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ABSTRACT

The study of biracial individuals and their unique experience has been limited. As biracial individuals increase in number, understanding their experiences will become more important to psychologists and mental health professionals.

The purpose of the study was to compare biracial individuals and monoracial individuals on measures of psychological well being, ethnic identity, and attitudes towards biracial people. The present study examined one general research question and three hypotheses:

- General Research Question & Hypotheses
  - Will scores on measures of ethnic identity, individual self-esteem, collective self-esteem, subjective well being, and attitudes toward biracial children significantly differ between biracial and monoracial groups?
  - Bracey, Bamara, and Umana-Taylor’s (2004) results on self-esteem and ethnic identity will be replicated in this study on adults.
  - When compared to monoracial individuals, biracial individuals will have significantly more positive attitudes towards biracials.
  - A positive relationship exists between psychological well being and attitudes towards biracials for biracial individuals.
Participants completed a web-based survey from an undisclosed location of their choosing. Participants were solicited from various multicultural and professional psychology list serves and through Ohio State University’s Research Experience Program.

Results indicated that biracial adults appear to be as psychologically well adjusted as their monoracial counterparts. Results even suggested that biracial adults have more realized ethnic identities than their monoracial counterparts. Bracey et al.’s (2004) results were replicated in the present study (biracials were found to be as psychologically well adjusted as monoracials). Also, a positive relationship was found between biracial individuals’ psychological well being and their attitudes towards multiracial children. Support for the second hypothesis was not found – biracial individuals in the study did not have more positive attitudes toward biracials than their monoracial counterparts.

Implications of the findings along with the limitations of the study are discussed. Recommendations of future research are also given.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The study of biracial individuals and their unique experiences is an important issue that has received little attention from mental health professionals. As the conceptualization of race and ethnicity in the United States evolves from a dichotomized philosophy to a more fluid one, acceptance of the biracial individual and examination of the biracial experience will gain support. In the year 2000, history was made when the U.S. Census Bureau included the option to select more than one racial category when indicating racial identity (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2001). For the first time, multi/biracial individuals were recognized as a legitimate demographic group in the U.S. Multi/biracial individuals are those people who claim a racial/ethnic heritage that consists of two or more racial groups. The biracial label is more specific and refers only to multiracial individuals whose parents are of two distinct racial/ethnic groups. The two terms will not be used interchangeably even though the study of biracial individuals technically doubles as the study of multiracial people. This concession is an indicator of the increasing recognition of multi/biracial individuals in the U.S. It is also an indication that biracial individuals now have a political voice and are actively seeking to define their own existence (Gootman, 2006; Rodriguez, 2000). The creation and growth of mixed
race political groups such as The MAVIN Foundation, Project RACE, and The Multiracial Activist are tangible examples of this new found political voice.

The 2000 U.S. census survey reported that 93.3 percent of individuals who chose to identify themselves as more than one race identified as biracial (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2001). This figure accounts for approximately six and a half million Americans. This number will increase as interracial marriage rates rise and Americans become more likely to claim their mixed ancestry (Rodriguez, 2003). As the biracial population grows and traditional constructions of race are challenged, the U.S. becomes more willing to relax its rigid racial conceptions. Research on the biracial experience is increasing in importance - in order for mental health professionals to maintain adequate multicultural competence, they must study this “new” group scientifically.

Relatively speaking, the study of biracial individuals and their experiences has been limited. The first publication of empirically based writings on the multi/biracial experience and identity did not appear until 1992 (Root, 1992). This publication facilitated interest in this area resulting in more theses, dissertations, essays, and research articles focused on studying the multi/biracial experience (Hall & Okazaki, 2002). Informed by an increasing body of articles and papers, the study of biracial experiences has proved unwieldy due to methodological difficulties. A vast number of potentially meaningful variables (various racial/ethnic combinations, perception of biracial individuals, ethnic identification, regional diversity, parental influence, etc.) assist in creating a confluence of studies which often have little relevance to one another. One
prevalent theme in the study of biracial individuals has been the perception of biracial people as “marginalized” (Brown, 1990; Herring, 1995; Stonequist, 1937).

Past speculation and discussion about the biracial experience has portrayed biracial individuals as troubled, disadvantaged, and marginalized. Stonequist (1937) stated that the racial ambiguity inherent in being biracial posed problems for “normal” identity development and adjustment. Stonequist believed that biracial individuals developed a “marginalized” identity characterized as a negative state of being. Gibbs (1987) stated that multiracial individuals may have trouble identifying with their parents and peers due to the inherent ambiguity and uncertainty of their identity. Gibbs also believed that this ambiguity would negatively effect a biracial individual’s social identification with specific racial/ethnic groups. Bradshaw (1992) commented on the negative effects of physical racial ambiguities and biracial individuals. Bradshaw hypothesized that biracial individuals bombarded with questions such as, “What are you?” may have a devalued sense of self. These and other publications (McDermott & Fukunaga, 1977; Reuter, 1969) have conceptualized the biracial experience as an ambiguous, negative state of being.

