combined Income</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Completed Education</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College admin</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Racial perceptions of neighborhoods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current neighborhood</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Childhood neighborhood</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mostly Caucasian</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Mostly Caucasian</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly African American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Mostly African American</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The participants chose where they wanted to complete the Q sort and post-sort interview. One couple completed the study in the researcher’s home because it was near their place of employment. All other couples completed the Q sort in their own homes. All participants were told of the purpose of the study and assured that confidentiality would be maintained as explained in their letter of consent (see Appendix I). They also signed a consent form for the post-sort audiotape interview (see Appendix J), and completed a demographic form entitled Participant Information Form (see Appendix K).
**Conditions of Instruction**

Each participant had his or her own Q set (Appendix A) of 33 randomly shuffled statement cards and a Q sort grid (see Figure 2) on which to place the cards. Participants completed their Q sort separately from their spouse at a table or desk in a separate room. They were not allowed to converse with each other. Participants were given verbal and written Conditions of Instruction (see Appendix L). They were asked to review each of their statement cards in order to become familiar with the variety of statements presented about the issue at hand (S. R. Brown, 1993). Next, participants were asked to think about experiences of prejudice since being married and to use their initial impressions for sorting the cards into three separate piles. One pile was for agree statements, another pile was for disagree statements, and a third pile was for statements about which they felt neutral or not sure (Addams, 2000).

Participants were instructed to reread each card in each pile and place each card on the continuum. That is, cards in the agree pile would be placed in the +4 (most agree) column, cards in the disagree pile would be placed in the -4 (most disagree) column, and the third pile of cards would be placed in the 0 (central) column of the grid.

Participants were free to ask the researcher any questions at any time or to refer to their copy of the Conditions of Instruction. Each participant was told that the specific vertical order of where statements were placed did not matter (Addams, 2000). They could change their minds at any time until all sorted statement cards reflected their own individual point of view. When each participant determined that sorting was complete, they recorded the number of each statement card onto their own individual answer sheet.
(see Appendix M), which is a replication of the larger Q sort grid. As individuals completed his or her sort, a post-sort interview followed.

Post-Sort Interview

The purpose of the post-sort interview is to help the researcher understand the subjective experiences of the participants (S. R. Brown et al., 1999). The post-sort interview aids the researcher in formulating a more accurate interpretation of the data (i.e., the factors that emerge from the data analysis) that might not have been possible without conferring with the participants (McKeown & Thomas, 1988). The interview also gives the participants the opportunity to discuss why they ranked certain statements the way they did. According to S. R. Brown (1980), the participant “feels most strongly, or is most certain about those statements at the extremes of the distribution [-4, +4] . . . [and] display[s] relative neutrality, or conflict towards those in the center area” (p. 201). Therefore, they were asked:

1. What prompted you to place the statements you did under the -4 column?
2. What prompted you to place the statements you did under the +4 column?
3. What prompted you to place the statements you did in the neutral (central) column?
4. Do you have any other comments you wish to make about any other statements?

The interviews ranged from 8 minutes to approximately 12 minutes. After completing the post-sort interviews, all data were collected and prepared for data analysis.
Data Analysis

The PQ Method (Schmolck & Atkinson, 2002) data analysis was part of the current Q methodology study. Data generated from the Q sorts were analyzed using the PQ Method computer software program. Data analysis consisted of three steps of statistical procedures (McKeown & Thomas, 1988). The first step was the correlation of the data (i.e., individual Q sort), which resulted in a correlation matrix (see Appendix P). The second step was a factor analysis in which factors were extracted for the purpose of identifying the number of groupings, or how the Q sorts had grouped themselves. The third step was the computation of a set of factor scores.

To complete the first step of data analysis, the development of a correlation matrix, the researcher manually entered each of the 40 participants’ Q sort scores obtained from their answer sheets into the software program. The resulting 40 x 40 correlation matrix (Appendix P) represented each participant’s Q sort scores in relation to each other. Each participant’s scores were expressed by a correlation coefficient that varied between 1.0 (negative correlation) and 1.0 (positive correlation) where a 0 coefficient meant the variables (participants) were not correlated (Addams, 2000).

The second step was the factor analysis. Factor analysis revealed statistically how participants were grouped or how they grouped themselves. In Q methodology, the focal point is not the individual but on commonly held points of view within the group (Addams, 2000). The aim of factor analysis is to identify patterns of relationships among the participants. Participants who share similar views on a topic will share the same factor. For the current study, the resulting factors represented the number of different
ways participants’ Q sort clustered around certain statements regarding experiences of prejudice.

There are two methods for extracting factors within the PQ Method computer software program: the centroid method and the principal components analysis method (PCA). Centroid analysis is usually employed if the researcher is working from a theoretical framework. Centroid analysis permits the researcher to use abductive logic (hunches) in data interpretation from many different angles. From a statistical standpoint this method is generally “regarded as only an approximation to the more precise and universally preferred principal components method” (S. R. Brown & Robyn, 2004, p. 104). According to Kramer and Gravina (2004) centroid analysis uses an “average correlation estimate” whereas PCA “assumes a perfect inter-sort correlation estimate,” that is 1.0 (p. 125). The centroid method was not appropriate for this study because the goal was to reveal what factors would emerge without hypotheses, preconceived judgments, or influences developed by the researcher. Therefore, PCA supplemented with the varimax method of orthogonal rotation was chosen as the appropriate method for the current study.

PCA plus the varimax method of orthogonal rotation is the most commonly used method by Q-methodologists. The varimax method “attempts to minimise the number of variables with high loadings on each factor” (Addams, 2000, p. 28). This method identifies the best possible divisions among different factors and accounts for the maximum amount of variance. The PQ Method software program (Schmolck & Atkinson, 2002) extracts up to eight unrotated factors. However, eight unrotated factors
do not represent an accurate view of the data (S. R. Brown, 1998). Therefore, the varimax method of orthogonal rotation was used in order to extract factors. This method increases each Q sort’s relationship with one factor and decreases its relationship with all others.

Each Q sort has a factor loading that shows the extent to which a Q sort is associated with a factor (S. R. Brown, 1993). A Q sort may have a strong positive correlation with one factor and weaker correlations with others. A positive loading on one factor identifies shared subjectivity with other persons on that factor. A negative loading on a factor indicates that a participant with whom it is associated has a view the opposite of those participants at the opposite pole of the factor (McKeown & Thomas, 1988).

Each factor has loadings that help define the nature or characteristics of that factor. Factor loadings are correlation coefficients (ranging from 1.0 to -1.0) identifying the extent or degree to which each Q sort shows a relationship with each composite factor array. For example, if a Q sort loading is .75, it indicates that the Q sort is positively correlated (i.e., has high agreement with) that factor’s array of factor scores. If the loading is -.75, it relates negatively (high disagreement) to that factor.

Calculations are used to locate factor loadings that are at or above the statistically significant level ($p < .01$). Factor loadings are statistically significant ($p < .01$) if they are at or above $\pm 2.58$ times the standard error (SE). The calculation for the $SE = 1/\sqrt{N}$, where $N$ is the number of statements in the Q sort (McKeown & Thomas, 1988). For this study, $+2.58 \times SE = 2.58(1/\sqrt{33}) = \pm .45$, which specifies the magnitude of correlation required to reach a statistically significant level. Therefore, when a Q sort loads at $\pm .45$ it illustrates a meaningful relationship exists between the factor and a participant’s Q sort.
The third step of data analysis was the computation of factor scores. In Q methodology, the interpretation of factors is based on factor scores, whereas in traditional factor analysis, factor interpretation stems from interpretation of factor loadings (McKeown & Thomas, 1988). According to S. R. Brown (1993), “A factor score is the score for a statement as a kind of average of the scores given that statement by all of the Q sorts associated with that factor” (p. 117). Therefore, each Q sort represents each participant’s point of view, and each factor represents a commonly held view among participants, which is defined through factor scores for each statement card in the Q set.

A table of factor scores is created for each factor. Factor scores are calculated from factor arrays. A factor array is a model Q sort (Table 4) that approximates the meaning of all of the Q sorts significantly loaded on a given factor. The calculation of factor scores and the creation of the factor arrays make it possible to distinguish those particular statements that identify and differentiate patterns of responses. This process allows the researcher to begin to interpret factors according to the juxtaposition of the stimulus statements.

Summary

Chapter II explained how Q methodology was used in the current study and how the communication concourse “comprises the raw materials for Q methodology” (S. R. Brown, 1993, p. 97). The concourse originated with 532 statements. These statements were refined and reduced to a workable Q set of 33 statements. This study was divided into two phases: the Pilot study (Phase I) and the Main study (Phase II). Phase I, the Pilot study, helped to formulate Phase II, the Main study.
PQ Method software program (Schmolck & Atkinson, 2002) computed intercorrelations among sorts and provided a factor-analysis of data using PCA and the varimax method of orthogonal rotation, which are frequently used by Q methodologists (McKeown & Thomas, 1988). Factor rotation produced the final loadings on each factor. Details of the resulting statistical analysis produced by the PQ Method software program are found in Chapter III.

Data from the Q sort of the main study were analyzed by the PQ Method computer software program. Data analysis consisted of a three-step process: correlation matrix, factor analysis, and the computation of factor scores. Chapter III focuses on the results of the data analysis. Chapter IV focuses on the discussion of the results, the limitations of the study, and suggestions for future research.
CHAPTER III

RESULTS

This chapter presents the results and interpretation of 40 Q sorts relating to experiences of prejudice among African American and Caucasian interracially married couples. Participants completed their Q sorts separately from their spouse. The data collected from the 40 Q sorts were analyzed utilizing Schmolck and Atkinson’s (2002) PQMethod computer software program.

According to McKeown and Thomas (1988), data analysis consists of three “statistical procedures: correlation matrix, factor analysis and computation of factor scores” (p. 46). The results of the statistical procedures are presented in this chapter along with correlations between factor scores, factor scores and arrays, distinguishing statements, and factor characteristics. Discussion of the factors is presented in Chapter IV.

Correlation Matrix

As explained in Chapter II, correlation of the data was completed by entering the Q sort scores of 40 participants into the PQ Method computer software program. The result was a 40 x 40 correlation matrix representing each participant’s Q sort in relation to all others (see Appendix P). The matrix scores were expressed as correlation coefficients ranging from -1.0 (perfect negative correlation) to 1.0 (perfect positive correlation). Specifically, a correlation of 1.0 between any two sorts would indicate unanimous agreement, whereas a correlation of -1.0 would represent unanimous agreement.
disagreement between individuals. A correlation of 0.0 would indicate a lack of any agreement or disagreement. After obtaining the correlation matrix, the next step was conducting a factor analysis.

Factor Analysis

In Q methodology, factor analysis reveals how participants group or cluster together on each factor representing commonly held viewpoints among participants. Specifically, participants who are highly correlated with one another are represented on the same factor (Fairweather, 2001; McKeown & Thomas, 1988). According to Addams (2000), the purpose of factor analysis “is to find a limited number of factors that can adequately account for the observed correlations” (p. 27). For the current study, the factors that emerged represented commonly held viewpoints of the participants who defined each factor according to their perceptions of experiences of prejudice.

The principal components extracted in this study were rotated using varimax method of orthogonal rotation. The varimax method increases each Q sort’s relationship with one factor and decreases its relationship with all others. It does this by analyzing factor loadings. The PCA/varimax combination was used to produce 3-factor, 4-factor, and 5-factor solutions by selecting the major factors, and then designating those persons who defined those factors. Results revealed each of the three solutions had loadings on more than one factor. Q sorts with significant loadings on more than one factor are considered impure representatives of either of the respective factors.

The researcher purified the factors of each solution and completed a second rotation in order to obtain a clearer view of the data; that is, to find which participants
loaded significantly on one factor only. To purify the factors, the researcher used the option in the PQ Method software program permitting the manual flagging of the pure Q sorts on each factor. The pure Q sorts flagged represented those individuals who loaded at .45 or above on one factor only. Therefore, sorts loading significantly on two or more factors were eliminated.

After purifying the 3-factor, 4-factor and 5-factor solutions, the researcher decided to eliminate the 3-factor solution (see Appendix Q) for a number of reasons. This solution had a total variance of only 43%. In addition, the 3-factor solution had 27 purely defined Q sorts, and 13 participants (3, 4, 7, 8, 13, 15, 18, 24, 26, 27, 30, 35, and 40) who were undefined (those who did not load above .45), or those who were not pure, that is significantly loading on two or more factors. Additional factors would determine if the number of undefined (loadings below .45) participants and not pure loadings would decrease, reveal other viewpoints of experiences of prejudice, and explain more variance.

After manually flagging the pure Q sorts for the 5-factor solution (see Appendix S), the results revealed 14 participants who were undefined or not pure (4, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 15, 17, 21, 23, 26, 29 and 40), 26 participants who were purely defined, and the variance explained was 56%. The 5-factor solution had only two defining sorts on Factor 2, which showed that that factor had low reliability. As S. R. Brown (1980) stated, “five or six persons loaded significantly on a factor are normally sufficient to produce highly reliable factor scores” (p. 67).

Manually flagging the pure Q sorts for the 4-factor solution (see Appendix R), the results revealed that 28 participants were defined at .45 or above, 12 sorts were undefined
or not pure (4, 7, 8, 9, 13, 15, 17, 24, 26, 30, 35, and 40), and 50% of the variance was explained (see Table 2). The 4-factor solution was chosen because it had one more person defined and one less person undefined, or not pure, than the 3-factor solution. It also explained 7% more of the variance than the 3-factor solution and revealed a fourth viewpoint related to experiences of prejudice.

Correlations Between Factor Scores

Correlations between factors reveal how factors are similar to (agree) or dissimilar from (disagree) one another. The correlation between Factors 1 and 3 was .45, suggesting a medium level of agreement. The correlation between Factors 2 and 3 was -.23, a low level of agreement, and between Factors 3 and 4 was .08, a very low level of agreement. As shown in Table 3, the four factors overall have relatively low correlations, suggesting there are substantial differences in how the participants viewed experiences of prejudice.

Factor Scores and Arrays

In Q methodology, interpretation of factors depends primarily on factor arrays. The standard procedure for calculating factor scores “is to designate as defining variables only pure Q sorts . . . and to merge them to form a single array of factor scores for each factor” (Addams, 2000, p. 29). Each single array of factor scores is a composite Q sort formed from the merging of pure Q sorts. Each composite Q sort represents the average for every Q sort (weighted in terms of its factor loading) that loaded significantly on that factor. An example of composite Q sorts for each factor is presented later in this chapter.
Table 2

4-Factor Solution—Factor Loadings (With an X Indicating a Defining Sort)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q SORT</th>
<th>Loadings</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>0.7520X</td>
<td>-0.0820</td>
<td>0.1423</td>
<td>0.0939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2D</td>
<td>0.7048X</td>
<td>-0.1529</td>
<td>0.0432</td>
<td>0.2477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B</td>
<td>-0.0540</td>
<td>-0.0121</td>
<td>-0.0432</td>
<td>0.5191X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4C</td>
<td>0.2727</td>
<td>0.0808</td>
<td>0.3299</td>
<td>0.2054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5A</td>
<td>0.5729X</td>
<td>0.1105</td>
<td>0.0774</td>
<td>0.2872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6D</td>
<td>0.2814</td>
<td>0.0877</td>
<td>0.6291X</td>
<td>-0.1379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7A</td>
<td>0.2845</td>
<td>0.3342</td>
<td>-0.2493</td>
<td>0.0602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8D</td>
<td>0.3716</td>
<td>0.1558</td>
<td>0.2238</td>
<td>-0.2406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9B</td>
<td>0.1224</td>
<td>-0.3812</td>
<td>0.5787</td>
<td>0.4440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10C</td>
<td>-0.1265</td>
<td>-0.0803</td>
<td>0.6967X</td>
<td>0.2171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11A</td>
<td>0.4063</td>
<td>-0.3545</td>
<td>0.5972X</td>
<td>-0.0607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12D</td>
<td>0.4151</td>
<td>-0.1141</td>
<td>0.7055X</td>
<td>0.0879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13B</td>
<td>0.6149</td>
<td>-0.1299</td>
<td>0.5031</td>
<td>0.1172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14C</td>
<td>0.5341X</td>
<td>-0.0393</td>
<td>0.2167</td>
<td>-0.2904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15A</td>
<td>0.2413</td>
<td>0.5092</td>
<td>0.5685</td>
<td>-0.0756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16D</td>
<td>0.0526</td>
<td>-0.0379</td>
<td>0.7694X</td>
<td>-0.1258</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
Table 2 (continued)

**4-Factor Solution—Factor Loadings (With an X Indicating a Defining Sort)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q SORT</th>
<th>Loadings</th>
<th>Loadings</th>
<th>Loadings</th>
<th>Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17A</td>
<td>0.1493</td>
<td>0.4040</td>
<td>0.4639</td>
<td>0.4080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18D</td>
<td>0.2338</td>
<td>0.2247</td>
<td>-0.1420</td>
<td>-0.4861X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19B</td>
<td>0.6859X</td>
<td>-0.3309</td>
<td>0.3710</td>
<td>-0.0113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20C</td>
<td>0.6494X</td>
<td>-0.3147</td>
<td>0.1222</td>
<td>0.0453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21A</td>
<td>0.4559X</td>
<td>0.0728</td>
<td>0.2403</td>
<td>-0.0490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22D</td>
<td>0.5315X</td>
<td>-0.0074</td>
<td>0.0818</td>
<td>0.3350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23C</td>
<td>0.4164</td>
<td>0.1764</td>
<td>0.6367X</td>
<td>0.1043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24D</td>
<td>0.5426</td>
<td>-0.2168</td>
<td>0.4539</td>
<td>-0.0538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25A</td>
<td>0.1901</td>
<td>0.1109</td>
<td>0.6484X</td>
<td>0.3430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26D</td>
<td>0.4785</td>
<td>0.0439</td>
<td>0.5198</td>
<td>-0.2185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27A</td>
<td>-0.2651</td>
<td>0.4766X</td>
<td>-0.2034</td>
<td>0.0944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28D</td>
<td>-0.0918</td>
<td>0.7298X</td>
<td>-0.2439</td>
<td>-0.0904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29A</td>
<td>-0.3111</td>
<td>0.5669X</td>
<td>-0.1615</td>
<td>0.2954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30D</td>
<td>0.0819</td>
<td>0.0809</td>
<td>0.0006</td>
<td>0.1849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31B</td>
<td>0.1364</td>
<td>0.6170X</td>
<td>0.2041</td>
<td>0.1069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32C</td>
<td>0.1274</td>
<td>-0.1600</td>
<td>0.8178X</td>
<td>0.0369</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
Table 2 (continued)

4-Factor Solution—Factor Loadings (With an X Indicating a Defining Sort)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q SORT</th>
<th>Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33A</td>
<td>0.5614X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34D</td>
<td>-0.0812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35B</td>
<td>0.3621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36C</td>
<td>0.0597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37A</td>
<td>0.2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38D</td>
<td>0.0702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39A</td>
<td>0.5558X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40B</td>
<td>0.3699</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Defining sorts: 10 5 9 4 = 28

% expl.Var. 16 9 17 8 = 50%

Note. The 40 Q sorts were coded with numbers and letters. Odd numbers were female participants, even numbers were male participants. A = Caucasian female; B = African American female; C = Caucasian male; D = African American male.
Table 3

*Correlations Between Factors*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>-0.2496</td>
<td>0.4458</td>
<td>0.1048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-0.2496</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>-0.2292</td>
<td>0.2449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.4458</td>
<td>-0.2292</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.0758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.1048</td>
<td>0.2449</td>
<td>0.0758</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each factor contained statements that distinguished one factor from at least one other factor. Participants ranked certain statements significantly different from other participants. The PQMethod software program (Schmolck, & Atkinson, 2002) automatically determines the standard error of differences (SED) between factor scores and then prints out the differences exceeding 1.96 (SED), which is the magnitude of difference that is required for significance at the .05 level. For those statements that are significant at the .01 level (differences exceeding 2.58 SED) an asterisk is added. An example of a distinguishing statement is presented in Table 4.
Table 4

Example of a Distinguishing Statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>z-score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>z-score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>z-score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>z-score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I can’t really say that I have ever been accused of being a traitor” or “sellout” to my race.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-1.75*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Asterisk (*) indicates significance at $p < .01$

What can be seen in the factor arrays (see Table 5) are the ways in which the 33 statements are ranked on a continuum of -4 to +4. Statements of most importance on the factor arrays, such as those highly ranked at $\pm 4$ and $\pm 3$, may not necessarily be among the distinguishing statements for each factor. For instance, statement #3 ranked +4 on the Factor 1 array, but was not considered a distinguishing statement because it also ranked +4 on the Factor 3 array. That is, statement #3 ranked a +4 on both Factors 1 and 3.