Currently, there is a debate over the psychological health of multiracial individuals. Early work on this subject focused on the children of interracial marriages (Gordon, 1964; Henriques, 1974; Piskacek & Golub, 1973). These qualitative works predicted negative consequences (e.g., identity problems, depression, anxiety, etc.) stemming from a bicultural environment. More recent works examining biracial individuals have focused on ethnic identity development and psychological well-being
(Benedetto & Olisky, 2001; Brown, 1990; Herring, 1995). These articles, influenced by the historical emphasis on biracial identity as negative, highlight the potential difficulties of being biracial (e.g., marginalized identity, self-esteem issues, social adjustment issues, etc.). These articles view the biracial experience from a deficit perspective (what biracial individuals are lacking) and have a tendency to compare the experience to the “normal” experience, which they view as monoracial.

There are legitimate reasons why we may suspect differences between monoracial individuals and biracial individuals in areas such as psychological well-being, adjustment, and identity development. Stephan (1991) offers four reasons for this speculation. The first, “socialization of children growing up in mixed-heritage families is, to varying degrees, likely to be bicultural.” Second, “mixed-heritage children have more extensive options in establishing their identities than do children of single-heritage backgrounds.” Third, “mixed-heritage children may experience some degree of rejection by their extended families.” Fourth, “mixed-heritage children may also experience rejection in the larger society.” These factors serve as potential markers in differentiating the biracial experience from the monoracial experience. It is important to consider the possible effects of these factors and to recognize that these effects could be positive or negative. Although historical examination as focused on negative effects of these factors, it is more likely that biracial individuals experience negative and positive effects as a result of these differences.

In the current literature, the examination of negative and positive characteristics of the biracial experience is becoming more balanced. Current researchers, such as Dr.
Maria Root, are questioning the deficit perspective and viewing the biracial experience as a unique experience that should not be held up against a monoracial standard. Some researchers are comparing the biracial experience to bilingual studies which clearly indicate positive social outcomes related to bilingualism (e.g., positive intergroup attitudes, increased cognitive flexibility, decreased prejudice, etc. (Stephan, 1991).

Most of the published literature on biracial experience consists of non-empirical articles or are qualitative in nature. A review by Shih & Sanchez (2005) reported that there were only 43 published studies on multiracial individuals (28 qualitative; 15 quantitative). In addition, a large portion of these studies were conducted using a clinical sample and had small sample sizes. It is clear that there is currently a significant lack of research on biracial individuals. The current body of research can be extended in four ways. First, researchers can challenge the historical emphasis on the biracial experience being a negative experience. The emphasis should not be on what biracial individuals lack in comparison to monoracial individuals, but on how the experiences differ from and reflect each other. Second, researchers can spend more time identifying potential “advantages” of being biracial. Most research has focused on disadvantages of being biracial. Assuming the biracial experience is a unique one, it is reasonable to speculate that there are potentially unique advantages and disadvantages to growing up biracial in the U.S. Third, more work needs to be done with larger non-clinical samples. Larger sample sizes and non-clinical samples will give future work a robustness that past research does not have. Fourth, researchers could examine the current perceptions of biracial people. It is important to know the attitudes Caucasian and ethnic minority
groups have towards biracial individuals so that we can better understand the social climate biracial people exist in. It is also important to examine biracial individuals’ attitudes towards themselves. Do biracial individuals’ attitudes reflect those of their monoracial peers? If so, how does this affect their development and psychological well-being?

The present study attempted to extend the research in these four ways. The intent was to make a unique contribution to the literature that would provide us with a better understanding of the biracial experience by addressing questions such as, “Do attitudes towards biracial individuals reflect a social climate (in the U.S.) that continues to perceive biracials as marginalized and disadvantaged?”, “Are there specific differences between monoracial individuals (Caucasians and ethnic minorities) and biracial individuals (as identified by the reported race of their mother and father) on constructs such as psychological well-being, ethnic identity, etc.?” and “Are there psychological advantages to being biracial, and if so, what are these advantages?” Answering questions such as these helps biracial individuals further define their experience. It also provides counseling psychologists and other mental health professionals with more accurate information on this demographic. Understanding a client’s multicultural dimensions is essential to providing effective & efficient counseling (Sue et al., 1992).

The present study sought to embrace Division 17’s commitment to the study of culture and diversity. It also sought to empirically examine the historical bias that the biracial experience is negative. Accordingly, the purposes of the study were to examine the potential psychological advantages and disadvantages (psychological well-being,
ethnic identity) between monoracial individuals (Caucasians and ethnic minorities) and biracial individuals (who are identified as such because their parents are from two distinct racial groups) along with the attitudes these groups endorse regarding the biracial demographic. The present study also provided much needed quantitative research on the biracial demographic using a non-clinical adult sample. Few studies have compared biracial individuals (as indicated by reported race of mother and father) and monoracial individuals on measures of psychological well-being (Bracey, et al, 2004; Cooney & Radina, 2000; Shih & Sanchez, 2005) and none have done with a large adult sample.

This study sought to replicate past work and extend it by examining constructs not yet employed such as subjective well-being and collective self-esteem. The present study examined the relationship between biracial individuals’ psychological well-being, ethnic identity and their attitudes towards the biracial demographic. No studies have yet examined this relationship. This study provided unique contributions to the current body of literature by examining monoracial and biracial persons’ attitudes towards biracial individuals, by comparing biracial individuals and monoracial individuals on previously unexamined constructs of psychological well-being, and by using a non-clinical adult sample.
Chapter 2 highlights previous research articles and nonempirical studies that were written about the relevant constructs of this study. Relevant literature in the areas of ethnic identity, psychological well being, and racial attitudes were reviewed. Additionally, relevant articles focusing on biracial individuals were discussed. Finally, specific hypotheses related to the relevant constructs were described.

2.1 Ethnic Identity

Ethnic identity is a concept with multiple definitions. Tajfel (1981) defined ethnic identity as, “that part of an individual’s self-concept which derives from his knowledge of his membership of a social group (or groups) together with the value and emotional significance attached to that membership” (p. 255). While Tajfel’s definition highlights social identity as a key aspect of ethnic identity, different researchers have chosen other aspects of importance when examining this construct. White and Burke (p.311, 1987) felt ethnic identity could be described as one’s sense of shared attitudes and values with a particular ethnic group. Other researchers considered one’s attitudes towards their ethnic group to be a key aspect of ethnic identity (Parham & Helms, 1981).
The lack of consolidation of definitions suggests that ethnic identity is a broad concept with numerous aspects of importance.

Studies of ethnic identity have been as varied as its definitions. Some researchers have focused on the process of ethnic identity formation and development (Myers et al., 1991, Phinney, 1989; Phinney & Alipuria, 1990). Others have considered the relationship between ethnic identity and psychological well being (e.g., self-esteem, adjustment issues; Grossman, Wirt, & Davids, 1985; Phinney, 1991). Still others have examined the relationship between ethnic identity and gender (Abreu, et al., 2000; Arciniega, et al., 2008; Parham & Helms, 1985; Settles, 2006). Most often these areas of study overlap with each other. Questions such as, “Is there a relationship between self-esteem and ethnic identity development?” and, “Are there gender differences in ethnic identity development?” are not uncommon.

Additionally, measures of ethnic identity have proven difficult to construct. Phinney (1990) indicated that, “the reliability of [ethnic identity] measures is often not reported or is low enough to raise questions about conclusions based on the measure” (p.506). According to Phinney, less than a fifth of papers reported reliability coefficients for their ethnic identity measures, and it was rare to see the same measure used more than once (1990). However, a promising measure of ethnic identity was developed by Phinney (1992) and is known as the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM). The MEIM focuses on four important aspects of ethnic identity: self-identification; ethnic attitudes and sense of belonging; ethnic identity achievement; and ethnic behaviors and practices.
Self-identification can be defined as the ethnic label an individual uses for oneself. It can be distinguished from one’s ethnicity (objective measure of identification determined by parent’s cultural heritage), and may differ from one’s ethnicity (e.g., a Korean/Caucasian man may ethnically label himself Korean even though he is of mixed blood; Singh, 1977). Self-identifying with a particular ethnic group is an essential prerequisite for ethnic identity.

Attitudes towards one’s ethnic group and feelings of belonging to that group are key aspects of ethnic identity. The MEIM examines an individual’s attitudes and feelings of belonging towards a particular ethnic group by assessing one’s ethnic pride (how good one feels about his/her background) and one’s attachment to the group.

Ethnic identity achievement is a developmental process involving the exploration and resolution of identity issues. During this process, an individual explores the personal meaning of one’s ethnicity through the history and traditions of the ethnic group(s) he/she belongs to. Successful exploration and resolution of identity issues leads to the development of, “a secure sense of oneself as a member of a minority group (p. 160; Phinney, 1992).” The MEIM examines ethnic identity achievement by assessing one’s level of exploration and commitment to learn more about one’s background and the personal significance of ethnicity in one’s life.

Ethnic behaviors and practices are often used to identify key components of specific ethnic groups (Phinney, 1990). Phinney suggests two aspects of ethnic behaviors and practices that are common to most ethnic groups. These aspects are participation in cultural traditions and involvement in social activities with members of one’s group.
This four-factor model of ethnic identity was adopted for this study due to the increased flexibility it provides when applied to multiracial individuals. Since it does not limit individuals to developing a single-race identity, it allows for the development and existence of an identity based on more than one ethnic group.