Factor Characteristics

Characteristics of the four identified factors are shown in Table 6. The number of defining variables refers to the number of individuals who loaded significantly and purely on each factor; that is, the number of persons who defined each factor. For this study, 10 variables defined Factor 1, 5 defined Factor 2, 9 defined Factor 3, and 4 defined Factor 4.
Table 5

*Factor Scores and Arrays*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>At times, I feel that some of my spouse’s relatives do not want to have anything to do with me.</td>
<td>-4 -1 0 -3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I can’t really say that I have ever been accused of being a “traitor” or “sellout” to my race.</td>
<td>1 -4 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Overall, we are generally treated with the same respect as same-race couples.</td>
<td>4 1 4 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>There have been times when we have been out in public together, and we have heard derogatory or racist comments aimed at us.</td>
<td>-1 0 0 -2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>I have always had complete acceptance and support from my own family, marrying someone from another race has never been a problem.</td>
<td>4 -4 2 -4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Some people seem concerned that we have (or intend to have) mixed-race children, like it would upset the social order or something.</td>
<td>-1 3 0 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
Table 5 (continued)

Factor Scores and Arrays

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>In any job I have ever had, there has never been a problem with co-workers</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or bosses due to the fact that my spouse is of a different race.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>I have lost friends because I married interracially.</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>I’d rather not let some people know I married interracially.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I’m better off keeping some things to myself around certain people.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>My eyes were really opened to prejudice after I got married.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I never knew so many people were against African American and Caucasian</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>interracial marriages.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>There is racial bigotry in the church. I have experienced it.</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>When we’re out in public, many times I feel that people are staring at us</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with disapproving and judgmental eyes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
Table 5 (continued)

*Factor Scores and Arrays*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I can’t say that we have ever received poor service in restaurants or from retail sales people due to being an interracial couple.</td>
<td>2 -2 0 -1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>We can go anywhere in and around our town and no one has ever bothered us just because we are a Black and White couple.</td>
<td>3 -1 3 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I believe police have harassed us just because they do not like seeing us together.</td>
<td>-3 1 0 -1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>People have actually told me that I should have stayed within my own race.</td>
<td>-1 2 -2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I don’t think any one has had a problem renting or selling to us a place to live.</td>
<td>0 -2 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>It seems to me that the Black community is more accepting of our interracial marriage than the White community is.</td>
<td>2 -3 0 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
Table 5 (continued)

*Factor Scores and Arrays*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Where we live now, we just all of a sudden became</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a part of the neighborhood. We were immediately</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>accepted.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>I’ve noticed at times, that when people hear about,</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>see a photo, or meet my spouse for the first time,</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>they seem surprised my spouse is of another race.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>I have had to become more particular in choosing</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>friends. I need to know whom I can really trust and</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>that they really don’t care if I married interracially.</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>At first, there were folks who seemed to be against</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>our marriage, but they softened in time and now</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>seem generally quite accepting.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>It seems that those with more education have more</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>open attitudes and accept interracial marriage.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I feel more comfortable around them.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
Table 5 (continued)

*Factor Scores and Arrays*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>There have been times when Black women have really been angry when they have seen us together. They would coldly stare, make negative remarks, or say things like Blacks should stick together.</td>
<td>1 2 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>I suspect that if I were in a same-race marriage, I would not have to worry about racism the way I do now.</td>
<td>0 0 -1 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>There have been times when we have had to make vacation plans based on where it would be safer for us to travel.</td>
<td>-1 1 -2 -2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>I have always felt comfortable in social gatherings that consisted of only people from my spouse’s race. I’ve always felt accepted.</td>
<td>1 -3 2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>I have relatives who made up excuses to avoid being around us. I feel they really do not approve of my marriage.</td>
<td>-3 -1 -1 -1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
Table 5 (continued)

*Factor Scores and Arrays*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>I have felt really angry, upset or discounted when I have experienced an act of prejudice only to have my spouse think it was nothing, or that it was only my imagination.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Sometimes I wish we had more interracial couples as friends.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>What frustrates me is how common it is to hear racist comments from others who do not know I am in an interracial marriage. I doubt they would say those things if they knew my spouse is of another race.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>There have been occasions when we have been out socializing and I have felt the “cold shoulder” from strangers, indicating they didn’t approve of us in their group.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Overall, it seems like we have experienced overt and subtle acts of prejudice from our family members more so than from the public in general.</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6

Factor Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of Defining Variables</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Rel. Coef.</td>
<td>0.800</td>
<td>0.800</td>
<td>0.800</td>
<td>0.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite Reliability</td>
<td>0.976</td>
<td>0.952</td>
<td>0.973</td>
<td>0.941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.E. of Factor Scores</td>
<td>0.156</td>
<td>0.218</td>
<td>0.164</td>
<td>0.243</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average reliability coefficient refers to the expected average test-retest correlation for those individuals defining each factor; that is, the correlation of each person performing the same Q sort (i.e., sorting the same 33 statements in the same manner), under the same conditions, at different times. This indicates the stability of the attitudes under examination (McKeown & Thomas, 1988).

A factor’s composite reliability depends on the reliability of the persons comprising it. For the current study, the composite reliability coefficients for the four factors ranged from .94 to .98, which are quite high. A high composite reliability suggests that the statement patterns representing each of the four factors refer to distinct and stable views of experiences of prejudice by groups of individuals in African American and Caucasian interracial marriages. The composite reliability is found by using the formula

\[ r_{xx} = .80p / [1 + (p - 1).80], \]

where \( r_{xx} \) is a factor’s reliability, \( p \) is the number of persons.
defining a factor, and .80 is the estimated reliability coefficient for individuals (McKeown & Thomas, 1988, p. 54). The $r_{xx}$ is a subscript indicating the correlation $r$ of factor X with itself, which is a measure of test-retest reliability. The value of $r = .80$ is a default value based on findings in previous studies (e.g., Frank, 1956; Steller & Meurer, 1974). As factor reliability increases, the magnitude of error decreases, thus resulting in higher factor confidence.

In the case of Factor 1, where $p = 10$, factor reliability is $r_{xx} = [(0.80)(10)] / [1 + (10 - 1).80] = .98$, which implies that the factor array generated a second time would correlate with the array’s results from the first time to the extent of $r = .98$. For Factor 2, where $p = 5$, $r_{xx} = [(0.80)(5)] / [1 + (5 - 1).80] = .95$, which implies that the factor array generated a second time would correlate with the array’s results from the first time to the extent of $r_{xx} = .95$, and so forth.

The standard error (SE) associated with each factor indicates the amount of error in the factor scores. The higher the reliability for each factor, the lower the amount of error in the array of factor scores.

**Factor Names and Factor Results**

The naming of each of the four factors is “intended to pinpoint a particularly salient characteristic of the factor type” (Addams, 2000, p. 33). Each factor name is indicative of its content, theme, or story. In order to create an appropriate factor name, the researcher studied each factor’s statements by examining (a) the highly ranked (+4 and ±3) statements on the factor arrays (see Table 5), (b) the normalized factor scores (Appendix T), and (c) the distinguishing statements (Appendix U). In addition, selected
quotes were chosen from the post-sort interviews because they offered a clearer, thicker (more complex) understanding of the underlying meaning of the factors (S. R. Brown, 1993). Once the researcher obtained a clearer view of the data, and each factor’s salient characteristics were revealed, an appropriate name for each factor was created.

The four factors were named respectively: (a) family and public acceptance; (b) public rejection; (c) public acceptance; and (d) rejection and acceptance. These four factors are discussed in the next section along with selected demographics of the participants who defined those factors, selected quotes from participants’ post-sort interviews, and other data to illuminate the participants’ views of experiences of prejudice.

**Factor 1: Family and Public Acceptance**

Factor 1 accounted for 16% of the total variance contained in the correlation matrix. The total sample population was 40 participants (20 males and 20 females) of which a total of 28 individuals defined on the four factors. Of the 28 individuals, 10 participants defined Factor 1.

Demographic characteristics for Factor 1 participants are presented in Table 7. Six women (five Caucasians, one African American) and four men (two African Americans and two Caucasians) represented this factor. Seven of these participants were Caucasian (70%), and three were African American (30%). The ages of those loading on this factor ranged from 27-62 with the mean age of 41 years.
Table 7

Demographic Characteristics for Participants ($N = 10$) on Factor 1—Family and Public Acceptance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sort #</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Years Married</th>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>Income (thousands)</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Present Neighborhood</th>
<th>Childhood Neighborhood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Nurse</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2D</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5A</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14C</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19B</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bahai</td>
<td>Tutor</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20C</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bahai</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21A</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22D</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33A</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Nurse</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39A</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.*  
F = Female  
C = Caucasian  
M = Male  
AA = African American  
BA = Bachelor of Arts  
BS = Bachelor of Science  
MA = Master of Arts  
Mixed = African American and Caucasian
The number of years married for this group ranged from 2 to 21 years. Three married couples represented 60% of the participants defining this factor. The first couple, 1A and 2D, had the highest loadings of .75 and .70, respectively, and were 93% in agreement with each other. The second couple, 19B and 20C, had the next highest loadings of .69 and .65, respectively, and were 94% in agreement with each other. The third couple, 21A and 22D, had average loadings of .46 and .53, respectively, and were 85% in agreement with each other. Said in another way, these husbands and wives probably see “eye to eye” on many issues in their married life.

Participants’ combined income ranged from $60,000 to $175,000. Eight participants were of a Christian faith and two were of the Bahai faith. Six participants were living in a mixed neighborhood and four were living in a Caucasian neighborhood. All seven Caucasian participants grew up in a Caucasian neighborhood and all three African American participants grew up in an African American neighborhood.

Factor 1 was named Family and Public Acceptance based on the way the 10 participants ranked their statements, the factor arrays (see Table 5), distinguishing statements (see Table 8), and data garnered from the post-sort interviews. It is from the composite Q sorts within the factor arrays and distinguishing statements that interpretation of each factor develops.
### Table 8

*Distinguishing Statements for Factor 1—Family and Public Acceptance*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>RNK</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Sometimes I wish I had more interracial couples as friends.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.23*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>I can’t say that we have ever received poor service in restaurants or from retail sales people due to being an interracial couple.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.08*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>It seems to me that the Black community is more accepting of our interracial marriage than the White community is.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>What frustrates me is how common it is to hear racist comments from others who do not know I am in an interracial marriage. I doubt they would say those things if they knew my spouse is of another race.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Where we live now, we just all of a sudden became a part of the neighborhood. We were immediately accepted.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.52*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>I suspect that if I were in a same-race marriage, I would not have to worry about racism the way I do now.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.42*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>I’d rather not let some people know I married interracially. I’m better off keeping some things to myself around certain people.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.35*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
Table 8 (continued)

*Distinguishing Statements for Factor 1—Family and Public Acceptance*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>RNK</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>I don’t think any one has had a problem renting or selling to us a place to live just because we are an interracial couple.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.26*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>There have been times when we have had to make vacation plans based on where it would be safer for us to travel.</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>People have actually told me I should have stayed in my own race.</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>It seems that those with more education have more open attitudes and accept interracial marriage. I feel more comfortable around them.</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-0.69*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>I have relatives who made up excuses to avoid being around us. I feel they really do not approve of my marriage.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-1.49*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>I believe police have harassed us just because they do not like seeing us together.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-1.60*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Overall, it seems like we have experienced overt and subtle acts of prejudice from our family members more so than from the public in general.</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-2.37*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Asterisk (*) indicates the significance at $p < .01$
Table 9 shows the composite Q sort for Factor 1. The composite Q sort demonstrates how participants defining Factor 1 aggregately ranked their statements. The participants’ loadings on Factor 1 revealed acceptance and support from their families and from the public. This was supported by the -4 ranking of statement #1, “At times, I feel that some of my spouse’s relatives do not want to have anything to do with me.” The -4 indicated high disagreement because participants did have support from their spouse’s relatives. In addition, participants had support from their own families. They ranked statement #5, a +4, “I have always had complete acceptance and support from my own family, marrying someone from another race has never been a problem.”

Table 9

**Factor 1, Family and Public Acceptance, Composite Q Sort**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Most agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-4 2 items</td>
<td>-3 2 items</td>
<td>-2 4 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1 5 items</td>
<td>0 7 items</td>
<td>+1 5 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+2 4 items</td>
<td>+3 2 items</td>
<td>+4 2 items</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 15 8 4 9 2 7 14 3</th>
<th>33 28 10 6 12 19 13 30 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11 16 17 20 18</td>
<td>23 21 22 24 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 25 27</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Two other statements also illustrated support from family and relatives. Statement #28, ranked -3, was, “I have relatives who made up excuses to avoid being around us. I feel they really do not approve of my marriage.” The -3 ranking indicates that relatives do not approve of their marriage. Statement #33, “Overall, it seems like we have experienced overt and subtle acts of prejudice from our family members more so than from the public in general,” ranked -4, indicating that participants had not received overt and subtle acts of prejudice from the family.

The highly ranked statements relating to family experiences were not presented together on any of the other factors, thus making experiences of family acceptance one of the salient characteristics of Factor 1. The following are quotes from various participants’ post-sort interview data to illustrate the meaning of Factor 1.

Participant 20C, a Caucasian male, stated, “And my spouse’s family is really accepting and always seems to love me.” This participant appears to have a very good relationship with his African American relatives.

One participant expected to receive resistance from her parents or relatives who grew up during the tumultuous years of racial prejudice during the 1950s and 1960s. However, they received acceptance as illustrated by the following quote:

But I’ve never heard any comments from any of our family. I especially thought that I would hear something from my dad because his parents grew up in that era of just racial prejudice, and that’s what they grew up knowing, and I figured I would have a hard time with them and I had no hard time at all. My family is awesome. Relatives don’t make excuses to avoid being around us. We get
together for almost every holiday. They love my husband and they love the
babies. (21A)

The following are brief quotes by participants who also experienced acceptance
from family and relatives:

I feel very comfortable around her family and family members. (22D)

I never had any prejudices from my family at all. So it’s never been an issue with
my family. (1A)

Relatives don’t avoid us. Her family—everybody is very, very accepting and my
family as well. (22D)

Not only were experiences of family acceptance a salient characteristic of this
factor, but experiences of acceptance from the public also emerged on Factor 1. For
example, statement #3, ranked +4, was “Overall, we are generally treated with the same
respect as same-race couples.” Quotes from various participants’ post sort interviews
were chosen to illustrate the meaning of public acceptance on Factor 1:

Overall, we are generally treated with the same respect as same-race couples.

Because nowadays, even though you can see a difference, you can maybe tell
what someone is thinking if you’re intuitive. You can tell what they’re thinking,
but no one makes blatant statements or says you can’t come in here. You are
pretty much treated respectfully just like same-race couples. (2D)
Participant 2D, an African American male, expressed being intuitively aware of what others may be thinking “nowadays.” By his use of the word “intuitive” and “nowadays” he may perhaps have meant that he is aware that some people still do not accept interracial couples. However, he and his spouse indicated that they are still treated with respect as same-race couples.

Statement #14, ranked +3, was “We can go anywhere in and around our town and no one has ever bothered us just because we are an African American and Caucasian couple.” The following are two comments by participants who felt acceptance in their local neighborhood or town. Participant 14C, an African American male, mentioned,

Yeah, I mean overall we’re generally treated with the same respect as same-race couples, generally if you’re just comparing with people in the neighborhood and that type of thing.

Participant 14C may be indicating by the use of the words, “just comparing with people in the neighborhood,” that he and his spouse have acceptance in their local neighborhood, but perhaps they may have experienced prejudice outside of these parameters.

Participant 21A, a Caucasian female, stated, “In our town I feel like we’re really, really accepted.” It is wondered if participant 21A would have used the words “really, really accepted” if she were in a same-race marriage living in the same town.

Six (60%) of the 10 participants on Factor 1 live in mixed neighborhoods consisting of mostly African American families, Caucasian families, and mixed
inter racial families. Acceptance of interracial families is probably higher in mixed neighborhoods.

Statement #15, ranked -3, was, “I believe police have harassed us just because they do not like seeing us together.” The -3 ranking indicates disagreement because these participants have not been harassed by the police. Participant 2D, an African American male, stated:

I’ve heard of it [police harassing interracial couples], but I never experienced it at all. I don’t get any looks, I don’t get pulled over that often, maybe once or twice I got pulled over for speeding or something like that. But, I treat them with respect. It doesn’t matter what my color is, I get treated with respect as well.

Participant 2D does not seem to see police harassment as a race issue because it is more important to him to treat people with respect.

Statement #30 appeared on this factor with a high ranking of +3, “Sometimes I wish I had more interracial couples as friends.” This statement does not directly reflect a specific experience of rejection or acceptance, but it appears to reflect a desire to extend social networks by wishing one had other interracial couples as friends. Participant 33A stated that she never had a “strong need to have more interracial couples as friends, but as I think of it, it would be nice to know others.” Participant 20C stated he and his spouse were interested in seeing more couples, whether interracial or not, because they “know a lot of single people.” Two other participants provided comments relating to this response pattern:
I don’t know if it’s because an African American couple doesn’t feel like they have much in common with us just like a White couple might feel the same. You know, friends having things in common. So, if we had more interracial couple as friends . . . well, that’s just something I wish we had. (1A)

I would like to see more of that interracial couple dynamic because it gives you more information on what we have in common and to see how other young couples relate and live daily life, and raise children, and that would be a lot better. (19B)

Perhaps as participants read statement #30 it brought about a realization or a desire to know other African American and Caucasian interracial couples. That is, perhaps statement #30 created a curiosity of wanting to know how other couples are living their lives.

In summary, the 10 participants defining Factor 1 highly ranked statements relating to family and public acceptance. These participants did not focus on experiencing prejudice from family or the public, but focused on the positive experiences in their lives. This is not to surmise that they have not had any experiences of prejudice throughout their married life, which may or may not be the case. However, what this study indicates is, from the participants’ viewpoints, the positive experiences with family and public acceptance has been the issues of most importance and thus were highly ranked.

In addition, statement #30 may have prompted participants to consider initiating connections with other African American and Caucasian interracial couples. Of the 10
participants, 6 were three married couples. As mentioned earlier, the married couples were in high agreement with each other and had high loadings. It appears that their rankings contributed significantly to the outcome of positive experiences defining Factor 1.

**Factor 2: Public Rejection**

Factor 2 accounted for 9% of the variance relating to experiences of prejudice among individuals in African American and Caucasian interracial marriages. Five participants defined this factor. Demographic characteristics of Factor 2 participants are presented in Table 10. The five participants who defined Factor 2 represented 12.5% of the total sample of 40 participants. There were three females and two males on this factor and two were Caucasian and three were African American.

The age range for individuals on this factor was from 35 to 60 years. Years of marriage ranged from 12 to 28 years. There was one married couple on this factor (27A and 28D). Income ranged from $40,000 to $125,000. Three individuals were of a Christian denomination and two had no religious affiliation. Four of the five participants lived in a mixed neighborhood, and one lived in a Caucasian neighborhood. The three African American participants grew up in an African American neighborhood and the two Caucasian participants grew up in a Caucasian neighborhood.

Factor 2 was named *Public Rejection* based on the highly ranked statements (±4 and ±3) on the factor arrays, distinguishing statements (Table 11), and observations collected from the post-sort interviews. It is from the composite Q sorts within the factor
Table 10

Demographic Characteristics for Participants (N = 5) on Factor 2—Public Rejection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sort #</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Married</th>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>Total family Income (thousands)</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Present Neighborhood</th>
<th>Childhood Neighborhood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27A</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Social Worker</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28D</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29A</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31B</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34D</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.  F = Female  C = Caucasian  BA = Bachelor of Arts  MA = Master of Arts  M = Male  AA = African American  BS = Bachelor of Science  Mixed = African American and Caucasian  HS = High School
Table 11

*Distinguishing Statements for Factor 2—Public Rejection*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>RNK</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>At first, there were folks who seemed to be against marriage, but they softened in time and now seem generally quite accepting.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.03*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>There is racial bigotry in the church. I have experienced it.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.84*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Some people seem concerned that we have (or intend to have) mixed-race children, like it would upset the social order or something.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.54*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I believe police have harassed us just because they do not like seeing us together.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>There have been times when we have had to make vacation plans based on where it would be safer for us to travel.</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>I have had to become more particular in choosing friends. I need to know whom I can really trust and that they really don’t care if I married interracially.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.03*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>We can go anywhere in an around our town and no one has ever bothered us just because we are a Black and White couple.</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I have lost friends because I married interracially.</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I don’t think any one has had a problem renting or selling to a place to live just because we are an interracial couple.</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-0.88*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>I have always felt comfortable in social gatherings that consisted of only people from my spouse’s race. I’ve always felt accepted.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-1.11*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I can’t really say that I have ever been accused of being a “traitor” or “sell out” to my race.</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-1.75*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
arrays and distinguishing statements that interpretation of each factor develops. Table 12 shows the composite Q sort for Factor 2.

Table 12

*Factor 2, Public Rejection, Composite Q Sort*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Most agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 items</td>
<td>2 items</td>
<td>4 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor 2 represented various forms of rejection from the public in general. For example, statement #2, “I can’t really say that I have ever been accused of being a traitor’ or ‘sell out’ to my race” was ranked -4 indicating that participants highly disagreed with this statement because they had experienced these accusations. In addition, statement #6, “Some people seem concerned that we have (or intend to have) mixed-race children, like it would upset the social order or something” was ranked +3 indicating that participants agreed that some people were concerned about the interracial couple having children. Participant 27A, a Caucasian female, commented:
We had comments before we were married that we should be concerned about having children, and we should be forced to be sterilized because of the way our children would likely turn out to be as a result of being mixed race children.

Participant 27A received a rather poignant comment suggesting she be forced to be sterilized because of the way the children might turn out. It is possible such poignant comments may be an indication that people condone beliefs from slavery days. Yet, one would wonder how many same-race couples have been approached with concerns about their having same race children and suggesting sterilization.

Participants reported experiencing racial bigotry in the church (statement #11) by highly ranking this statement a +4. That is, all the participants possibly experienced this type of bigotry. Participant 27A, a Caucasian female, stated:

It’s just against all the biblical teachings . . . Others (in our church) who have said why do we worry about trying to bring Black families into our church even though the neighborhood is integrated because they have their own church and those people really don’t want to be part of us. So there is much bigotry there.

Statement #31 was ranked +3: “What frustrates me is how common it is to hear racist comments from others who do not know I am in an interracial marriage. I doubt they would say those things if they knew my spouse is of another race.” This ranking indicates that participants have felt frustration upon hearing racist comments. The following illustrates another participant’s experience:

And I was in a situation where one day I was getting my hair done and . . . they were making the stupid Whitey comments. And I had to basically say “Excuse
me. I really don’t appreciate this, my husband is White, my kids are biracial and I’m a customer here.” At this point, I can barely go to a Black hair salon because of the comments I constantly hear. They were just as my husband put it, making the stupid Whitey comments. (31B)

Participant 34D, an African American male, commented, “That is something [derogatory remarks] that any interracial marriage is always going to be confronted with.” His comment appears to be a strong indicator that not only had he and other participants on this factor experienced derogatory remarks, but also may reflect what other African American and Caucasian interrazially married couples are experiencing.

In summary, the five participants comprising this factor experienced various forms of rejection from the public. That is not to say that they never had positive experiences. Yet it seemed important to these participants to indicate their negative experiences during the Q sorting process as taking precedence over positive experiences. Perhaps the statements used in this study just happened to be the ones these five participants had recently experienced or strongly remembered.

Factor 3: Public Acceptance

Factor 3 accounted for 17% of the variance. Of the 40 participants in this study, 9 defined this factor. Demographic characteristics for all Factor 3 participants are presented in Table 13. The nine participants represented 23% of the total sample. Six males (four African American and two Caucasian) and three Caucasian females comprised this factor. The racial composition consisted of five Caucasian participants (55%) and four African American participants (44%). Ages of the individuals ranged from 28 to 51. The years
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sort #</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Years Married</th>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>Total family Income (thousands)</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Present Neighborhood</th>
<th>Childhood Neighborhood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6D</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10C</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Tradesman</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11A</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12D</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16D</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>College Admin</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23A</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Nurse</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25A</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32C</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38D</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.*  
F = Female  
C = Caucasian  
M = Male  
AA = African American  
BA = Bachelor of Arts  
MA = Master of Arts  
HS = High School  
Mixed = African American and Caucasian
of marriage ranged from 1 and 16 years. Participants 11A and 12D were the only married couple on this factor. The average yearly income ranged from $60,000 to $280,000. Two participants presently live in a mixed neighborhood. Seven participants presently live in a Caucasian neighborhood.

Factor 3 was named *Public Acceptance* based on the way participants ranked their statements, and from the data collected from the post-sort interviews. How these participants defined Factor 3 is interpreted from their rankings on the factor arrays (see Table 5) and the distinguishing statements (see Table 14).

The composite Q sort for Factor 3 (see Table 15) reveals statement #3 was ranked +4. This statement reads, “Overall, we are generally treated with the same respect as same-race couples.” Two similar quotes from selected participants were chosen to illustrate responses to this statement. Participant 11A, a Caucasian female, stated, “We are treated like any other couple” and participant 38D stated, “We are treated pretty much the same as other couples.” Although their comments were brief, it appears they felt accepted.

However, a similar comment by participant 25A brought in a different perspective: “We’ve been treated with the same respect as same-race couples. You know both of us, having been in same-race marriage before, we really haven’t seen any difference overall.” Previously being in a same-race marriage gives a base line for this couple to compare their present marriage and supports participant 25A’s comment that they “haven’t seen any difference overall.”
Table 14

*Distinguishing Statements for Factor 3—Public Acceptance*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>z-score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Where we live now, we just all of a sudden became a part of the neighborhood. We were immediately accepted.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.81*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I can’t really say I’ve been accused of being a “traitor” or “sell out” to my race.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>When we are out in public, many times I feel that people are staring at us with disapproving and judgmental eyes.</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>What frustrates me is how common it is to hear comments from others who do not know I am in an interracial marriage. I doubt they would say those things if they knew my spouse is of another race.</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-0.63*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>People have actually told me that I should have stayed within my own race.</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>I have really felt angry, upset or discounted when I have experienced an act of prejudice only to have my spouse think it was nothing, or that it was only my imagination.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-1.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I’d rather not let some people know I married interracially. I’m better off keeping some things to myself around</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-2.03*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15
Factor 3, Public Acceptance, Composite Q Sort

Most disagree       Neutral       Most agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>-4</th>
<th>-3</th>
<th>-2</th>
<th>-1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>+1</th>
<th>+2</th>
<th>+3</th>
<th>+4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 items</td>
<td>2 items</td>
<td>4 items</td>
<td>5 items</td>
<td>7 items</td>
<td>5 items</td>
<td>4 items</td>
<td>2 items</td>
<td>2 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statement #8, ranked -4: “I have lost friends because I married interracially.” A -4 indicated high disagreement among all the participants because they had not lost friends due to being in an interracial marriage. This is supported by the following comments: “And losing friends, no, I’ve never lost any friends” (10C), and “I have met tons of friends and never lost friends just because I was married to a Black guy” (11A).

A humorous comment was offered by 23A, whose husband is African American. She stated, “I definitely have not lost any friends and, in fact, I probably have more friends because they like this husband better.” Participant 23A apparently has close friends who can be honest with her by telling her they do like the present husband better than her previous one.

Statement #19, ranked +4: “Where we live now, we just all of a sudden became a part of the neighborhood. We were immediately accepted.” The +4 ranking indicated all participants on this factor felt immediately accepted in their neighborhoods. Statement #7,
ranked +3: “In any job I have ever had, there has never been a problem with co-workers or bosses due to the fact that my spouse is of a different race.” The ranking of +3 indicated participants are in agreement with this statement. For example, participant 23A stated, “I really don’t have any problems at work,” and a similar response from 6D stated that he “never had an issue” at work.

Participant 10C, Caucasian male, mentioned a previous problem he had encountered at work. He stated that some coworkers were saying the “n” word and he confronted them by saying, “You know my wife is Black and my son is Black” and he told them not to talk like that. He added that since the confrontation things have been fine at work. He had received an apology and stated, “They never really did it again.” However, participant 10C had to confront his coworkers, even though it resulted in an amicable outcome.

Statement #9, ranked -4: “I’d rather not let some people know I married interracially. I’m better off keeping some things to myself around certain people.” The high ranking of -4 indicates high disagreement with this statement. This is illustrated by the following comments:

You know, if people have a problem that I’m married interracially then they can just go somewhere else. I’m not going to hide it; I’m not ashamed of it at all. (10C)

I have never felt that I have to keep the fact that I am married to someone from a different race a secret. I’ve never had to hide that from anyone. (38D)
That seems ridiculous to me. Certainly, I’m not going to hide it. (32C)

The above three participants were all male, two Caucasians (10C, 32C), and one African American (38D). A high ranking of +4 or -4 indicated participants felt strongly about statement #9. It appears the wording of this statement possibly brought out some emotions because all three participants commented using the words “I’m not going to hide it.” In addition, participant 32C commented that it “seems ridiculous.” Because Factor 3 represents experiences of acceptance, and the participants have experienced acceptance in their neighborhood, friends, work, and so forth, the wording of this statement could have sounded insulting. That is, “I’m happy, how can you ask such a question or how can you think I would want to hide the fact that I am interracially married?”

In summary, the nine participants comprising this factor experienced various forms of public acceptance and appeared to have strong friendships. It seemed important to these participants to indicate their positive experiences during the Q sorting process as taking precedence over any negative experiences. Only one person indicated a previous problem at work. The participants who expressed feeling “immediately accepted” in their neighborhoods may be due to living in neighborhoods that are accepting of interracial couples. Research has shown that many interracial couples may be inclined to seek out neighborhoods and social activities, knowing where they will be accepted (Hibbler & Shinew, 2002). Further discussion of Factor 3 is presented in Chapter IV.
Factor 4: Rejection and Acceptance

Factor 4 accounted for 8% of the variance. Of the 40 participants in this study, 4 participants defined Factor 4 representing 10% of the total sample. Demographics for Factor 4 participants (two females, one African American and one Caucasian; two males, one African American and one Caucasian) can be found in Table 16. The racial composition consisted of two African Americans and two Caucasians. There were three participants of a Christian faith and one was of the Bahai faith. Ages of the participants ranged from 36 to 72 years.

Two participants have master’s degrees, one participant has a PhD degree, and one has a bachelor’s degree. Years married ranged from 2 to 33 years. Combined incomes ranged from $50,000 to $100,000. Two African American participants (3B, 18D) presently live in a mixed neighborhood and two Caucasian participants (36C, 37A) presently live in a Caucasian neighborhood. The two African American participants grew up in an African American neighborhood. Participant 36C grew up in a Caucasian neighborhood and 37A grew up in a mixed neighborhood.

Factor 4 was named Rejection and Acceptance based on the way the four participants defined this factor and ranked their statements, the factor arrays, distinguishing statements (see Table 17), and data garnered from the post-sort interviews. It is from the composite Q sorts within the factor arrays and distinguishing statements that interpretation of each factor develops. Table 18 shows the composite Q sort for Factor 4. What appears noteworthy about this factor is that participants felt they had
received acceptance more so from their spouse’s relatives than from their own family. Participants also indicated, by their rankings, that they received various forms of acceptance from the public.

These findings are supported by the ranking of the following statements: “I have always had complete acceptance and support from my own family; marrying someone from another race has never been a problem” (statement #5, -4.) The -4 ranking indicated high disagreement because these four participants did not have support from their own families. In addition, statement #33, ranked +3, was, “Overall, it seems like we have experienced overt and subtle acts of prejudice from our family members more so than from the public in general.” The ranking of +3 indicated participants agreed with this statement. Quotes from various participants’ interview data were chosen to illustrate the meaning of Factor 4 due to their high loadings. The following two comments illustrate rejection from one’s own family:

I felt like my family were the ones that did reject me and I didn’t really care that maybe my friends didn’t like it. It was more important for my family to agree with our situation but there were people in the family that didn’t agree with it. (3B)
Table 16

Demographic Characteristics for Participants (N = 4) on Factor 4—Rejection and Acceptance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sort #</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Married</th>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>Total family Income (thousands)</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Present Neighborhood</th>
<th>Childhood Neighborhood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3B</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Admin Assist.</td>
<td>$ 50</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18D</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Bahai</td>
<td>College Admin</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36C</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 A</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.*  
F = Female  
C = Caucasian  
M = Male  
AA = African American  
BA = Bachelor of Arts  
BS = Bachelor of Science  
MA = Master of Arts  
Mixed = African American and Caucasian
Table 17

*Distinguishing Statements for Factor 4—Rejection and Acceptance*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>RNK</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>I have felt really angry, upset or discounted when I have experienced an act of prejudice only to have my spouse think it was nothing, or that it was only my imagination.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.90*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>I suspect that if I were in a same-race marriage, I would not have to worry about racism the way I do now.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.87*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Overall, it seems like we have experienced overt and subtle acts of prejudice from our family members more so than from the public in general.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.74*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>We can go anywhere in an around our town and no one has ever bothered us just because we are a Black and White couple.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Some people seem concerned that we have (or intend to have) mixed-race children, like it would upset the social order or something.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>It seems that those with more education have more open attitudes and accept interracial marriage. I feel more comfortable around them.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.13*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 18

*Factor 4, Rejection and Acceptance, Composite Q Sort*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Most agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-4 2 items</td>
<td>-3 2 items</td>
<td>-2 4 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>-1 5 items</th>
<th>0 7 items</th>
<th>+1 5 items</th>
<th>+2 4 items</th>
<th>+3 2 items</th>
<th>+4 2 items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My father—he was very, very racist. So, our relationship, when we were younger, we just kept it secret from him because of his huge racist attitude. (37A)

Statement #1, ranked -3, stated, “At times, I feel that some of my spouse’s relatives do not want to have anything to do with me.” The -3 indicates participants highly disagreed because their spouse’s relatives did accept them. The following comment reflects rejection by one’s own family but acceptance by the spouse’s family:

I am always comfortable with my spouse’s relatives. But, on the other hand, I have not always had complete acceptance and support from my own family. It’s almost been complete opposite. (36C)

This part of the study revealed that four participants have experienced acceptance by one side of the family and rejection by the other side. It was difficult for this researcher to find reasons or to surmise why this type of experience existed because this...
was a varied group of gender and race. One possible explanation is the ages of three of the participants (45, 55, and 72) indicating that they lived during the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s when prejudice against African Americans was intense. Two of the participants, 3B and 18D, had also been married for 26 years and 33 years, respectively, and therefore possibly experienced many negative situations against African American and Caucasian interracial couples over the years. The other possibility is that family members were blatantly prejudiced about interracial couples and did not like seeing their family member marry someone from another race.

In order to understand the complexities of family acceptance and rejection, a phenomenological study with each participant would have to be conducted. For example, a study consisting of two or three couples who are experiencing family members who are accepting and some who are rejecting their relationship might reveal various reasons or issues revealing in depth the experiences of these couples.

Participants on this factor stated they had not lost friends due to their interracial marriage (statement #8, -4) and they had not had to become particular in choosing friends (#21, -3). Participant 18D stated, “I don’t know any friends I lost because I married interracial” and 37A stated, “I absolutely have not lost any friends.” Their relationships with friends appeared to not present any problems before or after their marriage.

Varied perspectives emerged on this factor relating to statement #29 (+4): “I have felt really angry, upset, or discounted when I have experienced an act of prejudice only to have my spouse think it was nothing, or that it was only my imagination.” The high
ranking of +4 indicates possibly all four participants were in strong agreement with this statement. The following are responses supporting this factor:

This one made me laugh because I have noticed acts of prejudice towards us. But he [spouse] just says “Oh, I really didn’t notice” yet I did. I just laugh at him because he just goes with the flow and doesn’t think anything of it and is fine. (27A)

For one thing, my wife is sort of remarkable in that she is just matter of fact; she might be more acute and see things and be upset about it. So if I see something I think is prejudice, she definitely is not going to discount it ever. So it’s been that way, I mean she sees a lot of things sometimes that I don’t see, in the nuances of things. (18D)

Ok, he’s probably more idealistic about our interracial marriage, because when we first went out and people were staring at us, I told him that people were staring at us because they did not like seeing African American and Caucasian together. He said, “No, they’re staring at us because we look good together, not because we’re African American and Caucasian.” So I thought his attitude was very good. (3B)

I think from the standpoint of being a White male, and again having some of the naiveness, I’ve noticed things affecting me less and seem to have a bigger impact on her. But these things never caused problems between us. (36C)
The responses of the four participants indicated spouses did have different viewpoints about acts of prejudice but one spouse did not discount the other’s perspective. Instead, they had ways of adjusting to the situation such as humor (27A), knowing one will not be discounted (18D), maintaining a good attitude (3B), or having an awareness of one’s own naiveté. None of the participants expressed experiences of being angry, upset, or discounted. Perhaps each of these four individuals has a good relationship of communication and understanding with their spouse that enables them to navigate very well together through various situations in life.

Statement 25, ranked +4, was, “I suspect that if I were in a same-race marriage, I would not have to worry about racism the way I do now.” This statement seemed important enough to the participants to rank it a +4. In the post-sort interviews, participant 36C stated in a very matter of fact way that, “Relative to statement twenty-five, I just think it’s pretty self explanatory that if I wasn’t in an interracial marriage, but in a same-race marriage, that I wouldn’t have to worry about all the issues an interracial marriage brings.”

Participant 37A stated:

But there are sometimes when at a restaurant out of town I feel like I don’t know the area and I feel like they’re looking at us. They are staring and it could be my paranoia or it could just be I’m feeling the right thing because I feel more intuitive of how people think and feel that’s just how I’ve always been and I feel their disapproval.
However, participant 37A, a Caucasian female, had a different perspective. She commented:

This is especially prevalent when Christmas shopping. Because I had been trying to look for a Black Barbie doll, and I couldn’t find them, I was frustrated. . . . I remember being shocked with all the kids coloring their Santa Claus black. It never occurred to me that they think their Santa Claus is Black. I’ve always thought about him as White as I think Jesus and all that. Like a light bulb clicked and I’m like oh my gosh—it never even occurred to me about White privilege until I married. . . . I felt stupid almost to the fact that wow; you know I should have realized that especially since I’m an educator. That, right there, I never would have had to worry about it or thought about it if I didn’t have interracial kids.

As a White person, participant 36C mentioned things she took for granted, would be seen from an African American perspective. Because this factor was highly ranked, +4, it appears all four participants had noticed some differences of being in an interracial marriage as opposed to being in a same-race marriage.

In summary, Factor 4 participants highly ranked statements relating to experiences of acceptance together with experiences of rejection. The participants received acceptance from friends and acceptance from their spouse’s family, but rejection from their own family. Differing viewpoints of acts of prejudice between the spouses were handled with acceptance and understanding. Factor 4 is discussed further in Chapter IV.
Summary

Chapter III described the results of this study, which investigated the experiences of prejudice among individuals in African American and Caucasian interracial marriages. The results included correlation of the factors, factor analysis, and the computation of factor scores and various tables. Principal components analysis (PCA) and the varimax method of rotation were used resulting in four significant factors that represented 50% of the total variance. By using the standard error (SE) of measurement, factor loadings of ±.45 were considered significant ($p < .01$). Various statements, and their explanations, were presented for each of the four factors.
CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to obtain perceptions of experiences of prejudice among individuals in African American and Caucasian interracial marriages living in northeast Ohio. This study utilized Q methodology to examine the ways individuals experience prejudice. Forty individuals (20 couples) completed a Q sort. Analysis of the data was performed using PQ Method computer software program (Schmolck & Atkinson, 2002). Chapter III presented the results of the data analysis, the resulting 4-factor solution, and the statements that formulated each of the four factors: Factor 1, Family and Public Acceptance; Factor 2, Public Rejection; Factor 3, Public Acceptance; and Factor 4, Rejection and Acceptance.

This chapter discusses the meaning of each of the four factors. It discusses Social Dominance Theory, the guiding theory for this study, and its relationship to each factor. This chapter also presents limitations of the study, implications for future research, implications for counseling practice and counselor preparation, reflections on the Q sort process, and conclusion.

Numerous studies have found that African American and Caucasian interracial couples have experienced acceptance and rejection of their relationship by their families or the public in general (Foeman & Nance, 1999; Hudson & Hines-Hudson, 1999; Root,
2001; St. Jean, 1998; Yancey, G. A., 2002; Zebroski, 1999). Many believe their union is violating a societal taboo (Chito Childs, 2005a; Crowder, 2000; Guimond, Dambrun, Michinov, & Duarte, 2003; Harris & Kalbfleisch, 2000; Hibbler & Shinew, 2002; Root, 2001). St. Jean (1998) concluded that these couples were living two separate lives: one private and one public. In their private life, they could be themselves and live a life as a married couple. In their public life, they were experiencing a variety of negative reactions they would not have had if they been in a same-race marriage.

As presented in Chapter I, research has shown acceptance of African American and Caucasian interracial marriages is increasing (Kennedy, 2003; Root, 2001; Rosenblatt et al., 1995). A 2007 (Gallup News Service, 2007) survey determined 75% of Caucasians and 85% of African Americans approved of these marriages. This is a 14% increase from the 1997 survey, which revealed Caucasians had a 61% approval rating and an 8% increase for African Americans who previously had a 77% approval rating.

Even though research has shown increasing acceptance of African American and Caucasian interracial marriages, it was presumed that all participants in the current study would identify with some forms of prejudice in their sorting of statements. However, the participants on Factor 1 experienced not only acceptance from the family, but also various experiences of acceptance from the public such as being treated equally as same race couples; they could travel freely around town, and had never been harassed by the police. Factor 2 revealed various experiences of prejudice from the public. Factor 3 revealed public acceptance, and Factor 4 revealed both rejection and acceptance from various family members, and acceptance from the public.
It is important to note that statements with high-ranking scores of +4, -4, +3, and -3 (as explained in Chapter II) denote the personal opinions and feelings of all participants defining each factor. For that reason, analysis for this study was primarily focused on the explication of those high-ranking statements.

Factor 1: Family and Public Acceptance

Factor 1 may possibly leave a false impression that the participants had not experienced any form of prejudice. For the current study, participants rank ordered statements that were of most importance to them on a scale from most agree to most disagree. The high rankings of the participants were used to interpret the factors. Factor 1 participants’ high rankings favored experiences of acceptance more so than experiences of rejection due to prejudice. Ten participants defined Factor 1 of which six participants were three married couples. Each individual, of the three couples, loaded highly on this factor, thus appearing to see eye to eye with their spouse on various issues. Because they represented 60% of Factor 1, their high rankings contributed to the outcome of this factor. Perhaps if there were no married couples together on this factor, the outcome would have been different such as having a wider diversity of loadings.

One could speculate that the results of Factor 1 could have been due to the couples being married for a short time. Specifically, the three married couples had been married for only 2 to 3 years. Therefore, they may not have been exposed to many of life’s experiences, and they could possibly be seeing the world through the eyes of “honeymooners.” As a result, they may have been seeing their world (family and public) as that of acceptance.
One could also speculate about age as a factor that influenced the outcome of Factor 1, that is, 90% of the participants were under age 50. A Gallup poll (Gallup News Service, 2007) revealed the “Overall, 85% of Americans between the ages of 18 and 49 approve [of African American and Caucasian interracial marriages] . . . of those aged 50 and older, 67% approve” (p. 4). Root (2001) hypothesized that as Americans age, the negative trends towards African American and Caucasian interracial unions will continue to decrease, and trends towards acceptance of interracial marriages will continue to increase. Root also noted that a high rate of intermarriage is a sign of assimilation and that the minority group’s differences from the dominant society are diminishing.

Research also suggests that acceptance of African American and Caucasian interracial couples is increasing among the younger generation (Chito Childs, 2005b; Root, 2001; St. Jean, 1998). Along these same lines, after the post-sort interview in the current study, participant 1A stated, “A lot of my answers would have probably been different 20 years ago than they are today.” This comment possibly reveals the participant’s viewpoint that prejudice against African American and Caucasian couples has decreased significantly over the past two decades.

It could also be considered that some interracial couples may purposefully or unconsciously avoid negative situations and gravitate to where one is accepted and comfortable as found in a study by Hibbler and Shinew (2002). One could also argue that the experiences of acceptance from family and the public could also be explained by how their families and the public respond to them. That is, they are living and working in environments that respond favorably to African American and Caucasian interracial
couples. Therefore, their perceptions of acceptance could be a result of how others have responded to them.

Factor 2: Public Rejection

Factor 2 was defined by five participants. This factor consisted of an older population. Two of the participants, a married couple, were each 56 years old and had been married for 28 years. Another participant was 60 years old and had been married 17 years. The average age for all five participants was 50 years. According to how they rank ordered their statements, Factor 2 participants had experienced being called “traitors” or “sellouts,” had not had complete acceptance and support from their families, had experienced racial bigotry in the church, and had heard racist comments aimed at them.

Perhaps while the three older participants were rank ordering their statements, they were remembering what they had experienced years ago and thus placed their statements accordingly. On the other hand, some of the participants may have recently experienced various acts of prejudice and placed those cards accordingly.

The advantages of using Q methodology to carry out this study allowed participants to reflect on their experiences of prejudice or acceptance and to rank order these experiences according. Participants compared each statement, and decided which were most meaningful to them by placing their statement cards along a continuum grid of -4 (most disagree) to +4 (most agree). The participant “feels most strongly, or is most certain about those statements at the extremes of the distribution [-4, +4] . . . [and] display[s] relative neutrality, or conflict towards those in the center area” (S. R. Brown, 1980, p. 201).
When planning this study, the researcher presumed the resulting factors would reveal different experiences of prejudice significant to the participants defining each factor. However, not all factors revealed experiences of prejudice. As explained in Chapter II, there were 17 statements, of 33 statements, written in a negative tone (1, 4, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 21, 24, 26, 28, 31, 32, and 33), 12 statements written in a positive tone (2, 3, 5, 7, 13, 14, 17, 18, 19, 22, 23, and 27) and 4 statements having a general or neutral tone (20, 25, 29, and 30).

The results of this study produced four factors with low correlations between each factor suggesting substantial differences as to how participants viewed experiences of prejudice. For example, participants on Factor 1 highly ranked statements relating to family and public acceptance instead of prejudice. Participants on Factor 3 highly ranked various other statements relating to public acceptance instead of prejudice. Participants on Factor 2 highly ranked statements relating to their personal experiences of prejudice. Participants on Factor 4 highly ranked other statements relating to acceptance and rejection. Thus, the resulting factors expressed distinct experiences of prejudice.

A study by Paset and Taylor (1991) indicated that a person receives more support from those of his or her own race and gender. Therefore, the researcher was curious about participant rankings of statement #18: “It seems to me that the Black community is more accepting of our interracial marriage than the White community is.” Participants on Factor 2 highly disagreed with this statement, ranking it -3. Because three of the five participants on Factor 2 are African American (2 male, 1 female), one cannot speculate that this indicates that the Black community is not supportive of African Americans who
intermarry with Caucasians. Perhaps their responses indicate that the three participants felt they had not received acceptance from the African American community. Participants on the other three factors (Factors 1, 3, and 4) ranked statement #18 low (2, 0, and 1, respectively). Therefore, none of the four factors can lend support to Paset and Taylor’s study that one receives more support from their own race.

Research has also shown that it has been common for someone to be called a “traitor” or “sellout” if one is associated with, married to, or cohabitating with someone of another race (Chito Childs, 2005a; Gaines, 2001; Kennedy, 2003; G. A. Yancey, 2002). Participants were presented with statement #2, “I can’t really say that I have ever been accused of being called a ‘traitor’ or ‘sellout’ to my race.” Factor 2 participants highly ranked statement #2 a -4 indicating that these participants probably have been accused of being a “traitor” or “sellout.” Factor 2 is the only factor in which participants highly agreed they had experienced being called a “traitor” or “sellout.” Participants on the other three factors (Factors 1, 3, and 4) ranked statement #2 low (1, 2, and 1, respectively), indicating little or no concern. Therefore, only Factor 2 can lend some support to the research findings.