2.1.1 Biracial Ethnic Identity

The majority of research articles and nonempirical papers on the biracial experience focus on biracial identity formation and development (ethnic identity). This topic emerged as a necessary focus because of the lack of utility of monoracial identity development models when applied to biracial individuals. Poston’s (1990) article on biracial identity development identifies the limitations of the existing racial identity models when applied to biracial individuals. Existing models of racial identity development are limited in their utility when applied to the biracial population in large part because they do not allow for the integration of two or more group identities. These models also suggest that biracial individuals will first choose to identify with the dominant culture and reject the minority culture. Poston recognizes that biracial identity development is a unique process that is largely undefined. Poston (1990) calls attention to the need for a biracial identity development model and lists current models that are often applied to biracial individuals. These include Afro-American identity development models (Cross, 1971), general minority identity development models (Morten & Atkinson, 1983), and deficit models of biracial identity development (Stonequist, 1937).

Poston proposes a 5-stage model of biracial identity development. The stages are Personal Identity, Choice of Group Categorization, Emeshment/Denial, Appreciation, and
Integration. The first stage, Personal Identity, occurs at a young age. At this stage, an individual’s sense of self is based primarily on factors such as self-esteem and feelings of self-worth. Ethnic background and group membership are less salient during this stage.

The second stage, Choice of Group Categorization, is entered when biracial individuals are “forced” to choose an identity, usually a monoracial one. Some biracial individuals report that society forced them to choose a racial identity in order to participate in social groups (e.g., family, peer groups: Hall, 1980).

The primary choices are typically between that of the majority group and minority group (parents’ ethnicity). A biracial identity choice is rarely made during the Choice of Group Categorization stage because individuals in this stage do not yet have intimate knowledge of their cultural backgrounds. The third stage, Enmeshment/Denial, is typically entered during adolescence. Biracial individuals in this stage often experience feelings of confusion and guilt because their choice of identity does not accurately reflect their ethnic background. By choosing only one racial category, they are rejecting the other parent’s heritage and background. Individuals move out of this stage when they can appreciate both parental cultures. Until appreciation for both parents’ cultures can be achieved, the biracial individual will remain at this level.

The fourth stage, Appreciation, is characterized by the individual’s developing appreciation for their biracial identity. Individuals in this stage begin to explore their ethnic groups’ practices and traditions. Although appreciation for both relevant cultures has been achieved, individuals at this stage still tend to identity with one ethnic group.

The final stage is Integration. When the Integration stage is reached, the biracial
individual has learned to value both ethnic identities and achieves wholeness by integrating both identities into one. Poston’s (1990) 5-stage model is a progressive model that has a life-span focus. Poston’s proposed model highlights the uniqueness of biracial identity development. It places emphasis on biracial individual’s need to integrate and value multiple cultures. Poston alludes to the testability of his model and offers suggestions for future research (e.g., testing for the existence of the stages, testing the relationship between psychological well being measures and the stages of his model).

In 2001, Benedetto and Olisky’s article on biracial youth outlined the school counselor’s role in racial identity development. Benedetto and Olisky state that school counselors can assist biracial individuals in achieving a positive biracial identity. This article highlights Poston’s (1990) racial identity development model. Benedetto and Olisky state that biracial individuals can achieve a healthy biracial identity, but they may be faced with conflicting values along the way. These values stem from the questions, “Who am I?” and “Where do I belong?” These questions may be difficult for the biracial individual to answer. Without satisfactory answers to these questions, biracial individuals may be “at-risk” to suffer from various behavioral and emotional problems.

School counselors are in a position to help biracial individuals with these tough questions. Benedetto and Olisky highlight two factors that they believe are essential to positive identity development. These factors are racial identification and pride in one’s racial/cultural identity. Based on these factors, the authors offer three domains that school counselors can act on to educate biracial individuals on their unique experience. These domains are awareness of biracial experience, communication and facilitation of
communication about biracial experience, and exposure to aspects of the biracial experience. The findings of Benedetto and Olisky indicate the need for school counselors to become better equipped to assist biracial students.

Williams (1999) discusses the idea of claiming a biracial identity and shares her own personal experiences as a Caucasian/African biracial individual. The article describes the difficulties Williams encountered trying to achieve a positive biracial identity. Important in her discussion is the inherent racism found in typical social constructions of race and culture. Williams believed racism is internalized within the biracial individual and can hinder the development of a healthy biracial/cultural identity. As Williams elaborates on her experiences, it becomes apparent that many of her experiences fit nicely into Poston’s (1990) model of biracial identity development. Williams studied other models of racial identity development and realized that the existing models did not delineate the biracial experience. Williams stated that biracial individuals are left to their own devices when developing a positive multi-racial/ethnic identity.

Williams also defines a biracial experience she coins “simultaneity”. She struggles to describe this experience. The essence of simultaneity can be described as existing in different stages of identity development at the same time (her white and black identity) and yet experiencing this in a fluid, seamless way instead of as a split identity. The author’s work indirectly addresses the need for increased study of the biracial experience. Williams also conveys the notion that a better understanding of biracial identity formation and development is imperative for future counselors and mental health
professionals. The biracial population will continue to grow, and counselors will be “forced” to deal with complex racial issues and experiences.