The researcher was curious if African American and Caucasian couples in this study would experience stares in public, which is a common occurrence (Harris & Kalbfleisch, 2000; Hibbler & Shinew, 2002; G. A. Yancey, 2002). Participants were asked to rank statement #12, “When we’re out in public, many times I feel that people are staring at us with disapproving and judgmental eyes.” Participants ranked this statement
+2 on Factor 2, denoting some agreement. Participants on Factor 1 ranked statement #12 a 0 denoting this statement was probably not important to the participants or they really did not care if people stared at them. Participants on Factor 3 ranked statement #12 a -1 indicating perhaps some participants stated staring never happened to them or they did not notice or care. Factor 4 participants ranked this statement a +1 indicating some may have experienced stares or it was not important whether people stared or not. These low rankings do not support the previous findings of Harris and Kalbfleisch (2002), Hibbler and Shinew (2002), and G. A. Yancey (2002) because participants had little or not interest if they were being stared.

According to Hibbler and Shinew (2002), as mentioned in Chapter I, African American and Caucasian interrationally married couples experienced limited social networks due to perceived negative reactions from family, friends, public, or work environments. It was wondered, therefore, if couples would experience negative reactions from others that would limit various aspects of their social lives such as avoiding certain parties or group functions. Factor 2 participants highly ranked statements (#2, #5, #11, #31) representing negative experiences from the public. These experiences included being called “traitors” or “sellouts,” lack of acceptance and family support, bigotry in the church, and hearing racist comments. One can speculate, due to their negative experiences, that the participants may have cut family ties, or their families had severed those ties. Perhaps they avoided churches where they knew bigotry existed, avoided people who made derogatory remarks, and only socialized where they knew they would
be accepted. Therefore, due to their negative experiences they may be avoiding those situations which would appear to lend some support to Hibbler and Shinew’s findings.

Factor 3: Public Acceptance

Participants who loaded on Factor 3 (Public Acceptance) and also on Factor 1 (Family and Public Acceptance) were somewhat similar demographically. The majority of participants were Caucasian, 70% and 56%, respectively; 10 participants defined Factor 1 and 9 participants defined Factor 3. The majority of participants on each factor were under age 50.

The differences between Factor 1 and Factor 3 can be seen in the factor arrays and statement rankings. The two factors had a common theme of acceptance, but they revealed different perspectives of experiences of acceptance. Statements: #1, #5, #9, #15, #19, and #33 were ranked differently on Factor 1 and Factor 3. Factor 1 participants ranked these statements: -4, +4, 0, -3, +1, and -4, respectively. Whereas the rankings on Factor 3 were: 0, +2, -4, 0, +4, and +1, and +1, respectively. There were two statements having the same rankings as shown on the factor arrays, statements #3 and #14.

The same arguments to explain the results of Factor 1 could be used to explain the results of Factor 3. That is, the results of Factor 3 could be due to the influence of the younger generation (four of the participants were in their 20s and 30s). It could also be argued that the experiences of acceptance from the public could be explained as a result of how the public has responded to the participants. They possibly are living and working in environments that respond favorably to African American and Caucasian interracial
couples. Therefore, the participants’ perceptions of acceptance could be a result of how others have responded to them.

Factor 4: Rejection and Acceptance

Factor 4 was rather unique because the four participants who defined this factor experienced acceptance from their spouse’s family, but rejection from their own family. Participants ranked statement #1 as -3: “At times, I feel that some of my spouse’s relatives do not want to have anything to do with me.” The -3 ranking indicates disagreement because they do have acceptance from their spouse’s relatives. Participants highly ranked statement #5 as -4: “I have always had complete acceptance and support from my own family, marrying someone from another race has never been a problem.” The -4 ranking indicates strong disagreement. That is, the participants feel they have not had complete acceptance and support from their very own family.

The explanation for acceptance and rejection within participants’ own families resides in the experiences of each individual. An in depth study, whether it be phenomenological, a narrative interview, or other form of qualitative research, would unveil some of the complexities of the nature of these relationships.

Factor 4 participants highly ranked statement #29 a +4: “I have felt really angry, upset, or discounted when I have experienced an act of prejudice only to have my spouse think it was nothing, or that it was only my imagination.” The high ranking of +4 indicates high agreement, but, as explained in Chapter III, the responses of the four participants indicated spouses did have different viewpoints about acts of prejudice but they did not discount each other. Even though there were only four participants on Factor
4, the high ranking of statement #29 appeared to support hook’s (1992) viewpoint, and Killian’s (2002) viewpoint, that perceptions of racial reality could be very different from the standpoint of each race. That is, the Caucasian partner could interpret acts of prejudice differently than the African American partner.

**Social Dominance Theory**

Informed and guided by the Social Dominance Theory (SDT) the current study was designed to capture the presence, and possibly the absence of experiences of prejudice as perceived by individuals in African American and Caucasian interracial marriages. As the resulting four factors revealed, there were participants who experienced various forms of prejudicial behaviors and participants who experienced various forms of acceptance.

Important to this study is a construct within SDT called Social Dominance Orientation (SDO). SDO is a “general positive orientation towards group dominance” (Sidanius et al., 1996, p. 385). Those high in SDO use Hierarchy-Enhancing Legitimizing Myths (HE-LMs) to give support to their beliefs (group dominance). Those low in SDO use Hierarchy-Attenuating Legitimizing Myths (HA-LMS) to give support to their beliefs (group equality). The beliefs can consist of stereotypes, myths, attitudes, ideologies, and so forth, “that provide moral and intellectual justification for social practices that either increase, maintain, or decrease levels of social inequality among social groups” (Sidanius & Pratto, 2001, p. 104). Three processes that influence dominant and subordinate groups are aggregated individual discrimination, aggregated institutional discrimination, and behavioral asymmetry.
The first process, aggregated individual discrimination, addresses overt and subtle acts of discrimination that one individual imposes upon another. For example, there were individuals in this study who experienced stares in public, heard racist comments, or were called “traitor” or “sellout.” Participant 34D on Factor 2 experienced being called “traitor” or “sellout” and stated, “That’s something that any interracial marriage is always going to be confronted with.” The literature supports that these, and other acts of discrimination, are experienced by African American and Caucasian interracial couples (Chito Childs, 2005b; Root, 2001; Rosenblatt, 1995; G. A. Yancey, 2002). Various acts of prejudice directed toward the interracial couples from the family, or from individuals in public, are examples of aggregated individual discrimination.

The second process, aggregated institutional discrimination, is discrimination practiced by a social institution such as schools, hospitals, retail outlets, and so forth. An example of aggregated institutional discrimination is bigotry in the church (statement #11) as experienced by a participant on Factor 2 who stated:

It’s just against all the biblical teachings. . . . Others (in our church) who have said why do we worry about trying to bring Black families into our church even though the neighborhood is integrated. They have their own church and those people really don’t want to be part of us. So there is much bigotry there. (27A)

The third process is the behavioral asymmetry hypothesis that posits members of the subgroup do not act in their own best interests but help support the dominant group. For example, those being called a “traitor” or “sellout” are looked down upon by those within their own racial group because of their marriage or friendship with someone of
another race. G. A. Yancey (2002) mentioned that some African American fear interracial unions because they may weaken their racial unification in confronting Caucasian society politically. That is, some African Americans may have fears of the races mixing, producing mixed race children, and therefore weakening African American unification. Therefore, some members of the African American community may look upon those African Americans who intermarry as “traitors.”

The attitudes and beliefs that promote equality and reduce the structure of a dominant social hierarchy are Hierarchy-Attenuating Legitimizing Myths (HA-LMs). Those who believe in equality promote HA-LMs; for example, “all men are created equal.” The participants on Factor 1 and Factor 3 experienced family and public acceptance. Participant 20C, a Caucasian male, stated, “And my spouse’s family is really accepting and always seems to love me.” Participant 21A, a Caucasian female, stated, “But I’ve never heard any comments from any of our family. . . . My family is awesome. . . . They love my husband and they love the babies.” These two participants have experienced affirmation from their families whose attitudes and beliefs promote equality. Quotes from two other couples illustrate they live in areas where the neighbors or towns people also believe in equality: “We really haven’t had any issues with the way we’ve been treated in our town based on fact that we’re an interracial couple” (25A) and “I don’t think anybody makes any distinction in our neighborhood or in our town. We don’t have any problems” (23A).
Limitations

This study was limited to 20 African American and Caucasian interracial couples. Analyzing the data from this study brought to light a number of issues that could be further investigated and/or may have bearing on how this study is viewed. The use of the “snowball” technique was successful for recruiting participants. However, those recruited referred the researcher to friends or to others who were living in and around the same geographic areas of Cleveland, Ohio or in Kent, Ohio. There were no inner city couples or rural couples in this study. Therefore, the results of this study may have been different if it included inner city couples and rural couples.

There appeared to be a problem with some statements that were too long or were compound statements. For example, statement #33 was “Overall, it seems like we have experienced overt and subtle acts of prejudice from our family members more so than from the public in general.” The participants answered to the effect that they have experienced acts of prejudice from the family, but did not comment on “more so than from the public.” The “more so than from the public” could have been eliminated because other questions in the Q sort referred specially to the public.

Implications for Future Research

The present study focused on a certain population and did not consider inner city or rural populations. Therefore, future research, and future Q-methodology studies, could be focused on the differences of experiences of prejudice among inner city, suburban, and rural couples. For example, a question that may be explored is: Do African American and Caucasian interracially married couples, living in the inner city, perceive support and
opposition differently than African American and Caucasian interracially married couples living in rural areas? What are the perceptions of prejudice of African American and Caucasian interracially married couples living in the suburbs as compared to African American and Caucasian interracially married couples living in the inner city? Another question for consideration is: Are there differences in perceptions of social support among inner city, suburban, and rural African American and Caucasian interracial couples?

A question for future research could be developed from statement #25: “I suspect that if I were in a same-race marriage, I would not have to worry about racism the way I do now.” The research question to be explored could be: What do members of an African American and Caucasian interracial marriage think would be different if they were in a same-race marriage? This type of study might possibly give an in depth view of individuals in an interracial marriage comparing their interracial marriage with a same-race marriage. This type of study might reveal their thoughts and feelings may bring to light new insights into the experiences of these couples.

Four separate Q studies could be developed from this present study: (a) experiences of family acceptance; (b) family rejection; (c) public acceptance; and (d) public rejection. These studies may bring new insights as to what interracial couples are experiencing more so than the current study. For example, one may want to study the various ways families show acceptance to African American and Caucasian interracial couples. The studies could be from the points of view of each of the family members and
then a study from the points of view from each member of the couple. The responses could then be compared.

The explanation for acceptance and rejection within participants’ own families resides in the experiences of each individual. An in-depth study, whether it be phenomenological, a narrative interview, or other form of qualitative research, could unveil some of the complexities of the nature of these relationships. A qualitative study could be completed with only family members of the interracial couple, and then a qualitative study with the interracial couple about their relationships with their family members could be completed thus giving detailed information from the whole family.

Implications for Counseling Practice and Counselor Preparation

Even though interracial marriages are more acceptable and common than in the past, prejudice still exists (Chito-Childs, 2002; Kalmijn, 1993; Root, 2001; Rosenblatt et al., 1995). Lewandowski and Jackson (2001) noted that the unions of African American men and Caucasian women “have been viewed as the most repugnant of all interracial unions” and the “most despised” (p. 290).

As the number of African American and Caucasian interracial unions multiply, it will become increasingly important to recognize and comprehend the needs of these couples and their families. Interracial unions bring with them their own unique set of family and social issues. These issues can involve religious beliefs, family traditions and cultural beliefs, gender, race, economic issues, and so forth.

The counselor needs to be aware of the myths and stereotypes regarding interracial marriages that still prevail in today’s society and the historical context from
which many of these myths and stereotypes developed (G. A. Yancey, 2002). Increasing the counselor’s awareness will help the counselor to understand that myths and stereotypes are the foundations of many prejudicial attitudes that have led to acts of discrimination and violence that many interracial couples have experienced.

The multicultural counseling competencies proposed by Sue, Arredono, and McDavis (1992) offer excellent guidelines for improving the counselor’s effectiveness for counseling African American and Caucasian interracial couples. One of the competencies refers to the counselors’ awareness of their own assumptions, values, and biases. If the counselor is Caucasian, is he or she aware of his or her own White privilege? The counselor must look not only at the advantages of being Caucasian in a Caucasian dominated society, but to understand a variety of racial issues that confront the African American that Caucasians never had to experience.

If the counselor is African American, is he or she harboring negative attitudes against Caucasians, and African American and Caucasian interracial marriages? It is important for both African American and Caucasian counselors who wish to work with couples in an interracial union or marriage to examine their own views and biases influenced by their own culture, race, and religious beliefs. If the counselor is of a religion that believes couples should be married and not living together, can that counselor effectively counsel unmarried couples without unconsciously revealing any bias?

As discussed in the literature review, counselors need to be aware of the historical context of African Americans, antimiscegenation laws, etc. in order to understand how
history continues to impact opposition towards the African American and Caucasian races uniting. Counselors must continually monitor their own biases, beliefs, attitudes, and views about why interracial couples are together for the purpose of reducing the possibility of couples’ experiencing the counseling process as negative and maybe even harmful (Solsberry, 1994).

Another point to consider is that the counselor trainee must not assume that an interracial couple comes to counseling due to racial issues. Wehrly, Kenny, and Kenny (1999) found that for many interracial couples racial differences are more of a concern for others than for the couple. Couples come to counseling for the same reasons as those of same-race unions. Therefore, it is important for the counselor trainee not to have any preconceived ideas of why the couple is presenting themselves for counseling. It is important to listen and be sensitive to what each client is saying about issues in order to understand where the client is coming from.

A second competency is the counselors’ awareness of their clients’ worldviews. A counselor may encounter an interracial union where the Caucasian perspective of racial reality could appear different from the African American perspective relating to experiences of prejudice or other situations within the union (hooks, 1992). Does the counselor understand that partners may each hold their own worldview that may cause conflicts within the marriage or union? Are their religious conflicts involved? Counselors, who are of the same race as one of the partner’s in the union, or even gender, must be aware of possibly showing any partiality towards that client’s worldview. Therefore, a therapist who is aware of these situations can effectively aid couples in the
interpretation of their differences thus improving the effectiveness of the therapeutic process.

For counselor trainees interested in counseling African American and Caucasian interracial unions, it is important to learn and understand the history of slavery in the United States and the history of antimiscegenation laws and other laws developed to keep the races separate. As the counselor trainee progresses in understanding history, racial differences, White privilege, and worldviews the counselor’s multicultural competencies will increase. As counselor trainees become aware and sensitive to their own beliefs, biases, and attitudes, they will be able to become aware and sensitive to the needs of each partner in the interracial union.

Reflections on the Q Sort Process

Pre-Sort Process

Collecting 532 statements in order to develop the communication concourse was time consuming. However, the number of initial statements enabled the researcher to find the most common experiences of prejudice that African American and Caucasian interracial couples have encountered. In addition, forming a peer group panel to review statements provided outside opinions about statement content, wording, clarity, and conciseness for the pilot study.

Conducting a pilot study was advantageous in obtaining information about the study process. That is, it enabled the researcher to estimate the time involved to complete a Q sort and to gather information from the participants about the experiences of the Q sort process. This information was valuable in preparation for the main study.
As explained in Chapter II, one of the methods the researcher used to recruit participants was posting flyers (Appendix L) around the local community and two universities. Another recruitment method used was the “snowball” sampling technique (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982). The “snowball” technique was the most successful method for recruiting participants because it allowed study participants to recruit or notify the researcher of potential participants. The researcher first contacted three African American and Caucasian interracially married couples she knew personally. From these couples, the “snowball” technique was put into effect. That is, they referred the researcher to one or two other couples. The researcher would then contact prospective participants and explain the study to them. If they met the qualifications, and were interested, they joined the study. For those who were not interested in joining, the researcher thanked them for their time and asked if they knew of other couples. Therefore, the “snowball” continued to roll along until the researcher had 40 (20 couples) qualified participants.

One of the study participants referred the researcher to three churches in the area that had African American and Caucasian interracial couples as members. By contacting the churches, the researcher recruited three more couples. Another couple was recruited when the researcher’s husband noticed a story in the Cleveland newspaper, the *Plain Dealer*, about an African American and Caucasian married couple who owned a business together. The researcher contacted them and they became part of the study. Of the 20 couples who participated in this study, 3 couples were personally known by the researcher, 3 couples were from local churches, 1 couple was from a newspaper story, and 13 couples were recruited by the “snowball” technique. The researcher recruited and
interviewed couples between September of 2007 and January 2008. Approximately 30 couples were contacted resulting in 20 interested and qualified couples. There were only minor difficulties in scheduling appointments with the couples because of work, school, and family life.

**Post-Sort Process**

The Q-methodology software program (Schmolck & Atkinson, 2002) was used to analyze the data. The researcher found the software program easy to utilize. However, for entering data, the researcher felt it was important to find an efficient coding method for each participant to be identified in the data results.

Many researchers usually assign a number as the identifying code for each participant. However, for this study, the researcher felt that method would only make interpretation of the data very time consuming. A more efficient method was to assign a letter along with a number for identifying each participant’s gender and race. For example, in this study, the letter “A” represented a Caucasian female; the letter “B” represented an African American female; the letter “C” represented a Caucasian male, and the letter “D” represented an African American male. All odd numbers represented females, and the even numbers represented males. This method kept the identity of the participants confidential, yet the researcher knew if the participant was African American, Caucasian, male, or female just by referring to their code number.

There was a minor problem with the transcriptions from the post-sort interviews. As the researcher reviewed the transcriptions, she needed to go back and reread many of the transcripts, and review the participants’ Q sort answer sheets, in order to discover
exactly which statement was being discussed by the participant. During the post-sort interviewing process, the participants were instructed to comment on statements they placed under item markers of +4, or any statement that seemed salient to them. However, it would have been an efficient use of time to have participants first say the statement number and then comment on that statement.

Conclusion

This study utilized Q methodology to investigate experiences of prejudice among individuals in African American and Caucasian interracial marriages. This study involved 40 participants (20 couples) sorting 33 statements identifying various experiences of prejudice on a continuum of most disagree (-4) to most agree (+4). The resulting data were factor analyzed and rotated, and from data the following four factors emerged: Factor 1, Family and Public Acceptance; Factor 2, Public Rejection; Factor 3, Public Acceptance; and Factor 4, Acceptance and Rejection. These four factors represented four distinctly different perceptions of experiences of prejudice among the participants.

This chapter concluded with reflections on the Q sort process, limitations, implications for future research, and implications for training. It is hoped that this research project introduced new insights and new sensitivities related to experiences of prejudice as perceived by individuals in African American and Caucasian interracial marriages.
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Q SET STATEMENTS, PHASE II
Q set statements – Phase II

1. At times, I feel that some of my spouse’s relatives do not want to have anything to do with me.

2. I can’t really say that I have ever been accused of being a “traitor” or “sell out” to my race.

3. Overall, we are generally treated with the same respect as same-race couples.

4. There have been times when we have been out in public together, and we have heard derogatory or racist comments aimed at us.

5. I have always had complete acceptance and support from my own family; marrying someone from another race has never been a problem.

6. Some people seem concerned that we have (or intend to have) mixed-race children, like it would upset the social order or something.

7. In any job I have ever had, there has never been a problem with co-workers or bosses due to the fact that my spouse is of a different race.

8. I have lost friends because I married interracially.

9. I’d rather not let some people know I married interracially. I’m better off keeping some things to myself around certain people.

10. My eyes were really opened to prejudice after I got married. I never knew so many people were against African American and Caucasian interracial marriages.

11. There is racial bigotry in the church. I have experienced it.

12. When we’re out in public, many times I feel that people are staring at us with disapproving and judgmental eyes.
13. I can’t say that we have ever received poor service in restaurants or from retail sales people due to being an interracial couple.

14. We can go anywhere in and around our town and no one has ever bothered us just because we are an African American and Caucasian couple.

15. I believe police have harassed us just because they do not like seeing us together.

16. People have actually told me that I should have stayed within my own race.

17. I don’t think anyone has had a problem renting or selling to us a place to live just because we are an interracial couple.

18. It seems to me that the Black community is more accepting of our interracial marriage than the White community is.

19. Where we live now, we just all of a sudden became a part of the neighborhood. We were immediately accepted.

20. I’ve noticed at times, that when people hear about, see a photo, or meet my spouse for the first time, they seem surprised my spouse is of another race.

21. I have had to become more particular in choosing friends. I need to know whom I can really trust and that they really don’t care if I married interracially.

22. At first, there were folks who seemed to be against our marriage, but they softened in time and now seem generally quite accepting.

23. It seems that those with more education have more open attitudes and accept interracial marriage. I feel more comfortable around them.
24. There have been times when Black women have really been angry when they have seen us together. They would coldly stare, make negative remarks, or say things like Blacks should stick together.

25. I suspect that if I were in a same-race marriage, I would not have to worry about racism the way I do now.

26. There have been times when we have had to make vacation plans based on where it would be safer for us to travel.

27. I have always felt comfortable in social gatherings that consisted of only people from my spouse’s race. I’ve always felt accepted.

28. I have relatives who made up excuses to avoid being around us. I feel they really do not approve of my marriage.

29. I have felt really angry, upset or discounted when I have experienced an act of prejudice only to have my spouse think it was nothing, or that it was only my imagination.

30. Sometimes I wish we had more interracial couples as friends.

31. What frustrates me is how common it is to hear racist comments from others who do not know I am in an interracial marriage. I doubt they would say those things if they knew my spouse is of another race.

32. There have been occasions when we have been out socializing and I have felt the “cold shoulder” from strangers, indicating they didn’t approve of us in their group.

33. Overall, it seems like we have experienced overt and subtle acts of prejudice from our family members more so than from the public in general.
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INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL PHASE I
March 6, 2007

Patricia Schafer, Graduate Student
ACHVE
Kent State University

Re07-110, “Experiences of Prejudice Among Individuals in African American and European American Interracial Marriages - A Q Methodological Study, Phase I.”

Dear Ms. Schafer,

I am pleased to inform you that the Kent State University Institutional Review Board approved your Application for Approval to Use Human Research Participants as Level 1, Category 2 research. This application was approved on October 17, 2006 and is good for one year. This approval will expire on October 16, 2007. An annual periodic review form will be sent within a year of the original date of approval of the application. If the annual periodic review form is not received, please contact me, as it is the responsibility of the principal investigator to renew the information on the approved application on an annual basis.

HHS regulations and Kent State University Institutional Review Board guidelines require that any changes in research methodology, protocol design or principal investigator have the prior approval of the IRB before implementation and continuation of the protocol. The IRB further requests an annual report and a final report at the conclusion of the study.

If you have any questions, please contact me at 330-672-2704. (klight@kent.edu)

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Katherine Light
IRB Administrator

cc: Jason McGlothlin, ACHVE
Cynthia Osborn, ACHVE
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INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL PHASE II
October 18, 2007

Patricia Schaefer, Graduate Student
ACHIVE
Kent State University

Re: 06-61, “Experiences of Prejudice among Individuals in African American and Caucasian Interracial marriages: A Q Methodological Study. Phase II.”