Another interesting article comes from Herring (1995) on developing a biracial identity focuses on developmental dilemmas for biracial individuals and possible strategies and interventions to assist this population. Herring states that biracial individuals often experience difficulties in a large range of areas from identity confusion to suicide. These difficulties develop because biracial individuals develop self-concepts and racial attitudes differently than other [ethnic] groups. A conflict arises between the biracial experience and pervading sociocultural constructions (e.g., monoculturalism, dichotomized ingroups/outgroups). As with the previous articles, Herring discusses the limitations of existing models of racial identity development when applied to biracial individuals. Alternatively, Herring supports Poston’s (1990) model of biracial identity development because it begins to address the limitations/weaknesses of the previously mentioned models. Herring offers several strategies for counselor education and the counseling process when working with biracial students such as creating a positive relationship based on empathy and genuineness, being aware of presenting problems that are unique to biracial students, validating a biracial individual’s struggles around race/ethnicity, focusing on positive self-esteem development around biracial identity, and providing psycho-educational resources geared towards biracial individuals. While Herring does not offer empirical support for his strategies and interventions, he challenges others to collect empirical data on the biracial population so we may better understand their experiences.
Seminal to the development of research on the multiracial experience is Maria P. Root. Root’s (1998) study observed 20 biracial sibling pairs with the intent of examining the processes, experiences, and affect associated with racial identity development. Sibling pairings were sent questionnaire packets that were to be completed individually. The packets included a background questionnaire, a body image inventory, a brief mental health inventory, a sibling racial reference inventory, a racial experiences questionnaire, and an identity questionnaire. When the questionnaires were completed, the siblings participated in two 2-hour interviews, each being interviewed separately.

Root’s report provides four experiences that may lead to different choices of identity between siblings. The four experiences are hazing (demeaning process of racial and ethnic authenticity testing), family dysfunction (parent substance addiction, violence, abandonment, etc.), impact of integration (level of racial integration of schools, neighborhoods, etc.), and other salient identities (identities transcending race such as religious and military affiliation). Generally speaking, the study identified experiences that may effect biracial identity development. Sibling differences in biracial identity development may be affected by the four experiences described above and the age in which the experience occurs. Continued research is necessary to understand these differences.

Lastly, a qualitative study by Kerwin, Ponterotto, Jackson, and Harris (1993) examined racial identity in biracial children through semistructured interviews. The participants were nine Black/White biracial children from intact middle or upper-middle income families. This study examined biracial individual’s perceptions of the beliefs that
they are “marginalized” and “at-risk” of psychological/social maladjustment. Interviews with the parents and children revealed that the problems often associated with being biracial were not identified by the biracial individuals themselves. In this sample, biracial children did not identify themselves as marginalized and often saw advantages to existing “between cultures” (e.g., more cultural awareness). This finding challenges deficit models of biracial identity development. The majority of parents also viewed their children as biracial and not monoracial. Kerwin et al. calls for more qualitative and quantitative research in the area of biracial identity development. The researchers believe a clearer understanding of the biracial experience is necessary before counselors can provide supportive interventions and strategies for biracial individuals.

The above studies served as the driving force and motivation behind the present study’s focus on biracial individuals. These studies indicated that there is a difference between monoracial and biracial individuals, and that this difference is as yet unclear.

2.2 Psychological Well Being

Psychological well being is a broad concept that holds different meanings for those in the scientific community. Practically speaking, psychological well being serves as an umbrella term for many constructs that assess psychological functioning. Constructs such as contentment, subjective well being, self-esteem, adjustment, body image, happiness, depression, and collective self-esteem can all be considered constructs relevant to psychological well being (Diener & Diener, 1995; Diener, Lucas, & Oishi, 2002; Kuhl & Helle, 1986; Mendelson, White, & Mendelson, 1996; Rubin & Hewstone,
All of these constructs objectively or subjectively provide insight into one’s psychological functioning.

This dissertation assessed the psychological well being of biracial individuals and monoracial individuals in three ways. The constructs chosen were global personal trait self-esteem (individual self-esteem), collective self-esteem, and subjective well being. Three constructs were chosen instead of one to provide a more generalized assessment of psychological well being. Self-esteem was chosen for replication purposes, and the other constructs were chosen because they are yet to be examined with biracial individuals. Specific instruments were chosen based on their outstanding reliability and validity testing.

Global personal trait self-esteem describes people’s personal assessment of their overall self-concept (Kline, 1993; Long & Spears, 1997; Rubin & Hewstone, 1998) over an extended period of time. Many scales have been developed to measure this construct (Kuhn & McPartland, 1954, Twenty Statements Test [TST]; Rosenberg, Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale [RSES], 1965).