Dear Ms. Schaefer,

I am pleased to inform you that the Kent State University Institutional Review Board approved your Application for Approval to Use Human Research Participants as Level 1, Category 2 research. This application was approved on August 29, 2007 and is good for one year. This approval will expire on August 28, 2008. An annual periodic review form will be sent within a year of the original date of approval of the application. If the annual periodic review form is not received, please contact me, as it is the responsibility of the principal investigator to renew the information on the approved application on an annual basis.

HHS regulations and Kent State University Institutional Review Board guidelines require that any changes in research methodology, protocol design or principal investigator have the prior approval of the IRB before implementation and continuation of the protocol. The IRB further requests an annual report and a final report at the conclusion of the study.

If you have any questions, please contact me at 330.672.2704. (klight@kst.edu)

Sincerely,

Katharine Light
IRB Administrator

cc: Jason McGuithlin, ACHIVE
    Cynthia Osborn, ACHIVE
APPENDIX D

SECONDARY SOURCES
### SECONDARY SOURCES

**AND CONCOURSE STATEMENT NUMBERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>306 - 308</td>
<td>Weller (June, 2005).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>344 - 376</td>
<td>Yancey and Yancey (2002).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>396 – 486</td>
<td>Chito Childs (2005a).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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COMMUNICATION CONCOURSE

(532 STATEMENTS)
Communication concourse

(532 statements)

1. I want a White family. A minority is not going to be in my family.
2. I told her that she would no longer be my niece if she went through with this marriage.
3. I just thought she could do better than—and stay within her race.
4. I was really kind of mad . . . that he would not ever attend any family functions we were at.
5. I mean to keep everything pure . . . . You keep everything pure.
6. Why didn’t he stay within his own race?
7. I just don’t believe in the interracial marriages.
8. They can’t help it because they’re Mexican. I can’t help it because I’m White. Someone can’t help it because they’re black. That’s the way it is. But I said and I still say it: that you should stay within your race, and—and there won’t be no problems.
9. I would feel embarrassed if my daughters dated a black man, and I would wonder, “Where did I go wrong?”
10. I refer to them (black) as porches, niggerachis and a couple of times coon.
11. I’m seeing somebody, and he’s black. Because of the way my mom feels, it’s putting a halt on him wanting to be with me.
12. For as long as I can remember, my parents have told me that Whites stay with Whites and blacks stay with blacks.
13. My mom said she’d be humiliated, embarrassed, disgusted if I ever married a Black guy, a Mexican, a Hawaiian, any person of color.
14. She (referring to her mom) said it would be completely wrong to bring a mixed child into this world.
15. A little bit, I probably would be [embarrassed].
16. More so I think than anything. How would they look at me?
17. Outside friends, people, co-workers (fear of what they would think).
18. You would be embarrassed personally and it would be a social issue for you.
19. She wants to date only Black men.
20. Erika (Black) is married to a White man and she wants her sister to marry White.
21. I feel very strongly that I only want to date black men.
22. It’s like black men think, you know, I’ve got this great education, I’ve got this car. Now let me get a White woman, like she’s some kind of trophy.
23. My sister [Erika] is convinced that White men are more tolerant of intelligent African American women than black men are.
24. I’m suspicious of White men . . . they think I’m exotic, and they want to experience me. But they don’t want to go out with me in the open because it’s taboo.
25. Do you think that I’ve sold out by marrying outside of the race?
26. No. You know, he’s good people.
27. I do not have a problem with people dating interracially . . . However, for me personally, I hesitate to do that, one, because of the negative experiences I’ve had with White people in general . . .
28. You know, he’s [her White husband] is the exception probably, I would think and not the rule. You know, I think his parents raised him not to be oppressive, you know. He’s just—he’s fantabulous.
29. I’m questioning whether or not some African American man is going to appreciate her . . .
30. I think the pickings are slim . . . such a small pool [of black men] with her having, you know, an advanced degree. . . . It’s going to be very difficult for her to find someone.
31. I’m tired of being an educated black woman without a man and being alone because black men date White women.
32. And, certainly, there is an element of truth to what everybody is saying (friction between black men and black women).
33. That is the first thing that White women don’t deal with (outnumbering the White men). The second thing White women don’t deal with is negative attitudes about them. Black women have negative attitudes associated with them. We’re combative, we’re confrontational, etc.
34. Eric, a Black male: I would not marry a black woman at all.
35. Eric: They got more than a chip . . .
36. And the black woman raised you, and you need to remember that.
37. This is an issue that certainly needed to be brought up today and discussed because there are a lot of people who have very strong opinions on both sides of the issue. . . . my wife did date black men predominantly. And when I came along, I swept her off her feet. It had nothing to do with me being black or White. I swept her off her feet. I love my wife very much.
38. We ultimately have to get to the core of who we are, stand on our principles and go forward and not get caught up in all of the drama and the stereotyping that there is.
39. My biggest fear is that the baby is going to be dark, having kinky hair and a large butt.
40. Blacks should have black babies, and Whites should have White babies. I don’t believe the two races should mix.
41. I think he is disgusted with me because I was with a black man.
42. Knowing that a black man was intimate with my daughter absolutely makes my blood boil.
43. My biggest fear is that Isabella—that’s the baby—is going to be dark, have kinky hair, large lips and a large butt.
44. I call a White woman with a black man a loving White bitch.
45. That’s what I’ve been taught. That’s how I was raised.
46. My daughter having a black baby is causing me a lot of grief because I don’t know how to deal with it. I was hoping that it would be light skinned so I could maybe pass her off as Latino.
47. What’s that do to you, thinking that you’re bringing a child into the family that is an object of hatred and rejection?
48. It really hurts me to know that he has ill feelings toward the race of my child.
49. You just say that the “N” word and women are what’s wrong with the world.
50. I believe that White people are discriminated against just as much as blacks.
51. I have been a victim of racism, racial profiling, as a matter of fact.
52. I feel like I’ve been a victim of racism because when I go into stores, they look at me and they think I’m going to steal something.
53. My mom is White and my dad is black. And I’m not White enough for the White people, and I’m not black enough for the black people.
54. My husband is—is black, and we’ve been a victim of racism when we’re out together.
55. I’ve never been denied any opportunities because of the color of my skin.
56. I have seen more discrimination from the black community than I have from the White community.
57. Blacks marry Whites for status.
58. Whites who marry Blacks do so in an attempt to act out, to punish parents or make a social statement.
59. The couple learns to insulate itself when possible from people and situations that are potentially harmful.
60. Blacks are genetically inferior to Whites.
61. Blacks are physically superior to Whites.
62. Oreo.
63. Biracial individuals and couples are outcast by both racial groups.
64. The most corrosive form of White opposition to interracial couples is racism.
65. I really wasn’t aware how badly racism exists until I married.
66. Interracial partnership challenges racism.
67. There are still powerful forces in society that make b-w interracial marriage difficult.
68. Everyone wants us to be separate – either you are Black or White – either or thinking is dangerous.
69. Life as an interracial couple is not that big of deal.
70. We don’t view ourselves as an interracial couple.
71. Our problems are not magnified just because we are interracial.
72. Some of their participants told them about expectations of family members and others that “interracial partners have trouble getting along with each other and trouble getting along in society.”
73. I felt self-conscious at first being in an interracial relationship.
74. My mother said, ‘Oh you are going to have so much trouble.’
75. Doomed to fail – troublemakers.
76. There are some blacks that don’t want blacks to marry White; there are some
Whites that don’t want Whites to marry blacks.
77. They’ve got to deal with race and race issues, sometimes on a daily basis.
78. A participant felt others think that you are rebelling against your family.
79. They must have a hidden agenda.
80. You have low self-esteem.
81. Is our love strong enough to withstand what our families might think?
82. Blocked from wanting to be ordinary: For most couples, the blocks to being
ordinary came mostly from others: privacy-invading stares . . . words and
actions directed at them as an interracial couple that conveyed racist
sentiments.
83. I guess it’s always an awareness when you’re out in the public, that makes you
self-conscious.
84. One of the most common ones [stereotypes] is the ‘pimp and the hooker.’
85. You get together because of sex.
86. And that is the only reason you got together because of this great mystique
around African American male sexuality, and White women just lust after
African American males—that all came out of slavery days in America.
87. A lot of the problems in the relationship are not generated from within but
from without.
88. Forbidden fruit . . . we do what we are told not to do.
89. The history of b/w relationships in America can affect everybody, not only
people in b/w relationships, but also people who have any reaction at all to a
b/w couple.
90. I think we would probably get a stronger reaction from African American
males and females because of the whole thing about slavery . . . and
associating with the oppressor.
91. Cultural differences are likely to challenge any couple relationship.
92. A White family member’s choice of partner is a choice of a relative for
everyone in the family.
93. Don’t tell the neighbors.
94. There was opposition to my interracial relationship from my family members.
(More opposition to daughters in an interracial relationships)
95. In America, there seems to be a standardized discourse against interracial
relationships.
96. Societal, community, neighbor or family disapproval.
97. Issues of safety and well being
98. Clannishness of African Americans.
99. Problems children would have.
100. Likelihood of poor economic future.
101. ‘Problems’ not specified.
102. Are you sure you want to be in this relationship? It is going to mean problems.
(White mother to daughter).
You don’t know what you are getting into . . . if you bring brown babies home.  
If you marry a black man your income level goes down.  
You two are educated and can buy your way out of making a choice about what race they are.  
My mother and family had no conception that we could ever live anywhere it wouldn’t be a major problem.  
Your father would turn over in his grave.  
Mother’s concern that I was making my life narrower rather than broader.  
We had relatives that would not even come to the wedding.  
All blacks are poor and live in the inner city (or ghetto).  
You are marrying out of your class. You are beneath yourself.  
Olivia talked about her father asking her where he had gone wrong in raising her.  
People are people and their race should have nothing to do whatsoever with the way they are treated as a person.  
My parents stated they would disown or disinherit me.  
Some White families want to avoid acquiring Black kin.  
At times I felt internal and external pressure from my family to split up and not marry.  
I have friends who would date someone from another race (Black or White) but would not take them home to meet their parents for fear that their parent’s reactions.  
There was some opposition at first, but that declined.  
No good comes from getting too involved with White people.  
Whites can easily turn against black people, even those they claim as their friends.  
Black men are inherently violent and lust for White women.  
Children will be confused about their identity under the One-Drop Rule or possibly be rejected by both Blacks and Whites.  
If a White woman chooses a black man, she is considered to have rejected or been rejected by all White men.  
There is a shortage of Black men.  
I am afraid if my partner gets angry with me, he/she will call me “nigger.”  
The White partner will gravitate toward the superior position, the Black partner toward inferior status in the partnership.  
Marrying someone just like you will produce better results.  
Only when the two bloods mix freely in marriage will the color problem be solved.  
Interrmarriage would symbolize the abolition of prejudice that is so strenuously fought.  
Whites tend to disapprove of Black/White marriages, whereas Blacks usually approve.  
African American females are less tolerant of B/W interracial marriages than
are either African American males or Caucasian females.

132. There should be laws against marriages between Blacks and Whites.
133. “Money Whitens.”
134. One Black ancestor is all that is needed to make a person Black for life.
135. Concerns of White future in-laws over the skin color of their children’s offspring reflect their fear of intermixture. Such as “well your children could be dark.”
136. You better watch out, because you might have little Black kids running around the house some day.
137. Dark pigmentation is a marker, a stigma with obvious consequences.
138. Derogatory names.
139. Look at that nigger and White trash together.
140. If a woman is married to a Black man she is called White trash.
141. Having biracial children is a threat to the existing racial order.
142. Prejudice against miscegenation is very pervasive.
143. It’s a brand new world and everybody is the same.
144. I don’t think I became sensitive to it [prejudice] until we were together on a more frequent basis and now I see all the little things that I would not have seen otherwise.
145. Closeness to their mates gives White partners entrée into a domain where “all the little things that [they] would not have seen otherwise” are noticeable.
146. Both parties experience pressure from the larger society and in order to function, isolate themselves.
147. Couples appear to be involved in two separate, conflicting lives: one public, the other private.
148. Some people are afraid to tell others, such as at work, that they have a spouse of the opposite race for fear of consequences.
149. Some people are afraid to tell others they are dating someone from the opposite race for fear of consequences.
150. It is possible to hypothesize that conceptions of color and views of social equality will be reflected in attitudes towards intermarriage.
151. Color is connected to biology . . .
152. Deconstructing of color (intermarriage) will represent a threat to existing arrangements.
153. Significance assigned to color.
154. Black females are less tolerant than Black males or White females.
155. Attitudes of Black females appear irrational.
156. Black females guarded against White males.
157. Intermarriage a symbol of social equality.
158. Whites may perceive they have little to gain from an interracial union.
159. We must maintain racial purity.
160. Races should never mix.
161. Whites are more opposed to B/W interracial marriages.
162. God made us different and we should not mix. We should stick with our own.
163. If an African American and Caucasian person are working together, people assume that the White person is the boss.
164. Church leaders are part of the problem of segregation.
165. We are all children of God, intermarriage is okay.
166. Blacks are more supportive of Black/White unions than Whites are.
167. Black men appear particularly offended by a Black/White male union.
168. Black women seem resentful of Black males with White females.
169. Black guys are so macho. It is like bringing down their pride to see a Black woman with a White guy.
170. Black women try to become a wedge between a Black man and his White wife.
171. Black women are mean to White women who are married to Black men.
172. Black females tend to disapprove of intermarriage.
173. Black males approve of intermarriage.
174. Those who grew up in an interracial neighborhood are more accepting of B/W unions.
175. It doesn’t matter what [people] look like . . . their hair . . . just the person inside. If the people get along, it doesn’t matter where they come from, as long as they get along.
176. Upbringing and similarity of interest are more important than pigmentation in determining mate choice.
177. For interracial couples, the salience of color seems to diminish after marriage; race consciousness does not diminish. In their every day interaction, they are reminded by Blacks, Whites, relatives, and nonrelatives of the inappropriate nature of their association.
178. The ideal nature of intermarriage is a symbol of social equality.
179. Color is a marker of difference . . . and is the standard by which human rights and privileges are distributed.
180. Intermarriage would symbolize the abolition of prejudice that is so strenuously fought.
181. Money Whitens.
182. Whites are more likely than Blacks to disapprove of interracial unions.
183. African American females are less tolerant of the b/w interracial couple than are either African American males or Caucasian females.
184. Well, your children could be dark.
185. You better watch out, because you might have little Black kids running around the house some day.
186. Dark pigmentation is a marker, a stigma with obvious consequences.
187. Getting stares and negative racial slurs in public places.
188. She’d be called White trash and I’d be called nigger.
189. I’d be called White trash (female).
190. I’d be called nigger (male).
191. A color blind society.
192. Blacks display ambivalence toward the interracial union.
193. Whites express strong reservations towards interracial union.
194. Rooted in the ideal of racial purity.
195. Concern over the children’s skin color.
196. Negative reactions are more subtle here.
197. Black/White unions are trouble in our society.
198. Black dating White: How come you did not look at none of us?
199. Color meant little in their marriages.
200. I hope they don’t have children.
201. I really did not think it was pervasive as it is [prejudice against blacks].
202. I don’t think I became sensitive to it until we were together on a more frequent basis. I see all the little things that I would not have seen otherwise [she is White, he is black].
203. I could lose my job if the boss knew my spouse was black.
204. I don’t announce it at work that my wife is black.
205. We live two lives, our public life and our private life.
206. One identity reserved for the public world is based on their physical appearance or pigmentation. In contrast, the other identity—their intermarriage, an essential part of their private world—is seldom revealed to outsiders for fear of consequences.
207. Anti-miscegenation is very subtle here.
208. Because Black/Whites unions deconstruct the traditional significance of color and associated role expectations, they are potentially chaotic, confusing, and troubling to the society.
209. I have more trouble with the White race than I have with the Black race as far as being around other people.
210. Blacks are reportedly more supportive of Black/White unions than Whites are.
211. Black men appear particularly offended by a Black female/White male union.
212. For Black guys, it is like bringing down their pride when they see a Black woman with a White guy. But they can handle a Black man with a White woman.
213. There are not that many successful, single, straight, unjailed Black men out there.
214. African American male disclosed that Black women tried to become a wedge between him and his White wife.
215. Growing up in a mixed neighborhood helped racial attitudes towards intermarriage in a positive manner.
216. It doesn’t matter what [people] look like, just the person inside. If the people get along, it doesn’t matter where they come from, as long as they get along.
217. Upbringing and similarity of interest are more important than pigmentation in determining mate choice.
218. People should stay with their own.
219. In the past, it bothered me to see Black/White couples together.
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220. Salience of color seems to diminish after marriage, race consciousness does not diminish.
221. In our everyday interactions, we are reminded by Blacks, Whites, relatives, and non-relatives of the inappropriate nature of our association.
222. Black males appear to resent unions between Black females and White males.
223. Marry within your own race.
224. You could have done better.
225. You have been accused of ‘selling’ out.
226. Blackness still had cast connotations.
227. White women are trying to take all the good black men.
228. White women were more traumatized, or disowned, by their families’ reactions than black women or black men.
229. Parents became angry at decision to marry someone of another race.
230. The fact that God separated the races shows that he did not intend for the races to mix.
231. Stick with your own kind.
232. The Bible does not forbid or condemn marriages with other races or people . . . only those contracted with an idolater or unbeliever.
233. But what about the children?
234. I have to think where it is psychologically and physically safe for us to go.
235. Higher education seems to be more associated with a more open attitude toward interracial contact.
236. Whites who marry blacks experience a shift down in status.
237. Blacks who marry Whites do not experience a shift up in status.
238. I have been socially ostracized and called names.
239. Marry your own kind.
240. My parents/relatives felt “fearful” of my marrying out of my race.
241. A White woman who engages in sex with Negroes should be considered no longer to be a part of the White Race.
242. Once you go Black you never go back.
243. Black families are less resistant to intermarriage than Whites.
244. I have been rejected by some in-laws [due to marrying another race].
245. My family disowned me because I married outside my race.
246. Generally, from a White person’s point of view, marrying a Black person is marrying down.
247. Generally, from a Black person’s point of view, marrying a White person, is marrying up.
248. Discrimination on the basis of skin color persists.
249. Revenge; to control what one has been denied.
250. Rebelling against parents.
251. Self-loathing, a wish for punishment.
252. People who marry outside their racial group marry for the same reasons people who marry inside their racial group.
Black person, married to a White person, is a sign of disloyalty to the Black race.

Black women think White women are out to steal their men.

My spouse’s family accepts my marriage better than my own family.

Some people do not consider the partner’s family to be family.

Families of color are less threatened than White families by mergers with other-race families.

One side of our family rejects us while the other side accepts us.

Neither side accepts us.

Both sides accept us.

We remain geographically distant as a way of maintaining the best family relations possible.

Interracial couples are usually asked their intentions about having children much earlier in a relationship than are other couples.

When my family found out I wanted to marry someone of another race, they cut me off.

Whites have more privileges merely by virtue of the color of their skin.

A Black person’s race does not confer on them the same advantages as a White person.

Whites do not realize all the privileges they have merely due to the color of their skin.

I used to think never in a million years would I marry someone from another race.

The fact that he/she is Black [or White] did not have that much affect on my family.

Society does discriminate against interracial couples, particularly black-White couples.

Some have tried to discourage us to have children.

We still live one day at a time, handling the prejudice we face as it comes.

I was hostile and mistrustful of black people who dated outside their race . . . especially men.

No child of mine if going to date a White person.

You have no respect for your race if you choose to date outside of it.

My parents did not want anything to do with my spouse.

We had to be careful where we wanted to live due to racial discrimination.

Social, we seek out other interracial couples with whom we can relate.

Generally, I had a hard time adjusting to the various forms of racism that has happened to us.

White people have more privileges due to their skin color.

My partner is aware that I am treated differently due to my skin color.

I became acutely aware of how racism is real when I married my spouse.

My partner’s family does not fully accept me.

I was told, by my family, I was a disgrace having a relationship outside my race.

I lost some friends because I was marrying someone outside my race.
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285. Having children brought my parents closer together to us.
286. Black women are accused of abandoning their black brothers when they date White men.
287. Verbal abuse against interracial couples is common.
288. It is common for interracial couples to receive disapproving stares from strangers.
289. We have been turned away at restaurants because we were an interracial couple.
290. Interracial couples have received poor service at restaurant or stores.
291. White women seem most supportive.
292. White men seem most opposed to interracial unions.
293. People of the same gender and race as themselves seemed most supportive.
294. Opposite genders and race seems most opposed to that person’s interracial union.
295. Marriages between Black men and White women are more frequent than Black women and White men.
296. Mothers of daughters were more supportive of the relationship than mothers of sons.
297. Fathers of sons were more supportive than fathers of daughters.
298. Many couples did not receive social support from parents.
299. Interracial couples meet more often at work than at school.
300. Sometimes we have been treated with less respect than other people.
301. I have been on the receiving end of angry comments.
302. When we took a trip we have experienced racial profiling.
303. I have felt forms of discrimination in my workplace because of my marriage.
304. Discrimination either verbally or body language can be very subtle.
305. Sometimes we have to take precautions when traveling such as where we stop for gas, to use restrooms or to eat.
306. Mommy’s parents were upset at first when she married a black man.
307. Marrying a black man had given us complications she hadn’t anticipated.
308. As a black person at Harvard, the lighter you were, the blacker you had to act. I was trying to take away a smart, good-looking black man and, being light-skinned, I wasn’t ‘allowed’ to do that.
309. Family tried to break up relationship and it eventually worked.
310. Black women are not to be trusted and were bossy and aggressive.
311. Marrying someone your own race makes life easier.
312. Stares, glares, rolled eyes from others.
313. Whispers or comments: “Jungle fever” as some people walk by.
314. Also “Why is she with him.”
315. Gall people feel when they see us together, agitation, disgust.
316. People are angry at the site of a B/W couple.
317. Needed to be on “constant alert” on a day to day basis.
318. Some Black women feel marrying a White woman is pathological. Unnatural.
319. Traitors to your own race.
Parents accepted us, but others: What about the children?

Keep with your own kind.

The White wife felt intimidation from Black women.

Choose our friends carefully.

Stay away from places where we feel uncomfortable.

We have more Black friends than White.

Don’t even think about marrying a White girl.

You can have them as friends, but don’t marry them.

Marry outside the race weakens the culture and economic resources.

I don’t care what anybody says, White people feel superior to former slaves.

Black women present the strongest opposition to interracial dating and marriage.

Can’t trust White people.

Whites just don’t understand Blacks.

There is a lot of White racism. (against irms)

Those who date interracially are traitors.

If you date out of your race you are a “sell out.”

You are betraying your family and community.

It’s about sex.

It’s about money.

It’s about status.

You think their race is better than your own.

I was afraid of what my family would say if they knew I was dating a White guy.

Not accepted into social activities that is not my race.

White wife stated: Black women have insulted me.

Marrying “one of them.”

A person in an interracial marriage is a “sellout” or “traitor” to their race.

Stares.

Interracial relationships are about being rebellious.

Most interracial couples are comprised of a White woman and a minority man.

Interracial couples will not be welcomed anyway.

Only desperate people chose interracial relationships.

Interracial relationships are driven by sexual curiosity – “jungle fever.”