Collective self-esteem can be defined as, “the esteem in which they (group members) hold the shared self-image that constitutes their social identity” (p. 42, Rubin & Hewstone, 1998). Simply put, collective self-esteem involves one’s self-image in relation to the groups of which he/she is a member. Currently, only one measure of collective self-esteem has been developed and tested (Luhtanen & Crocker, Collective Self-Esteem Scale [CSES], 1992). The CSES focuses on four important aspects of

Membership esteem can be described as how good of a group member one perceives him or herself to be. The CSES measures membership esteem by assessing how good or worthy individuals feel in relation to their social groups. Private collective self-esteem refers to how positive one perceives their social groups to be. The CSES measures private collective self-esteem by assessing one’s personal evaluations of how good their groups are. Public collective self-esteem refers to a person’s perception of how others (out-groups) evaluate one’s social groups. The CSES measures public collective self-esteem by assessing one’s judgments of how other people evaluate relevant social groups. Finally, identity esteem refers to the magnitude of one’s social group affiliations to one’s self-concept. The CSES measures identity esteem by assessing the importance social group memberships.

Subjective well being can be defined as, “a person’s cognitive and affective evaluations of his or her life” (Diener, Lucas, & Oishi, 2002, p. 63). People use these cognitive and affective evaluations to assess their levels of fulfillment and satisfaction. Studies have shown that subjective well being is a valid construct that exists separately from constructs such as self-esteem (Lucas, Diener, & Suh, 1996). Some measures of subjective well being are the Satisfaction With Life Scale (Diener, Emmons, Larson, & Griffin, 1985), the Life Satisfaction Index (Neugarten, Havighurst, & Tobin, 1961), and the Philadelphia Geriatric Center Morale Scale (Lawton, 1975).
Occasionally, the psychological well being of biracial individuals is the main focus of a study. Cooney and Radina’s (2000) study used data from a national survey to compare adjustment of multiracial adolescents (grades 7-12) to monoracial adolescents (a “white” group and a “minority” group. Previous studies looking at adjustment of multiracial individuals have been conducted using clinical samples. Two thousand and eighty-eight adolescents (non-clinical) were examined through a multivariate analyses. Control variables were adolescent age, adolescent sex, parent age, parent education, and parent marital quality. Nine dependent variables were employed: depression, delinquent behavior, substance abuse, receipt of psychological counseling, grade retention, school suspension, subject grading (school performance), school problems, and feelings towards school. In general, individuals of multiracial status were found to have more adjustment problems than their white counterparts, but similar rates when compared to minority group adolescents. The results of this study support the concern for multiracial individuals and adjustment issues. Cooney and Radina state school counselors and teachers should become more aware of the unique struggles and trials experienced by multiracial individuals. Clearly, their findings suggest multiracial education is necessary to create a multicultural community more accepting of multiracial individuals which would, in turn, increase the likelihood of biracial children/adolescents developing a positive ethnic identity.

Brown (1990) focuses on many of the barriers to achieving healthy levels of psychological well being for biracial individuals. Generally speaking, socially marginalized biracial individuals have “identity problems” because they do not fit into
socially accepted definitions of race/ethnicity (monocultural definitions). This “marginalized” position makes it difficult for the biracial individual to determine his/her status and role in the surrounding social groups and settings. Brown highlights the biracial experience of first entering school. At this point, the biracial individual is assaulted with anxiety provoking questions based on physical ambiguity such as, “What nationality are you?” and “What are you?” These questions imply that the biracial child is “not normal” and are a reflection of the inherent stereotypes infused in monoracial social constructions/settings. Bradshaw (1992) stated that multiracial individuals often experience an exaggerated emphasis on physical appearance due to the perception that they are “exotic, beautiful, or fascinating”. She believed this emphasis could lead to a devalued sense of self and a feeling of “otherness”. The identity issues biracial individuals deal with are only exacerbated due to mainstream society’s failure to acknowledge and understand the biracial experience. An increased awareness and understanding of the biracial experience is necessary to combat the stereotypes that are infused within mainstream social constructions.

Bracey et al. (2004) conducted a comparative study using biracial and monoracial adolescents. The study was conducted because of the authors’ belief that there was a dearth of research on biracial individuals. The study compared biracial and monoracial groups (N = 3282) on measures of self-esteem and ethnic identity. They also examined the relationship between self-esteem and ethnic identity for both groups. Due to the inconsistency of results in previous studies, the authors’ did not state specific hypothesis in regards to differences between the groups. Instead, their general research question was
whether or not there were significant differences between the groups on the selected variables. Bracey et al. found that there were significant differences between the groups on measures of self-esteem (e.g., biracials scores higher than Asians, but lower than Blacks) and ethnic identity (e.g., biracials scored higher than Whites, but lower than Blacks, Asians, and Latinos). They also found a relationship between ethnic identity and self-esteem for all groups (e.g., higher scores on ethnic identity were associated with higher scores on self-esteem for all groups). Bracey et al. stated that the study contributed to the literature by helping “fill in the gaps of existing literature by providing empirical data on biracial adolescents.” The study also acknowledges that ethnic identity development may be complex for biracial adolescents, yet their psychological well being does not appear to suffer as a result.