Members of interracial couples do not have a problem with racism.

Interracial children will suffer.

Race does not matter in a interracial relationship.

A person in an interracial marriage is a sellout to their own race,

It is true that we have to endure the stares that most interracial couples face.

Beyond the stares and bigoted comment or two.

There are churches that are still not welcoming to such couples.

Partners in interracial marriages do experience more resistance than those in same-race marriages.

Human beings’ insistence on sticking with one’s ‘own kind’.

Stares.
When we were in the company of other black people, she would sometimes stand a little farther away from me and not give the impression that we were an item.

It completely broke their (grandparents) hearts when I told them I was marrying a black person.

My dad and step mom came to the wedding . . . . my mother and grandparents did not come . . . and I was disowned as a family member . . . . my children would never be claimed as family.

I was disobedient to God . . . for disobeying the commandment Honor they father and mother.

Sellout.

What about the children?

Some people tell me that marriage is hard enough already, so why would I want to make it more difficult than it already is?

My parents asked me, “Why not find a good mate with one of your ‘own’ people?”

Other evangelicals suggest that you are violating the commandment of honoring your father and mother.

They were told they could not marry at their church (in 1994) because the church was not ready for it.

David said he had “death threat” letters and family reunion “denials.”

My mother meant that people who came from different races, religions, etc., were not “our kind of people.”

I know your son is marrying someone of a different race, “how are you handling the situation?”

As parents, we were confused “What had we as parent done wrong?” on skin color.

The younger generation is not nearly as color-conscious as their parents.

You should have married your own race.

Interracial couples frequently . . . had to deal with racism, discrimination, and prejudice within their own families.

Horrifying [family rejection] to me.

She was “ostracized at work (because of Black boyfriend).”

Two people have experienced hurtful situations at work (by being in an irr).

Stares were from upper class people.

We can’t go South because it’s not going to go well down there.

I’m always in a protection mode. In today’s climate I’m concerned with racist mentality.

We were refused service in a restaurant.

I don’t want to go out and do anything in public anymore. I’d rather be safe at home and just sit.

Couples felt socially isolated in various aspects of daily life: work, family and leisure. Primary cause was due to racism.
Couples had limited social networks due to perceived negative social reactions. Some couples feared being ostracized at work if people knew they were in an interracial relationship. Racism affected how they perceived and selected activities in their social lives. A recurring theme among these couples was being very ‘careful’ where they go for leisure experiences. They had constant concern for safety and comfort and do research before traveling. Overall, racism was an important leisure constraint. Some couples experienced more racism from families than from work or from social life. Many Whites became more aware of discrimination and the privileges they had as White. Whites, especially, consider an interracial relationship involving a black person to be much less acceptable than one involving a Latino or Asian person. Whites and blacks respond to me differently than before [than when I was single and White]. Usually for a White person they don’t think about race and I think that being in an interracial relationship and marriage that I have become more aware of my Whiteness. I’m sensitive to the fact that I’m a Caucasian male. I did think about it [race] more like what will everyone say. There were these black girls behind us and they were insulting to me and I got angry. A Black woman was afraid of what people would say, especially her family and friends. She (White) had no idea that being in an interracial relationship would be a problem for others. Some of the Whites had their eyes opened to the issues of race and racism that they would not have previously have seen if they were in a same-race relationship. I don’t notice what others may think or say . . . if they stare like there is a problem . . . but we never really encountered negative views. So I don’t notice [people looking], not really as much as I did before, and I think it’s because I’m not looking as much. I’m just so happy. Felt that every where they went that African American and Caucasian look at them differently. I still know if I bring you [White husband] there, there’s a certain percentage of black women that are going to give you and me dirty looks. There are certain places they do not go to together. There are distinctions between private and public lives. For example in private life, race is not a factor; but with family and friends, they feel their ‘racial differences’ are central. Because after we met I became real aware of inequality, racially and just in
Opposition occurred in predominantly black and predominantly White social environments. He (bm) would say: “Maybe we should not go,” like to an all black social gathering.

There is a significant amount of opposition. It’s just not a problem anymore . . . it’s just more acceptable these days. Others often refuse to acknowledge that the two are a couple. The stares they receive all the time in restaurants, and waitresses being nasty. African American and Caucasian looking at them on the subway; staring at them.

A White woman became disgusted. A Black male taunted them while they ate at an outdoor restaurant. They are continually being treated differently whey they go out in public. It doesn’t matter if we’re at the car wash, the market, the club, somebody is going to look or make a comment under their breath.

You are dirty as the ground, dirty as the street . . . you two do not belong together, it isn’t right (a White woman to a b/w couple). Upper-middle-class predominantly White neighbors often are non accepting of interracial couples; face less opposition renting an apartment in a lower-income black neighborhood.

A White male was almost in a physical altercation at the post office where he worked with another employee who made derogatory racial comments, specifically about black women.

Co workers making derogatory remarks. She (Lisa) expressed some doubt about what the coworkers really say about her and Vince (husband).

They [couples] did not socialize with or engage in conversations or situations where the race of their partner or children would be revealed.

In the workplace, interracial couples “can encounter overt or subtle difficulties . . . opposition, or the idea that being involved interracially is not the expected norm, is often implied but not directly expressed.”

Interracial couples experience more “opposition when they happen to one’s own family or neighborhood . . . ”

I lost every friend I had at the time. Socially, many couples avoided all White social circles and would go where there were more diverse couples.

Many Whites do not accept interracial relationships. We have “unconditional acceptance” in our place of worship. They or people they knew had encountered opposition in predominantly White churches from either religious officials or church members.

The minister said that he would not marry them claiming biblical justification for the refusal.

Some couples felt more accepted in a Unitarian Universalist congregation (or
predominantly black Baptist or Episcopalian churches) rather than a predominantly White Catholic or Christian church.

436. A lack of acceptance at predominantly White churches prompted them to seek out the UUA churches.

437. White respondents’ views that black-White relationships were not likely or acceptable in their social circles.

438. Interracial couples cite police harassment, getting pulled over a disproportionate number of times when together.

439. They [b/w couple] clearly interpreted the police’s response as based on the idea that they did not belong together, especially not in that neighborhood.

440. Couples discussed how others were concerned about (1) how society would respond, (2) the couples’ children, and (3) the general ‘difficulty’ of being with someone of a different race.

441. Interracial relationships are not expected or preferred.

442. African American women, in interracial love relationships, face the stigma of being accused of being race traitors and whores.

443. Whereas African American men engaged in similar relationships can find their status as men raised.

444. To engage in an intimate relationship with a White person means that one is selling out to White society and in the process has sold out the black community.

445. Blacks who cross the color line are often accused of sacrificing their blackness for a White ideal.

446. We have had a lot of problems especially with black girls, some he knows but most just strangers who stare, or say something nasty to him and me.

447. Black women I heard all the time, saying to him real loud, ‘What are you doing with that or what’s wrong with your own color, what’s wrong with your own kind.’

448. Another White wife: “I’ve had [black] women be blatantly pissed off . . . they have to put their anger somewhere so they put it toward the White woman.”

449. One couple described “White individuals and communities as supportive, identified black women as the only ones who ever gave them problems.”

450. One black man described Whites as relatively supportive but black women as opposing, “They will definitely shut you off because you are with a White woman, because they think you betrayed them . . .”

451. One White wife wrote: “I would think not all black women have opposition to it, but there are some black women who do . . .”

452. Intermarriage is understood as a rejection of blackness and an internalization of the dominant belief held by Whites that blacks are inferior.”

453. My friends have objected to my interracial relationship.

454. We definitely feel more comfortable in a black community.

455. Our social circles are predominantly Black.

456. We’ve experienced places not renting to us because we were an interracial couple.
Black churches, like black neighborhoods, were also viewed as relatively more accepting than White counterparts.

According to most couples, black communities and black families, are still more accepting of interracial unions than Whites.

The couples stated that blacks are most vocal about their opposition but that Whites have a problem but are afraid to express it because of fear of blacks in general.

It might be expected that the family is the source of the greatest hostility toward interracial relationships?

My parents would just worry and wouldn’t want me to make my life harder than it had to be.

It’s just not fair to the children.

One African American male stated that her White parents believed that blacks were inferior and he was not good enough for their daughter.

Family responses were of opposition and often expressed in more subtle ways.

Many in my family didn’t acknowledge our wedding or come to it, and we aren’t invited to certain family functions.

Certain family members did not allow their black partner in their house.

White families chose to marginalize the White member of their family rather than accept a black individual into their primary group.

My grandmother was completely against it. She said it’s just like slavery. He must be using you . . . My parents didn’t really care, not like a big issue, but just a little shocked.

Don’t I like my own people?

Intermarriage is seen as a sign that black individuals feel their own race is inferior.

There is just more in common with your own race.

The black male partner stated his family was supportive but his White wife disagreed.

Some black partners stated that their families’ expressed opposition to their relationships came as a surprise.

Only two people in my family acknowledged his presence. My father and younger brother.

White family members would not include the Black family member in their conversations.

I stopped going home.

I was raised not to judge people but they were upset I wanted to marry a White person.

Black families view interracial relationship as a loss in many ways.

My family was totally against us getting married. They did not fly in for the wedding, they just thought blacks should be with blacks and Whites should be with Whites.

My mother worried about what problems we would have to deal with.
“Lee’s [African American male] assertion that his family is accepting of the relationship is in contrast to Jill’s [White wife] perceptions (including his mother) prefers same-race unions, reflecting an ambivalence about interracial unions.”

It’s not fair to the children.

Are you going to raise them black?

Many of the White families had difficulty accepting the black partner.

White parent to adult child: “I just worry about the problems you will face in society.”

She would not want to face it as a racial incident.

She has her own way of thinking and a lot of things she is ignorant to.

We view things a lot differently.

Mira (White wife): “. . . race wasn’t a factor, this is where Dennis perceives situations as they are and I don’t . . . I don’t want to think that other people are viewing us that way.”

Her aunt and uncle saw I was black and they walked out of the ceremony.

We won’t go too far off the interstate. Danger is danger, and I’d feel safer every time at the back of the McDonald’s than at a rest area.

We may sit on separate sides, and we don’t look like we’re together (in reference to riding public transportation at night – they protect each other that way).

I lost the respect of my co-workers because they thought I had sold out.

I think it was about being pregnant and having a conflict with a particular person (rather than seeing it as racial).

And they started calling me the White man’s woman.

But I don’t think your opportunities were hindered by that (racism).

I didn’t know that it had anything to do with any ethnic concerns. I thought that you couldn’t stand them.

That’s part of it (he is White) I had a good reading of how they would react.

Someone urged me not to go through with my wedding saying I was making a mistake.

My partner is more hypersensitive to racial situations than I am.

I think some situations are racial, but my partner does not.

He does not realize some situations are racial.

Whites have more privileges in public.

When out in public, I feel I need to be vigilant of possible racist incidents.

My spouse thinks I suspect that most negative experiences were all racially based.

Neighbors complained to the landlord so the landlord paid them to move.

Stares, need to be cautious in public.

They had to pick and choose where they go to prevent harassment or potential harassment.

There is some hostility but not all the time when we are out together.

More hostility from Black women but not White women when out together.
196

511. Tracy’s church refused her to have her wedding there.
512. Sean (Tracy’s husband) feels she cannot understand “bigotry” because she is White.
513. I sometimes feel reluctant telling my spouse about racial problems I have encountered.
514. Still treated “shabbily” in her neighborhood.
515. Slurs, “nigger,”
516. Treated unfair at work “particularly from Whites.”
517. Felt alienated and isolated from peers because of interracial racial relationship.
518. “Nigger lover.”
519. Parents later supported her.
520. Stares and glares.
521. He sensed coworkers did not approve of his interracial marriage.
522. While driving, a White man tried to run them off the road.
523. Both of their churches did not want them after they were married and told not to participate in activities together in church.
524. Their son was called “Oreo.”
525. Neal felt that most Whites have a problem with Interracial married couples.
526. “Stay in your race so you can have children that look like you.”
527. Initial rejection by both families.
528. They are accepted by “most” family members.
529. Not being served at a restaurant.
530. Stares.
531. Avoid going certain places – safety.
532. Isolation and rejection from family and some friends.
APPENDIX F

PEER REVIEW LETTER (70 STATEMENTS)
Hi everyone. I could use your help with my dissertation. If you have the time, I would appreciate it so much. If some of you could finish by this Sunday and give it to me at our meeting – that would be great. Others, could you e-mail it to me at: Research46@aol.com within the next 10 days or so.

My dissertation is entitled: Experiences of Prejudice among Individuals in African American and Caucasian Interracial Marriages – a Q-methodological Study. The participants in the study will be ranking statements about prejudice on a scale from:

-4 -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3 +4

At present, I am looking for three things:

♦ That any individual in the study will be able to answer the statement (male, female, Black, White).

♦ If you think a statement is not worded properly, or not concise or clear enough, please comment.

♦ Finally, add any statements of experiences of prejudice that you think I may have missed.

Statements that are similar in content will be combined and/or eliminated later.
Family/children

1. One or both of my parents were worried we might have a mixed-race child.
   (Example: This statement is worded so that any one can answer it. A participant in the study may feel he did not experience this and may rank it in the **Most disagree** area on the scale.)

2. One or both of my parents said they would disown me if I had a mixed-race child.
   (Example: This statement is worded ok. A participant may have experienced this and would rank it in the positive end of the scale under **Most agree** area on the scale.)

3. One or both of my parents thought having a mixed-race child would cause the child to suffer.

4. Some friends and relatives have tried to discourage us from having children.

5. After getting married, I feel we were asked too many times if we intended to have children.

6. One or both of my parents refused to come to my wedding.

7. I had some relatives that refused to come to my wedding.

8. I had some friends that refused to come to my wedding.

9. My grandparents refused to come to my wedding.

10. One or both of my parents disowned me because I married outside my race.

11. Up to the present time, my parent(s) still does not want anything to do with my spouse.

12. My side of the family still does not approve of my interracial marriage.

13. My spouse’s family still does not accept me.
14. I was really distressed about my family’s negative reaction to our marriage.

15. I feel I’ve had to deal with racism, discrimination and prejudice more so from my own family than from my spouse’s family.

16. I feel I’ve had to deal with racism, discrimination, and prejudice more so from our families than from work or the public in general.

17. My family accepts my interracial marriage more so than my spouse’s family accepts us.

18. My side of the family rejected us while my spouse’s family accepted us.

19. Neither side of our families accepted us.

20. At first my family did not accept my spouse, but now they do.

21. Some of my family members still do not accept my interracial marriage.

**Work**

22. I have been ostracized at work because of my spouse’s race.

23. I don’t let people know at work I am married to someone from another race because I know it will cause problems.

24. I am afraid I may lose my job if my boss and/or coworkers find out I am in an interracial marriage.

**Social – African American and Caucasian**

25. Since being married interracially, I’ve felt more support from the Black community and less support from the White community.

26. Since being married interracially, I’ve felt more support from the White community and less support from the Black community.
27. I feel we have more Black friends than White friends.

28. I feel we have more White friends than Black friends.

29. Since being in an interracial marriage, I have felt more disapproval or resentment from African American males.

30. Since being in an interracial marriage, I have felt more disapproval or resentment from Caucasian males.

31. Since being in an interracial marriage, I have felt more disapproval or resentment from African American females.

32. Since being in an interracial marriage, I have felt more disapproval or resentment from Caucasian females.

33. I have seen African American females intimidate my spouse.

34. I have seen Caucasian females intimidate my spouse.

35. I have seen African American males intimidate my spouse.

36. I have seen Caucasian males intimidate my spouse.

Social – Religion

37. My church no longer welcomed me after I married interracially.

38. My church accepts us as an interracial couple.

39. I had to find another church to join that would accept interracial couples.

Social – General

40. I have not told some people I am in an interracial marriage due to fear of rejection.

41. When out in public with my spouse, people make derogatory comments to us indicating they do not like interracial couples.
42. When we are out in public together people stare at us a lot.

43. I notice that I am not accepted into some social activities because of my race.

44. I feel we have to choose our friends carefully because not everyone accepts us.

45. I really do not feel comfortable in most social activities that do not include people of my race.

46. I have experienced poor service at restaurants when I am with my spouse.

47. I have received poor service at retail stores when I am with my spouse.

48. I feel in our everyday interactions, we are reminded by Blacks, Whites, relatives, and non-relatives of the inappropriate nature of our association.

   **Social – Safety**

49. I feel racism limits some of our leisure activities of where we want to go and what we want to do.

50. Sometimes I feel we have to take precautions when traveling such as where we stop for gas, restrooms or to eat because of racism against interracial couples.

51. At times I have felt that I don’t want to go out in public, I’d rather be safe at home.

52. I feel there are some places we need to stay away from because we are an interracial couple.

53. I have to think where it is psychologically and physically safe for us to go.

54. I’m always in a protection mode . . . in today’s climate I’m concerned with racist mentality.

55. I have experienced racial profiling when out with my spouse.

56. I felt we had to be careful where we wanted to live due to racial discrimination.
57. Some places would not rent or sell to us because we are an interracial couple.
58. Generally, I had a hard time adjusting to the various forms of racism that has happened to us as a couple.
59. I feel where we live now is a safe neighborhood for us.

   Social – Selling out

60. Because I married someone from another race, I’ve been told I have been a “traitor” to my race or that I have “sold out.”
61. My parents told me that Whites stay with Whites and Blacks stay with Blacks.
62. My family told me I should marry one of my “own” people.
63. Some of my friends thought it was wrong for me to marry someone from another race.

   Social - Skin Color

64. I feel that my spouse is treated positively due to his/her skin color, but I am not.
65. I feel that my spouse is treated negatively due to his/her skin color, but I am not.
66. I was not welcome in my spouse’s family because of my skin color.
67. My spouse is aware that I am treated differently due to my skin color.

   Social White Privilege Awareness

68. I really wasn’t aware how badly racism existed until I dated and married someone from another race.
69. As a couple, I feel I am more aware of racism against us than my spouse is.
70. My spouse thinks I am too sensitive and people are not all racists.
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PEER REVIEW RESULTS (42 STATEMENTS)
Peer Review Results (42 statements)

1. My parents do not want to have anything to do with me because I married interracially.
2. My spouse’s parents still have not accepted me.
3. Some of my relatives only pretend to accept my interracial marriage.
4. My spouse and I have had to deal with prejudice from one or both of our families more so than from work and the public in general.
5. At first, some of my family members did not accept my spouse, but now they do.
6. I have been told by some of my relatives that it is not good to bring a mixed race child into this world.
7. We have been asked more frequently than same-race couples if we intended to have children.
8. There are times I have been treated badly at work because of my spouse’s race.
9. I don’t let people at work know I am married to someone from another race because it will cause problems with coworkers.
10. I am afraid I may lose my job if my boss finds out I am in an interracial marriage.
11. Some of my friends still think it is wrong for me to be in an interracial marriage.
12. Some of my friends don’t think it is good for us to have children.
13. I do not hear from some old friends anymore because I married interracially.
14. I’ve been told I have been a “traitor” to my race or that I have “sold out.”
15. We have more Black friends than White friends.
16. We have more White friends than Black friends.
17. We have to choose our friends carefully because not everyone accepts interracial couples.

18. I have felt more disapproval from African American males than from anyone else because of my interracial marriage.

19. It seems like African American females have shown the most disapproval to our marriage.

20. Since being in an interracial marriage, I have felt more disapproval from Caucasian males than from anyone else.

21. Caucasian females seem to show the most disapproval to our relationship.

22. Our church accepts us as an interracial couple.

23. Since being married interracially, I have experienced discrimination from some church members.

24. We have had a hard time finding a church that will accept us.

25. At times I have not told people I am in an interracial marriage due to fear of rejection.

26. When we are out in public together, people have called us names or have made derogatory comments.

27. People stare at us a lot when we are out in public together.

28. We have received poor service at restaurants because we are an interracial couple.

29. It seems like sales people ignore us a lot or treat us poorly when we go shopping.

30. It seems like the lighter the skin color, the better the person is treated.

31. When traveling, we have to carefully plan and take precautions (e.g., getting gas, where we eat) because we are an interracial couple.
32. There are times when I haven’t wanted to go out in public with my spouse because of how we will be treated.

33. When we are out together, I feel I have to be in a protection mode because of racism.

34. I feel we have experienced racial profiling by the police because they did not like seeing an African American and Caucasian couple together.

35. There are places in our city where we cannot go together because it would be too dangerous for us.

36. Our neighborhood is a safe place for us to live.

37. There were places that would not rent or sell to us because we are an interracial couple.

38. As an interracial couple we are accepted in our neighborhood.

39. I have become more aware of how badly racism is since I married interracially.

40. I am more aware of racism against us than my spouse is.

41. My spouse thinks I am too sensitive and people are not all racists.

42. I still have a hard time adjusting to the various forms of racism that has happened to us because we are an interracial couple.
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PILOT STUDY, PHASE I

(33 STATEMENTS)
Pilot Study, Phase I (33 Statements)

1. My parents do not want to have anything to do with me because I am married interracially.
2. My spouse’s parents do not want to have anything to do with me because I married interracially.
3. Some of my relatives only pretend to accept my interracial marriage.
4. Some of my spouse’s relatives only pretend to accept me.
5. My spouse and I have had to deal with prejudice from one or both of our families more so than from work and the public in general.
6. I have been told that it is not good to bring a mixed-race child into this world.
7. I was/am often asked about my intentions to have children.
8. I have been treated badly at work because of my spouse’s race.
9. I do not let people at work know I am married to someone of another race.
10. I am afraid I may lose my job if my boss finds out I am in an interracial marriage.
11. Some of my friends think it is wrong for me to be in an interracial marriage.
12. I have lost friends because I married interracially.
13. I have been told I am a “traitor” to my race or have “sold out.”
14. I have more Black friends than White friends.
15. I have more White friends than Black friends.
16. I have to choose friends carefully because not everyone accepts interracial couples.
17. Black males disapprove of our relationship.
18. White males disapprove of our relationship.

20. White females disapprove of our relationship.

21. I have experienced discrimination from some church members.

22. I have had a hard time finding a church that is accepting.

23. I have not told people I am in an interracial marriage due to fear of rejection.

24. When I am with my spouse in public, people have called us names or have made derogatory comments.

25. People stare at us a lot when we’re out in public together.

26. We have received poor service at restaurants because we are an interracial couple.

27. Sales people ignore us or treat us poorly when we go shopping.

28. Our social activities are limited because we are an interracial couple.

29. In public, I have to be careful and take precautions because we are an interracial couple.

30. I have experienced racial profiling.

31. There are places in our city where we cannot go.

32. We have had difficulty finding a place to live.

33. I have become more aware of racism since I have been married.
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LETTER OF CONSENT

PHASE I AND PHASE II
Letter of Consent, Phase I

Experiences of Prejudice among Individuals in African American and Caucasian Interracial Marriages, Phase I
Consent Form

I am conducting research on Experiences of prejudice among individuals in African American and Caucasian interracial marriages. Specifically, I am interested in learning about the experiences of prejudice that spouses in these marriages have based on being a member of an interracial marriage. I am inviting you to participate in this project. If you decide to participate, you will be asked to provide me with information about you, such as age, education, gender, and so forth, and sign two brief consent statements. Then you will be asked to complete what is referred to as a Q sort, which entails sorting 33 statements regarding various experiences of prejudice. You will complete your Q sort in a separate room from your spouse. The Q sort statements are sorted on a continuum of +4 to -4, with +4 representing statements that are most agree and -4 representing statements that are most disagree with prejudice. This sorting will take approximately 30-45 minutes. The results of your sortings will be kept at a secure location, in a locked drawer, at all times at Kent State University, in room 310 of White Hall. Your Q sort will have a code number so that the information cannot be linked to your actual name. Only the researcher will know your identity.

I would also like to conduct a brief audiotape interview with you, after you have sorted all the cards. Your interview will be conducted separately from your spouse. This interview will help me understand your reasons for sorting the cards as you did. This interview should take approximately 10-15 minutes. Your identity will be protected by having a code number on the audio tapes and not your name. You have the right to hear the audiotapes before they are used in this study. Also, when this project is over, you will have the choice to keep the tapes yourself, or have the tapes destroyed (by you or the researcher).

If you take part in this project, you will be helping to develop the final set of statements for 20 African American and Caucasian married couples. The ultimate goal of this study is to inform other researchers and those working in a multicultural atmosphere, such as marriage or couples counseling, become more sensitive to and aware of experiences of prejudice among interracially married couples. This knowledge may help improve counseling techniques. Taking part in this project is entirely up to you, and no one will hold it against you if you decide not to do it. If you take part, you may stop at any time without incurring any penalty.

If you want to know more about this research project, you may contact my faculty advisors Cynthia Osborn, Ph.D., at (330) 672-2662, or Jason McGlothlin, Ph.D., at (330) 672-0716. In addition, if you feel you may be interested in counseling services they are
available at the Counseling and Human Development Center, 325 White Hall, Kent State University.

The project has been approved by Kent State University. If you have questions about Kent State University’s rules for research, please call Daniele Finotello, Ph.D., Professor and Acting Dean of Graduate Studies (330-672-3012).

You will receive a copy of this consent form.

Sincerely,

Patricia A. Schafer, MA, LPCC-S
Doctoral Candidate in Counseling and Human Development Services

I agree to take part in this project under the conditions stated above, including audiotaping. I know what I will have to do and that I can stop at any time without any penalty incurred. I understand that my identity and any identifying information from this study will be kept confidential within the limits of the law by this researcher. I will receive a copy of this letter and this signature page.

____________________________________________________________________
Signature        Date
Letter of Consent, Phase II

Experiences of Prejudice among Individuals in African American and Caucasian Interracial Marriages, Phase II

Consent Form

I am conducting research on Experiences of prejudice among individuals in African American and Caucasian interracial marriages. Specifically, I am interested in learning the perceptions of prejudice that spouses in these marriages have based on being a member of an interracial marriage. I am inviting you to participate in this project. If you decide to participate, you will be asked to provide me with information about you, such as age, education, gender, and so forth, and sign two brief consent statements. Then you will be asked to complete what is referred to as a Q sort, which entails sorting 33 statements regarding various experiences of prejudice. You will complete your Q sort in a separate room from your spouse. The Q sort statements are sorted on a continuum of +4 to -4, with +4 representing statements that are most agree and -4 representing statements that are most disagree with prejudice. This sorting will take approximately 30-45 minutes. The results of your sortings will be kept at a secure location, in a locked drawer, at all times at Kent State University, in room 310 of White Hall. Your Q sort will have a code number so that the information cannot be linked to your actual name. Only the researcher will know your identity.

I would also like to conduct a brief audiotape interview with you, after you have sorted all the cards. Your interview is completed separately from your spouse. This interview will help me understand your reasons for sorting the cards as you did. This interview should take approximately 10-15 minutes. Your identity will be protected by having a code number on the audio tapes and not your name. You have the right to hear the audiotapes before they are used in this study. Also, when this project is over, you will have the choice to keep the tapes yourself, or have the tapes destroyed (by you or the researcher).

If you take part in this project you will be helping other researchers and those working in a multicultural atmosphere, such as marriage or couples counseling, become more sensitive to and aware of perceptions of prejudice. Understanding and clarifying possible different perceptions of prejudice may be due to different worldviews held by each member in the marriage. This knowledge may help improve counseling techniques. Taking part in this project is entirely up to you, and no one will hold it against you if you decide not to do it. If you take part, you may stop at any time without incurring any penalty.

If you want to know more about this research project, you may contact my faculty advisors Cynthia Osborn, Ph.D., at (330) 672-2662, or Jason McGlothlin, Ph.D., at (330) 672-0716. In addition, if you feel you may be interested in counseling services they are
available at the Counseling and Human Development Center, 325 White Hall, Kent State University.

The project has been approved by Kent State University. If you have questions about Kent State University’s rules for research, please call Daniele Finotello, Ph.D., Professor and Acting Dean of Graduate Studies (330-672-3012).

You will receive a copy of this consent form.

Sincerely,

Patricia A. Schafer, MA., LPCC-S
Doctoral Candidate in Counseling and Human Development Services

I agree to take part in this project under the conditions stated above, including audiotaping. I know what I will have to do and that I can stop at any time without any penalty incurred. I understand that my identity and any identifying information from this study will be kept confidential within the limits of the law by this researcher. I will receive a copy of this letter and this signature page.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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AUDIO TAPE CONSENT FORM

PHASE I AND PHASE II
AUDIO TAPE CONSENT FORM

(Phase I and Phase II)

I agree to audiotaping immediately after the Q sort is completed.

_____ yes  _____ no

I have been told that I have the right to hear the audiotapes before they are used.

_____ I want to hear the tapes    _____ I do not want to hear the tapes

When the research project is complete:

I prefer to have the tapes returned to me    _____ yes  _____ no

I prefer to have Patricia A. Schafer destroy the tapes  _____ yes  _____ no

The tapes may be used by Patricia A. Schafer and other researchers approved by Kent State University for this research project only

_____ yes  _____ no

_________________________________________________________________________

Signature          Date
APPENDIX K

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION FORM

PHASE I AND PHASE II
PARTICIPANT INFORMATION FORM

Code ________________

Today’s Date ________________

Participant Name ____________________________________________________

1) Gender _____M      _____F

2) Age ______

3) Years married to current spouse ______

4) Ethnicity

______ African American

______ Caucasian

5) Religious Affiliation ______________

6) Currently employed   Yes    No

If yes, what is your position or title? ______________________________

If no, brief history of previous positions.

____________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________

7) Approximate combined family income (gross) $____________

8) Highest level of education_______________________________
9) Your perceptions of the racial/ethnic composition of your current neighborhood
   as:  _____ Mostly Black
        _____ Mostly White
        _____ Mixed, African American and Caucasian, and/or other

10) Your perceptions of the racial/ethnic composition of the neighborhood in which
    you grew up.
    _____ Mostly Black
    _____ Mostly White
    _____ Mixed, Black, White, and/or other
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CONDITIONS OF INSTRUCTIONS

PHASE I AND PHASE II
Conditions of Instruction – Pilot Study, Phase I

I would like to know your opinions about experiences of prejudice you have encountered since being in an interracial marriage. In order to help me understand your opinions about these experiences, I will first ask you to read all the statement cards to become familiar with them.

Next, reread the statement cards, and as you read each one you will be making three piles. The left pile is for statements you feel you disagree with, the right pile is for statements you feel you agree with experiences, and the middle pile is for statements you feel neutral or ambivalent about. Please begin reading each statement card and place it in one of the three piles based on your first impressions.

Now that you have the three piles, you will do a final reading and place each statement on the continuum grid given to you. You will be working back and forth on the grid, changing things when you want to. In order to begin, take the right pile of most like your experiences, and choose statements to place under the +4 marker on the grid. Next, go to your left pile of least like your experiences, and choose statements to place under the -4 marker on the grid. The vertical order in which you place the statements under the markers does not matter.

Turning back to the right side pile, select statements from the most like your experiences and place those under the +3 marker area; then go to the left side pile and select statements from the most disagrees and place those under the -3 marker. Continue working back and forth towards the middle neutral area, until you have placed all statement cards on the grid. You are free to change your mind during the sorting at any
time. Also, please feel free to consult with me if you have any questions. Let me know when you are done and satisfied with your Q sort.

When you are done, do NOT remove statements from the grid. They need to be recorded onto the smaller grid score sheet provided. Notice each statement card has a number written on the back of it. Please write that number onto the score sheet by matching how you placed your statements on the larger grid. Please ask me any questions at any time.

When you are finished, we will begin the audiotape interview. I will be asking you a total of five questions. The first three are in reference to the Q sorting process.

1. What prompted you to place the statements you did under the -4 column?
2. What prompted you to place the statements you did under the +4 column?
3. What prompted you to place the statements you did in the neutral (central) column?

The last two questions refer to your opinion about the Q set in general:

1. Do you think any major issues have been missed?
2. What would you do differently?
Conditions of Instruction – Phase II

I would like to know your opinions about experiences of prejudice you have encountered since you have been married. In order to help me understand your opinions about these experiences, I will first ask you to read all the statement cards to become familiar with them.

Next, reread the statement cards, and as you read each one you will be making three piles. The left pile is for statements you feel you disagree with, the right pile is for statements you feel you agree with, and the middle pile is for statements you believe neutral or ambivalent about. Please begin reading each statement card and place it in one of the three piles based on your first impressions.

Now that you have the three piles, you will do a final reading and place each statement on the continuum grid given to you. You will be working back and forth on the grid, changing things when you want to. In order to begin, take the right pile of agree statements, and choose statements to place under the +4 marker on the grid. Next, go to your left pile of disagree statements and place those under the -4 marker on the grid. The vertical order in which you place the statements under the markers does not matter.

Turning back to the right side pile, select statements you feel you agree with and place those under the +3 marker area; then go to the left side pile and select statements from the disagree and place those under the -3 marker. Continue working back and forth towards the middle neutral area, until you have placed all statement cards on the grid. You are free to change your mind during the sorting at any time. Also, please feel free to
consult with me if you have any questions. Let me know when you are done and satisfied with your Q sort.

When you are done, do NOT remove statements from the grid. They need to be recorded onto the smaller grid score sheet provided. Notice each statement card has a number written on the back of it. Please write that number onto the score sheet by matching how you placed your statements on the larger grid. Please ask me any questions at any time.

When you are finished, we will begin the audiotape interview. I will be asking you a total of three questions. The first three are in reference to the Q sorting process.

1. What prompted you to place the statements you did under the -4 column?
2. What prompted you to place the statements you did under the +4 column?
3. What prompted you to place the statements you did in the neutral (central)
APPENDIX M

Q SORT ANSWER SHEET
Code___________

Q sort Answer Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Most agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 items</td>
<td>2 items</td>
<td>4 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 items</td>
<td>7 items</td>
<td>5 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 items</td>
<td>2 items</td>
<td>2 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 items</td>
<td>2 items</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX N

PARTICIPANT EVALUATION FORM

PHASE I ONLY
The purpose of the pilot study will be to find out if any modifications need to be made based on participants’ responses to the following nine questions. The responses to the nine questions may be written or tape-recorded.

1. Were the instructions clear for sorting the statements?
2. Were the statements in the Q set brief and concise?
3. Were the statements easy to read and understand?
4. Did each statement make sense?
5. Do any statements need reworded or eliminated?
6. Do any changes need to be made to the audio tape post-interview?
7. Can you think of any major issue(s) not incorporated into this Q set?
8. Were you comfortable with the length of time it took to complete the Q set and the post-interview?
9. Do you have any other comments or suggestions?
APPENDIX O

FLYER
KENT STATE RESEARCH PROJECT

September 2007 – December 2007

African American/Caucasian interracially married couples are needed for a study on experiences of prejudice.

Your opinions about experiences of prejudice are important.

- To qualify: Married for one year or more. Age 18 or older.
- What you will do: Rank-order 33 statement cards according to your experiences of prejudice.
- Participate in a brief audiotaped interview (5 – 10 minutes).
- Time involved: 1 hour 15 minutes

If this sounds of interest to both you and your spouse or you would like more information, please contact:

Patricia A. Schafer (Doctoral Candidate, Kent State University)

Resrch46@aol.com or

440-349-4469 (Home) 440-349-4521 (Business)

Results of this study will be used to train new therapists, improve counseling techniques, and increase therapists awareness of multicultural issues with families and couples.
APPENDIX P

CORRELATION MATRIX
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37
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39
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1A
2D
3B
4C
5A
6D
7A
8D
9B
10C
11A
12D
13B
14C
15A
16D
17A
18D
19B
20C
21A
22D
23C
24D
25A
26D
27A
28D
29A
30D
31B
32C
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34D
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Correlation Matrix Between Sorts


### Correlation Matrix Between Sorts (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>31</th>
<th>32</th>
<th>33</th>
<th>34</th>
<th>35</th>
<th>36</th>
<th>37</th>
<th>38</th>
<th>39</th>
<th>40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1A</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-30</td>
<td>-19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2D</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3B</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4C</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5A</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6D</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-29</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8D</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-23</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9B</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10C</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>11A</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12D</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>13B</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>14C</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>15A</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>-29</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>16D</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>17A</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>18D</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-33</td>
<td>-34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>19B</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>20C</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>21A</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>-23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>22D</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>23A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>24D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>25a</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>26D</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>-23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>28D</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-27</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>29A</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>30D</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>31B</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>32C</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>33A</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>34D</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-37</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>35B</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>36C</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>37A</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>38D</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>39A</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>40B</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX Q

3-FACTOR SOLUTION PURIFIED
### 3-Factor Solution Purified - Factor Loadings (With an X Indicating a Defining Sort)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q SORT</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 1A</td>
<td>0.1693</td>
<td>0.0405</td>
<td>0.7372X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 2D</td>
<td>0.1116</td>
<td>0.0667</td>
<td>0.6689X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 3B</td>
<td>0.0391</td>
<td>0.2967</td>
<td>-0.1144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 4C</td>
<td>0.3329</td>
<td>0.2272</td>
<td>0.2563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 5A</td>
<td>0.0952</td>
<td>0.2954</td>
<td>0.5399X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 6D</td>
<td>0.5688X</td>
<td>0.0499</td>
<td>0.3111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 7A</td>
<td>-0.3017</td>
<td>0.2962</td>
<td>0.2774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 8D</td>
<td>0.1474</td>
<td>0.0150</td>
<td>0.4050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 9B</td>
<td>0.7060X</td>
<td>0.0162</td>
<td>0.0750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 10C</td>
<td>0.7225X</td>
<td>0.1150</td>
<td>-0.1369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 11A</td>
<td>0.6424X</td>
<td>-0.2506</td>
<td>0.4158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 12D</td>
<td>0.7189X</td>
<td>0.0384</td>
<td>0.4152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 13B</td>
<td>0.5312</td>
<td>0.0378</td>
<td>0.6054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 14C</td>
<td>0.1741</td>
<td>-0.1620</td>
<td>0.5676X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 15A</td>
<td>0.4312</td>
<td>0.4151</td>
<td>0.2720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 16D</td>
<td>0.7323X</td>
<td>-0.0429</td>
<td>0.0829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 17A</td>
<td>0.4251</td>
<td>0.6098X</td>
<td>0.1205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 18D</td>
<td>-0.2576</td>
<td>-0.1136</td>
<td>0.2897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 19B</td>
<td>0.4265</td>
<td>-0.2057</td>
<td>0.6833X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 20C</td>
<td>0.1913</td>
<td>-0.1801</td>
<td>0.6355X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
3-Factor Solution Purified - Factor Loadings (With an X Indicating a Defining Sort)

(continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q SORT</th>
<th>Loadings 1</th>
<th>Loadings 2</th>
<th>Loadings 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21 21A</td>
<td>0.2097</td>
<td>0.0700</td>
<td>0.4652X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 22D</td>
<td>0.1314</td>
<td>0.2289</td>
<td>0.4909X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 23A</td>
<td>0.5941X</td>
<td>0.2735</td>
<td>0.4194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 24D</td>
<td>0.4762</td>
<td>-0.1416</td>
<td>0.5502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 25A</td>
<td>0.6550X</td>
<td>0.3546</td>
<td>0.1662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 26D</td>
<td>0.4603</td>
<td>-0.0319</td>
<td>0.5126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 27A</td>
<td>-0.2823</td>
<td>0.4057</td>
<td>-0.2681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 28D</td>
<td>-0.4023</td>
<td>0.5008X</td>
<td>-0.0702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 29A</td>
<td>-0.2305</td>
<td>0.5992X</td>
<td>-0.3340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 30D</td>
<td>0.0115</td>
<td>0.1797</td>
<td>0.0619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 31B</td>
<td>0.0840</td>
<td>0.5766X</td>
<td>0.1412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 32C</td>
<td>0.8292X</td>
<td>-0.0343</td>
<td>0.1368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 33A</td>
<td>0.0519</td>
<td>0.2799</td>
<td>0.5724X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 34D</td>
<td>-0.0790</td>
<td>0.5043X</td>
<td>-0.0774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 35B</td>
<td>-0.1595</td>
<td>0.0192</td>
<td>0.3125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 36C</td>
<td>0.0172</td>
<td>0.6021X</td>
<td>-0.0166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 37A</td>
<td>0.1878</td>
<td>0.6777X</td>
<td>0.1254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 38D</td>
<td>0.6943X</td>
<td>-0.0854</td>
<td>0.0965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 39A</td>
<td>-0.0217</td>
<td>-0.1281</td>
<td>0.6028X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
### 3-Factor Solution Purified - Factor Loadings (With an X Indicating a Defining Sort)

(continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q SORT</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Loadings</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40 40B</td>
<td>0.3956</td>
<td>-0.1805</td>
<td>0.4055</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| % expl. Var. | 18 | 9 | 16  |  = 43% |
| Defining Variables | 10 | 7 | 10  |  = 27 |

Note. The 40 Q sorts were coded with numbers and letters. Odd numbers were female participants, even number were male participants. The letters: A = Caucasian female; B = African American; C = Caucasian male; D = African American male. Therefore, 1A = Caucasian female, and 2D = African American male, and so forth.
APPENDIX R

4-FACTOR SOLUTION (UNPURIFIED AND PURIFIED)
### 4-Factor Solution Unpurified and Purified

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q SORT</th>
<th>Loadings</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 1A</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.7520X</td>
<td>-0.0820</td>
<td>0.1423</td>
<td>0.0939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 2D</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.7048X</td>
<td>-0.1529</td>
<td>0.0432</td>
<td>0.2477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 3B</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.0540</td>
<td>-0.0121</td>
<td>-0.0432</td>
<td>0.5191X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 4C</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2727</td>
<td>0.0808</td>
<td>0.3299</td>
<td>0.2054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 5A</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5729X</td>
<td>0.1105</td>
<td>0.0774</td>
<td>0.2872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 6D</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2814</td>
<td>0.0877</td>
<td>0.6291X</td>
<td>-0.1379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 7A</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2845</td>
<td>0.3342</td>
<td>-0.2493</td>
<td>0.0602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 8D</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.3716X</td>
<td>0.1558</td>
<td>0.2238</td>
<td>-0.2406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 9B</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1224</td>
<td>-0.3812</td>
<td>0.5787</td>
<td>0.4440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 10C</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.1265</td>
<td>-0.0803</td>
<td>0.6967X</td>
<td>0.2171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 11A</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.4063</td>
<td>-0.3545</td>
<td>0.5972X</td>
<td>-0.0607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 12D</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.4151</td>
<td>-0.1141</td>
<td>0.7055X</td>
<td>0.0879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 13B</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.6149X</td>
<td>-0.1299</td>
<td>0.5031</td>
<td>0.1172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 14C</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5341X</td>
<td>-0.0393</td>
<td>0.2167</td>
<td>-0.2904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 15A</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2413</td>
<td>0.5092</td>
<td>0.5685X</td>
<td>-0.0756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 16D</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0526</td>
<td>-0.0379</td>
<td>0.7694X</td>
<td>-0.1258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 17A</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1493</td>
<td>0.4040</td>
<td>0.4639</td>
<td>0.4080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 18D</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2338</td>
<td>0.2247</td>
<td>-0.1420</td>
<td>-0.4861X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 19B</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.6859X</td>
<td>-0.3309</td>
<td>0.3710</td>
<td>-0.0113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 20C</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.6494X</td>
<td>-0.3147</td>
<td>0.1222</td>
<td>0.0453</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
4-Factor Solution Unpurified and Purified (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q SORT</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21 21A</td>
<td>0.4559X</td>
<td>0.0728</td>
<td>0.2403</td>
<td>-0.0490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 22D</td>
<td>0.5315X</td>
<td>-0.0074</td>
<td>0.0818</td>
<td>0.3350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 23A</td>
<td>0.4164</td>
<td>0.1764</td>
<td>0.6367X</td>
<td>0.1043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 24D</td>
<td>0.5426X</td>
<td>-0.2168</td>
<td>0.4539</td>
<td>-0.0538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 25A</td>
<td>0.1901</td>
<td>0.1109</td>
<td>0.6484X</td>
<td>0.3430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 26D</td>
<td>0.4785</td>
<td>0.0439</td>
<td>0.5198</td>
<td>-0.2185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 27A</td>
<td>-0.2651</td>
<td>0.4766X</td>
<td>-0.2034</td>
<td>0.0944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 28D</td>
<td>-0.0918</td>
<td>0.7298X</td>
<td>-0.2439</td>
<td>-0.0904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 29A</td>
<td>-0.3111</td>
<td>0.5669X</td>
<td>-0.1615</td>
<td>0.2954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 30D</td>
<td>0.0819</td>
<td>0.0809</td>
<td>0.0006</td>
<td>0.1849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 31B</td>
<td>0.1364</td>
<td>0.6170X</td>
<td>0.2041</td>
<td>0.1069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 32C</td>
<td>0.1274</td>
<td>-0.1600</td>
<td>0.8178X</td>
<td>0.0369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 33A</td>
<td>0.5614X</td>
<td>0.3354</td>
<td>0.1326</td>
<td>-0.0412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 34D</td>
<td>-0.0812</td>
<td>0.5721X</td>
<td>0.0289</td>
<td>0.0869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 35B</td>
<td>0.3621</td>
<td>-0.2149</td>
<td>-0.2617</td>
<td>0.3189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 36C</td>
<td>0.0597</td>
<td>0.2311</td>
<td>-0.0408</td>
<td>0.6962X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 37A</td>
<td>0.2007</td>
<td>0.2787</td>
<td>0.1418</td>
<td>0.7236X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 38D</td>
<td>0.0702</td>
<td>-0.0963</td>
<td>0.7156X</td>
<td>-0.1138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 39A</td>
<td>0.5558X</td>
<td>0.1088</td>
<td>0.0651</td>
<td>-0.4113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 40B</td>
<td>0.3699</td>
<td>-0.0907</td>
<td>0.4314</td>
<td>-0.2675</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Shaded area denotes flagged (X) removed to purify data.