Examining the psychological well-being of biracial individuals is necessary. This area of interest is important because it focuses on outcome versus process. It is the difference between asking “Do biracial individuals turn out to be happy and well-adjusted adults?” and “How do biracial individuals turn out to be happy and well-adjusted adults?” Outcome has been given little attention in the past because it was assumed biracial individuals were not as well-adjusted as monoracial people. For this reason, psychological well-being was an important piece of the present study.

2.3 Attitudes Towards Biracial Individuals in America

As discussed in the introduction, the historical perception of biracial individuals has carried a negative valence. This negative perception developed centuries ago as a reaction to interracial children who did not fit neatly into rigid, American racial
categories. It is appropriate to view the development of these negative attitudes as a defense mechanism against a group of people who “threaten the psychological and sociological foundations of the ‘we’ and ‘they’ mentality that determines so much of an individual’s social, economic, and political experience in the United States (p. 164, Nakashima, 1992).” The prevailing racial ideology in the United States has emphasized racial absolutism – race is mutually exclusive and you must “choose”. In order to protect this philosophy from dissonance, the United States instated laws prohibiting interracial marriage and sexual relations. These federal laws came into existence in the 1600’s and were not removed from record until 1967 (Spickard, 1989). During this period of time, many theories and arguments were proposed to explain the inferiority of biracial individuals.

The two most common perspectives endorsing the inferiority of biracial individuals were biological arguments and sociological arguments (Nakashima, 1992). Many scientists asserted the idea of “hybrid degeneracy” which stated that mixed race individuals were genetically inferior to monoracial persons (Castle, 1926; Krauss, 1941). This inferiority was manifested in physical, emotional, mental, and moral weakness. Weakness in these areas was inevitable due to the genetic disharmony created by mixing races. The sociological argument was based on the idea that “people of mixed race are socially and culturally marginal, doomed to a life of conflicting cultures and the unfulfilled desire to be ‘one or the other,’ neither fitting in nor gaining acceptance in any group, thus leading lives of confused loneliness and despair (p. 165, Nakashima, 1992).” In this case, biology is not the issue. The inferiority of biracial individuals can be
attributed to their inability to successfully navigate a bicultural existence (Park, 1931; Smith, 1939).

Although these perspectives can still be identified in contemporary American society (e.g., “What about the children?; But which one are you?; It must have been tough…”), social scientists are beginning to study the positive as well as negative characteristics of the biracial experience instead of simply viewing the experience as problematic. Biracial individuals are beginning to examine and define their own experience. This movement is challenging the historical views of race in the United States.

2.4 Summary, Hypotheses, and Research Questions

To date, research on biracial individuals has focused primarily on ethnic identity formation and development (Benedetto & Olisky, 2001; Hall, 1980; Poston, 1990). The present study sought to extend the current body of research by challenging the historical emphasis on the biracial experience as negative, by attempting to identify potential “advantages” of being biracial, by examining the current perceptions of biracial people, and by soliciting a non-clinical, adult sample.

More specifically, the primary purpose of the study was to compare biracial individuals and monoracial individuals on measures of psychological well being, ethnic identity, and attitudes towards biracial people. This comparative study replicated Bracey et al.’s (2004) result (that biracial individuals generally appear to be as well adjusted as monoracial persons) and extended it by adding two more measures of psychological well being: collective self esteem and subjective well being. Similar findings were expected
for these new measures. The general research question was whether or not scores on measures of psychological well-being would differ significantly between biracial and monoracial groups. In addition, attitudes towards biracial individuals were compared. It was believed that biracial individuals were still perceived as “marginalized” in American society and that this would be reflected in monoracial individuals’ attitudes towards biracials. Conversely, it was believed that the recent push by biracial individuals to define their own experience would be reflected in more positive attitudes towards biracials. Lastly, the relationship between biracial individuals’ psychological well being and their attitudes towards biracials was examined. This study proposed that biracial individuals with more positive attitudes about the biracial demographic would have a more positive perception of their own lives and well being.

The present study formulated one general research question and three hypotheses.

• General Research Question & Hypotheses
  o Will scores on measures of ethnic identity, individual self-esteem, collective self esteem subjective well being, and attitudes toward biracial children significantly differ between biracial and monoracial groups?