(table continues)
4-Factor Solution Unpurified and Purified (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% expl. Var.</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>= 50%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants (Before purified)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>= 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants (After purified)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>= 28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX S

5- FACTOR SOLUTION (PURIFIED)
### 5-Factor Solution Factor Loadings (With an X Indicating a Defining Sort)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QSORT</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11A</td>
<td>0.7288X</td>
<td>0.0557</td>
<td>0.1208</td>
<td>0.0643</td>
<td>0.2207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22D</td>
<td>0.6805X</td>
<td>-0.0141</td>
<td>0.0228</td>
<td>0.2084</td>
<td>0.2775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33B</td>
<td>-0.0490</td>
<td>-0.0305</td>
<td>-0.0552</td>
<td>0.5138X</td>
<td>0.0647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44C</td>
<td>0.3864</td>
<td>-0.0421</td>
<td>0.2514</td>
<td>0.2405</td>
<td>-0.3111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55A</td>
<td>0.6156X</td>
<td>0.0970</td>
<td>0.0119</td>
<td>0.2921</td>
<td>-0.0895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66D</td>
<td>0.2096</td>
<td>0.2444</td>
<td>0.6688X</td>
<td>-0.1375</td>
<td>0.2283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77A</td>
<td>0.1902</td>
<td>0.4209</td>
<td>-0.2389</td>
<td>0.0520</td>
<td>0.1077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88D</td>
<td>0.4087</td>
<td>0.1343</td>
<td>0.1856</td>
<td>-0.2183</td>
<td>-0.1895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99B</td>
<td>0.2310</td>
<td>-0.4182</td>
<td>0.5383</td>
<td>0.4442</td>
<td>0.0238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1010C</td>
<td>-0.1313</td>
<td>-0.0308</td>
<td>0.7243X</td>
<td>0.2274</td>
<td>0.1439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1111A</td>
<td>0.4019</td>
<td>-0.2022</td>
<td>0.6148</td>
<td>-0.0877</td>
<td>0.3055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1212D</td>
<td>0.4631</td>
<td>-0.0704</td>
<td>0.6794</td>
<td>0.0964</td>
<td>0.0347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1313B</td>
<td>0.6467</td>
<td>-0.0522</td>
<td>0.4701</td>
<td>0.1097</td>
<td>0.1008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1414C</td>
<td>0.5730X</td>
<td>-0.0108</td>
<td>0.1807</td>
<td>-0.2888</td>
<td>-0.0715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1515A</td>
<td>0.1787</td>
<td>0.5698</td>
<td>0.5784</td>
<td>-0.0365</td>
<td>-0.0505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1616D</td>
<td>0.1154</td>
<td>-0.0620</td>
<td>0.7569X</td>
<td>-0.0934</td>
<td>-0.1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1717A</td>
<td>0.1789</td>
<td>0.3338</td>
<td>0.4196</td>
<td>0.4552</td>
<td>-0.2133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1818D</td>
<td>0.1652</td>
<td>0.3015</td>
<td>-0.1219</td>
<td>-0.4875X</td>
<td>0.0115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919B</td>
<td>0.7189X</td>
<td>-0.2187</td>
<td>0.3443</td>
<td>-0.0402</td>
<td>0.1924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020C</td>
<td>0.6809X</td>
<td>-0.2237</td>
<td>0.0895</td>
<td>0.0113</td>
<td>0.1717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2121A</td>
<td>0.3138</td>
<td>0.3233</td>
<td>0.2982</td>
<td>-0.0831</td>
<td>0.4518</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
### 5-Factor Solution Factor Loadings (With an X Indicating a Defining Sort) (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QSORT</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Loadings</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22D</td>
<td>0.4852X</td>
<td>0.1188</td>
<td>0.0739</td>
<td>0.3076</td>
<td>0.2589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23A</td>
<td>0.4597</td>
<td>0.1707</td>
<td>0.5946</td>
<td>0.1357</td>
<td>-0.1272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24D</td>
<td>0.6380X</td>
<td>-0.2215</td>
<td>0.3968</td>
<td>-0.0506</td>
<td>-0.0814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25A</td>
<td>0.2774</td>
<td>0.0294</td>
<td>0.5927X</td>
<td>0.3829</td>
<td>-0.2069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26D</td>
<td>0.4888</td>
<td>0.1099</td>
<td>0.5044</td>
<td>-0.2083</td>
<td>-0.0015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27A</td>
<td>-0.1988</td>
<td>0.2573</td>
<td>-0.2603</td>
<td>0.1541</td>
<td>-0.5163X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28D</td>
<td>-0.2361</td>
<td>0.7762X</td>
<td>-0.2040</td>
<td>-0.0645</td>
<td>-0.0341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29A</td>
<td>-0.3413</td>
<td>0.4612</td>
<td>-0.1707</td>
<td>0.3388</td>
<td>-0.2421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30D</td>
<td>-0.1180</td>
<td>0.3515</td>
<td>0.0989</td>
<td>0.1377</td>
<td>0.6050X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31B</td>
<td>0.0358</td>
<td>0.6746X</td>
<td>0.2210</td>
<td>0.1373</td>
<td>-0.0100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32C</td>
<td>0.1398</td>
<td>-0.0828</td>
<td>0.8338X</td>
<td>0.0432</td>
<td>0.1450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33A</td>
<td>0.5749X</td>
<td>0.3282</td>
<td>0.0803</td>
<td>-0.0182</td>
<td>-0.1813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34D</td>
<td>0.0393</td>
<td>0.2957</td>
<td>-0.0673</td>
<td>0.1701</td>
<td>-0.7036X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35B</td>
<td>0.2129</td>
<td>0.0505</td>
<td>-0.2001</td>
<td>0.2427</td>
<td>0.6515X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36C</td>
<td>0.0724</td>
<td>0.1700</td>
<td>-0.0809</td>
<td>0.7098X</td>
<td>-0.0645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37A</td>
<td>0.1903</td>
<td>0.2681</td>
<td>0.1085</td>
<td>0.7364X</td>
<td>0.0119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38D</td>
<td>0.0958</td>
<td>-0.0601</td>
<td>0.7245X</td>
<td>-0.0981</td>
<td>0.0284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39A</td>
<td>0.5377X</td>
<td>0.1839</td>
<td>0.0499</td>
<td>-0.4140</td>
<td>-0.0142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40B</td>
<td>0.4179</td>
<td>-0.0704</td>
<td>0.4072</td>
<td>-0.2588</td>
<td>-0.0632</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
5-Factor Solution Factor Loadings (With an X Indicating a Defining Sort) (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QSORT</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defining sorts</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 = 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% expl. Var.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7 = 56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* The 40 Q sorts were coded with numbers and letters. Odd numbers were female participants, even number were male participants. The letters: A = White female; B = Black female; C = White male; D = Black male. Therefore, 1A = White female, and 2D = Black male, and so forth.
APPENDIX T

NORMALIZED FACTOR SCORES
Table Q1

*Normalized Factor Scores - Factor 1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Z-SCORES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Complete acceptance and support from my own family</td>
<td>1.405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Generally treated same respect as same-race couples</td>
<td>1.360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Sometimes I wish I had more interracial couples as friends</td>
<td>1.233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>We can go anywhere in our town</td>
<td>1.184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Have not received poor service restaurants/retail stores</td>
<td>1.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Black community is more accepting than White community</td>
<td>0.983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Frustrating racist comments when they don’t know spouse race</td>
<td>0.941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Job no problem with coworkers/boss spouse is another race</td>
<td>0.888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Black women made negative remarks, stared or said things</td>
<td>0.746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Feel comfortable in social gatherings with spouse’s race</td>
<td>0.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Where we live now, immediately accepted</td>
<td>0.519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>First seeing photo or meeting spouse people are surprised</td>
<td>0.503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I can’t really say I’ve been accused traitor or sell out</td>
<td>0.456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>If in same-race marriage, would not have to worry racism</td>
<td>0.418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Not let some people know I married interracially</td>
<td>0.346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>No one had a problem renting or selling us a place to live</td>
<td>0.260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Socializing felt &quot;cold shoulder&quot; from strangers</td>
<td>0.215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Some folks against marriage, later softened &amp; accepted it</td>
<td>0.184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>I feel angry/upset when experience prejudice but spouse</td>
<td>0.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Out in public, people stare disapprovingly</td>
<td>0.024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
Table Q1 (continued)

*Normalized Factor Scores - Factor 1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Z-SCORES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Have made vacation plans where it is safer to travel</td>
<td>-0.194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>In public, heard derogatory or racists comments</td>
<td>-0.268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>People concerned about our having/have mixed-race children</td>
<td>-0.449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>People told me I should have stayed in my own race</td>
<td>-0.491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>I have had to become more particular in choosing friends</td>
<td>-0.668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Higher educated have more open accepting attitudes</td>
<td>-0.691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>My eyes opened to prejudice after I got married</td>
<td>-1.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>There is racial bigotry in the church</td>
<td>-1.237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I have lost friends because I married interracially</td>
<td>-1.288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>I have relatives who made up excuses to avoid us</td>
<td>-1.493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I believe police have harassed us because we are together</td>
<td>-1.596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Feel my spouse’s relatives do not want to have anything</td>
<td>-1.697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Prejudice from family more so than from public in general</td>
<td>-2.369</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table Q2

*Normalized Factor Scores - Factor 2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Z-SCORES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Some folks against marriage, later softened &amp; accepted it</td>
<td>2.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>There is racial bigotry in the church</td>
<td>1.837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>People concerned about our having/have mixed-race children</td>
<td>1.544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Frustrating racist comments when they don’t know spouse race</td>
<td>1.469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Higher educated have more open accepting attitudes</td>
<td>1.226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Black women made negative remarks, stared or said things</td>
<td>0.967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>People told me I should have stayed in my own race</td>
<td>0.865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Out in public, people stare disapprovingly</td>
<td>0.694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>First seeing photo or meeting spouse people are surprised</td>
<td>0.550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I believe police have harassed us because we are together</td>
<td>0.506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Have made vacation plans where it is safer to travel</td>
<td>0.444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>I feel angry/upset when experience prejudice but spouse</td>
<td>0.433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Generally treated same respect as same-race couples</td>
<td>0.336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Sometimes I wish I had more interracial couples as friends</td>
<td>0.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>I have had to become more particular in choosing friends</td>
<td>0.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>In public, heard derogatory or racists comments</td>
<td>-0.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Prejudice from family more so than from public in general</td>
<td>-0.204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Socializing felt &quot;cold shoulder&quot; from strangers</td>
<td>-0.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>My eyes opened to prejudice after I got married</td>
<td>-0.256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>If in same-race marriage, would not have to worry racism</td>
<td>-0.355</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
Table Q2 (continued)

**Normalized Factor Scores - Factor 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Z-SCORES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>We can go anywhere in and around our town</td>
<td>-0.381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>I have relatives who made up excuses to avoid us</td>
<td>-0.396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Feel my spouse’s relatives do not want to have anything</td>
<td>-0.447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Where we live now, immediately accepted</td>
<td>-0.475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I have lost friends because I married interracially</td>
<td>-0.546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Not let some people know I married interracially</td>
<td>-0.599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Have not received poor service restaurants/retail stores</td>
<td>-0.806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Job no problem with coworkers/boss spouse is another race</td>
<td>-0.830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>No one had a problem renting or selling us a place to live</td>
<td>-0.876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Feel comfortable in social gatherings with spouse’s race</td>
<td>-1.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Black community is more accepting than White community</td>
<td>-1.648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I can’t really say I’ve been accused traitor or sell out</td>
<td>-1.746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Complete acceptance and support from my own family</td>
<td>-2.102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table Q3

*Normalized Factor Scores – Factor 3*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Z-SCORES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Where we live now, immediately accepted</td>
<td>1.809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Generally treated same respect as same-race couples</td>
<td>1.727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>We can go anywhere in an around our town</td>
<td>1.498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Job no problem with coworkers/boss spouse is another race</td>
<td>1.309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I can’t really say I’ve been accused traitor or sell out</td>
<td>1.176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Complete acceptance and support from my own family</td>
<td>1.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Higher educated have more open accepting attitudes</td>
<td>1.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Feel comfortable in social gatherings with spouse’s race</td>
<td>0.974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>No one had a problem renting or selling us a place to live</td>
<td>0.923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Some folks against marriage, later softened &amp; accepted it</td>
<td>0.806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>First seeing photo or meeting spouse people are surprised</td>
<td>0.565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Prejudice from family more so than from public in general</td>
<td>0.292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Sometimes I wish I had more interracial couples as friends</td>
<td>0.184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Black community is more accepting than White community</td>
<td>0.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Black women made negative remarks, stared or said things</td>
<td>0.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Feel my spouse’s relatives do not want to have anything</td>
<td>0.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Have not received poor service restaurants/retail stores</td>
<td>0.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I believe police have harassed us because we are together</td>
<td>-0.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>In public, heard derogatory or racists comments</td>
<td>-0.418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>People concerned about our having/have mixed-race children</td>
<td>-0.440</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Z-SCORES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Out in public, people stare disapprovingly</td>
<td>-0.487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>If in same-race marriage, would not have to worry racism</td>
<td>-0.606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Socializing felt &quot;cold shoulder&quot; from strangers</td>
<td>-0.610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Frustrating racist comments when they don’t know spouse race</td>
<td>-0.627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>I have relatives who made up excuses to avoid us</td>
<td>-0.671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Have made vacation plans where it is safer to travel</td>
<td>-0.698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>There is racial bigotry in the church</td>
<td>-0.916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>People told me I should have stayed in my own race</td>
<td>-0.939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>My eyes opened to prejudice after I got married</td>
<td>-0.955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>I feel angry/upset when experience prejudice but spouse</td>
<td>-1.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>I have had to become more particular in choosing friends</td>
<td>-1.191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I have lost friends because I married interracially</td>
<td>-1.804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Not let some people know I married interracially</td>
<td>-2.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Z-SCORES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>I feel angry/upset when experience prejudice but spouse</td>
<td>1.897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>If in same-race marriage, would not have to worry racism</td>
<td>1.872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Prejudice from family more so than from public in general</td>
<td>1.744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Frustrating racist comments when they don’t know spouse race</td>
<td>1.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>No one had a problem renting or selling us a place to live</td>
<td>1.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>People told me I should have stayed in my own race</td>
<td>0.873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Some folks against marriage, later softened &amp; accepted it</td>
<td>0.697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Feel comfortable in social gatherings with spouse’s race</td>
<td>0.596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>We can go anywhere in an around our town</td>
<td>0.438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>First seeing photo or meeting spouse people are surprised</td>
<td>0.435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Black community is more accepting than White community</td>
<td>0.412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Out in public, people stare disapprovingly</td>
<td>0.390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I can’t really say I’ve been accused traitor or sell out</td>
<td>0.262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Black women made negative remarks, stared or said things</td>
<td>0.238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>People concerned about our having/have mixed-race children</td>
<td>0.223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Socializing felt &quot;cold shoulder&quot; from strangers</td>
<td>0.212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Higher educated have more open accepting attitudes</td>
<td>0.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>My eyes opened to prejudice after I got married</td>
<td>0.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Generally treated same respect as same-race couples</td>
<td>-0.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Sometimes I wish I had more interracial couples as friends</td>
<td>-0.311</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
Table Q4 (continued)

*Normalized Factor Scores – Factor 4*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Z-SCORES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Have not received poor service restaurants/retail stores</td>
<td>-0.423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Job no problem with coworkers/boss spouse is another race</td>
<td>-0.462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Where we live now, immediately accepted</td>
<td>-0.612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>I have relatives who made up excuses to avoid us</td>
<td>-0.660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I believe police have harassed us because we are together</td>
<td>-0.684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Not let some people know I married interracially</td>
<td>-0.866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>There is racial bigotry in the church</td>
<td>-0.937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>In public, heard derogatory or racists comments</td>
<td>-0.988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Have made vacation plans where it is safer to travel</td>
<td>-1.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Feel my spouse’s relatives do not want to have anything</td>
<td>-1.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>I have had to become more particular in choosing friends</td>
<td>-1.222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I have lost friends because I married interracially</td>
<td>-1.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Complete acceptance and support from my own family</td>
<td>-2.183</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX U

DISTINGUISHING STATEMENTS
Table R1

Distinguishing Statements for Factor 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1 RNK</th>
<th>1 SCORE</th>
<th>2 RNK</th>
<th>2 SCORE</th>
<th>3 RNK</th>
<th>3 SCORE</th>
<th>4 RNK</th>
<th>4 SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Sometimes I wish I had more interracial couples as friends.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.23*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I can’t say that we have ever received poor service in restaurants or from retail sales people due to being an interracial couple.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.08*</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-0.81</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>It seems to me that the Black community is more accepting of our interracial marriage than the White community is.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-1.65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>What frustrates me is how common it is to hear racist comments from others who do not know I am in an interracial marriage. I doubt they would say those things if they knew my spouse is of another race.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-0.63</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Where we live now, we just all of a sudden became a part of the neighborhood. We were immediately accepted.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.52*</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-0.47</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>I suspect that if I were in a same-race marriage, I would not have to worry about racism the way I do now.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.42*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-0.61</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I’d rather not let some people know I married interracially. I’m better off keeping some things to myself around certain people.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.35*</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-2.03</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-0.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
Table R1 (continued)

_Distinguishing Statements for Factor 1_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RNK</td>
<td>SCORE</td>
<td>RNK</td>
<td>SCORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I don’t think any one has had a problem renting or selling to us a place</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.26*</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to live just because we are an interracial couple.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>There have been times when we have had to make vacation plans based on</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>where it would be safer for us to travel.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>People have actually told me I should have stayed in my own race.</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-0.49</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>It seems that those with more education have more open attitudes and</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-0.69*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>accept interracial marriage. I feel more comfortable around them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>I have relatives who made up excuses to avoid being around us. I feel</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-1.49*</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>they really do not approve of my marriage.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I believe police have harassed us just because they do not like seeing</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-1.60*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>us together.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Overall, it seems like we have experienced overt and subtle acts of</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-2.37*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>prejudice from our family members more so than from the public in general.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Asterisk (*) Indicates Significance at $p < .01$
Table R2

*Distinguishing Statements for Factor 2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1 RNK</th>
<th>1 SCORE</th>
<th>2 RNK</th>
<th>2 SCORE</th>
<th>3 RNK</th>
<th>3 SCORE</th>
<th>4 RNK</th>
<th>4 SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>At first, there were folks who seemed to be against marriage, but they softened in time and now seem generally quite accepting.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.03*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>There is racial bigotry in the church. I have experienced it.</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1.24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.84*</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-0.92</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Some people seem concerned that we have (or intend to have) mixed-race children, like it would upset the social order or something.</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.54*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I believe police have harassed us just because they do not like seeing us together.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-1.60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>There have been times when we have had to make vacation plans based on where it would be safer for us to travel.</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-0.70</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>I have had to become more particular in choosing friends. I need to know whom I can really trust and that they really don’t care if I married interracially.</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-0.67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.03*</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-1.19</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>We can go anywhere in an around our town and no one has ever bothered us just because we are an African American and Caucasian couple.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
Table R2 (continued)

*Distinguishing Statements for Factor 2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RNK</td>
<td>SCORE</td>
<td>RNK</td>
<td>SCORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I have lost friends because I married interracially.</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1.29</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I don’t think any one has had a problem renting or selling to a place to live just because we are an interracial couple.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-0.88*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>I have always felt comfortable in social gatherings that consisted of only people from my spouse’s race. I’ve always felt accepted.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-1.11*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>It seems to me that the Black community if more accepting of our interracial marriage than the White community is.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-1.65*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I can’t really say that I have ever been accused of being a “traitor” or “sell out” to my race.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-1.75*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table R3

*Distinguishing Statements for Factor 3*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>RNK</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>RNK</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>RNK</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>RNK</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Where we live now, we just all of a sudden became a part of the neighborhood. We were immediately accepts.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-0.47</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.81*</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I can’t really say I’ve been accused of being a “traitor” or “sell out” to my race.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-1.75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.18*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>When we are out in public, many times I feel that people are staring at us with disapproving and judgmental eyes.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-0.49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>What frustrates me is how common it is to hear comments from others who do not know I am in an interracial marriage. I doubt they would say those things if they knew my spouse is of another race.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-0.63*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>People have actually told me that I should have stayed within my own race.</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-0.49</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-0.94</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>I have really felt angry, upset or discounted when I have experienced an act of prejudice only to have my spouse think it was nothing, or that it was only my imagination.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-1.05*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I’d rather not let some people know I married interracially. I’m better off keeping some things to myself around certain people.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-2.03*</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-0.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table R4

Distinguishing Statements for Factor 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1 RNK</th>
<th>1 SCORE</th>
<th>2 RNK</th>
<th>2 SCORE</th>
<th>3 RNK</th>
<th>3 SCORE</th>
<th>4 RNK</th>
<th>4 SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>I have felt really angry, upset or discounted when I have experienced an act of prejudice only to have my spouse think it was nothing, or that it was only my imagination.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-1.05</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.90*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>I suspect that if I were in a same-race marriage, I would not have to worry about racism the way I do now.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-0.61</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.87*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Overall, it seems like we have experienced overt and subtle acts of prejudice from our family members more so than from the public in general.</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-2.37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.74*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>We can go anywhere in an around our town and no one has ever bothered us just because we are an African American and Caucasian couple.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Some people seem concerned that we have (or intend to have) mixed-race children, like it would upset the social order or something.</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>It seems that those with more education have more open attitudes and accept interracial marriage. I feel more comfortable around them.</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-0.69</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.13*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX V

DEMOGRAPHICS OF ALL PARTICIPANTS
### Demographics of all Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sort #</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Years Married</th>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>Total family Income (thousands)</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Present Neighborhood</th>
<th>Childhood Neighborhood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Nurse</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2D</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td></td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Admin Assist.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4C</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td></td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5A</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6D</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7A</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8D</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Unemp</td>
<td></td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9B</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Unemp</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10C</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Tradesman</td>
<td></td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11A</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*table continues*
Demographics of all Participants (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sort #</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Years Married</th>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>Total family Income (thousands)</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Present Neighborhood</th>
<th>Childhood Neighborhood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12D</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13B</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14C</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15A</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16D</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>College Admin.</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17A</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Bahai</td>
<td>College Admin</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18D</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Bahai</td>
<td>College Admin</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19B</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bahai</td>
<td>Tutor</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20C</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bahai</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21A</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22D</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
## Demographics of all Participants (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sort #</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Years Married</th>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>Total family Income (thousands)</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Present Neighborhood</th>
<th>Childhood Neighborhood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23A</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Nurse</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24D</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25A</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26D</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27A</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Social Worker</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28D</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29A</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30D</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31B</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32C</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33A</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Demographics of all Participants (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sort #</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Married</th>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>Total family Income (thousands)</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Present Neighborhood</th>
<th>Childhood Neighborhood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34D</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35B</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>75 MA</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36C</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37A</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>75 MA</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38D</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39A</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>75 MA</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40B</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Tradesman</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. F = Female  C = Caucasian  BA = Bachelor of Arts  MA = Master of Arts  HS = High School  M = Male  AA = African American  BS = Bachelor of Science  Mixed = African American and Caucasian*
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