• Hypotheses
  o Bracey et al.’s (2004) results on self-esteem and ethnic identity will be replicated in this study on adults.
  o When compared to monoracial individuals (Caucasian; ethnic minority groups), biracial individuals will have significantly more positive attitudes towards biracials.
A positive relationship exists between psychological well being (individual self-esteem, collective self-esteem, and subjective well being) and attitudes towards biracials for biracial individuals.
CHAPTER 3

METHOD

3.1 Participants

The participants were 304 (116 male and 188 female) self-identified adults, age 18 or over. The participants were members of various organizations (SWIRL, MAVIN Foundation, Project Race, The Multicultural Activist, YAHOO Groups found under “biracial” and “multiracial” key words, etc.) interested in race/ethnicity issues or were students enrolled in The Ohio State University’s Research Experience Program (REP). Of the 304 participants, 241 completed the online survey in its entirety. The completion rate of the survey was 79%. Only individuals who indicated their informed consent for the study were considered participants. More information on the participants is provided in Chapter 4.

3.2 Instruments

The measures used in this study consisted of a 10-item demographic questionnaire, the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure, the Collective Self-Esteem Scale, the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale, the Satisfaction With Life Scale, the Attitudes Toward Multiracial Children Scale, and the Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding. The
measures were administered in three different orders to minimize order effects. Scale order was pre-determined with the requirement being that no scale appeared in the same order twice (e.g., If a scale appeared first in one iteration, it did not appear first on the other two survey iterations). The demographic questionnaire and the consent form always appeared at the beginning of the test battery, regardless of the order of the other instruments.

3.2.1 Demographic Questionnaire

The 10-item demographic questionnaire was created specifically for this study. It asked participants to indicate their sex, age, race, birth date, U.S. state they reside in, level of education, income level, race of their mother, race of their father, and whether or not they had ever had a romantic relationship with an individual of a different race than their own.

3.2.2 Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM)

Designed by Phinney (1992), the MEIM assesses three aspects of ethnic identity that are applicable to all monoracial and multiracial people (three ethnic identity subscales). These aspects are positive Ethnic Attitudes and Sense of Belonging, Ethnic Identity Achievement, and Ethnic Behaviors and Practices. Sample items include, “I have a lot of pride in my ethnic group and its accomplishments”, “I have a clear sense of my ethnic background and what it means to me”, and “I am active in organizations or social groups that include mostly members of my own ethnic group”. The author also acknowledges the importance of self-identification. In addition, the MEIM includes an
Other Group Orientation subscale. The purpose of this subscale (separate from the ethnic identity subscales) is to assess one’s interactions with and attitudes toward ethnic groups other than the one(s) they identify with. Both total scale score and subscale scores were examined during data analysis.

The MEIM consists of 23 questions using a 4-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (4). Scores were calculated by adding the item scores and dividing by the total number of items. Total scores may range from 1 – 4, with higher total scores indicating a more realized ethnic identity. Phinney (1992) reported a Cronbach’s alpha of .81 (high school sample) and .90 (college sample) in her use of the MEIM. No validity measures were described in the development study. Reliability coefficients of .93 (total scale), .95 (Other Group Orientation subscale), .93 (Affirmation & Belonging subscale), and .86 (Ethnic Identity Achievement) were found for the sample used in this study. No reliability coefficient was calculated for the Ethnic Behaviors subscale because reliability cannot be calculated with only two items.

3.2.3 Collective Self-Esteem Scale (CSES)

Designed by Luhtanen and Crocker (1992), the CSES measures four aspects of collective self-esteem (four subscales). These aspects are membership esteem, private collective self-esteem, public collective self-esteem, and identity esteem. Sample items include, “I feel I don’t have much to offer to the groups I belong to”, “Overall, I often feel groups in which I am a member are not worthwhile”, “Overall, my groups are considered good by others”, and “The groups I belong to are an important reflection of who I am”.
Membership esteem can be described as how good of a group member one perceives him or herself to be. The CSES measures membership esteem by assessing how good or worthy individuals feel in relation to their social groups (e.g., “I feel I don’t have much to offer to the groups I belong to”). The higher membership esteem one has the more positive of a group member he perceives himself to be. Private collective self-esteem refers to how positive one perceives their social groups to be. The CSES measures private collective self-esteem by assessing one’s personal evaluations of how good their groups are (e.g., “Overall, I often feel groups in which I am a member are not worthwhile”). The higher one’s private collective self-esteem, the more positive evaluations an individual makes about his social groups. Public collective self-esteem refers to a person’s perception of how others (out-groups) evaluate one’s social groups. The CSES measures public collective self-esteem by assessing one’s judgments of how other people evaluate relevant social groups (e.g., “Overall, my groups are considered good by others”). An individual with high public collective self-esteem believes those people outside of his social groups positively evaluate his social groups. Finally, identity esteem refers to the magnitude of one’s social group affiliations to one’s self-concept. The CSES measures identity esteem by assessing the importance social group memberships (e.g., “The groups I belong to are an important reflection of who I am”). High identity esteem indicates one’s group memberships are an important part of one’s self-concept. Both total scale score and subscale scores were examined during data analysis.
The CSES consists of 16 items which are scored on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7). Scores were calculated by adding the item scores and dividing by the total number of items. Total scores may range from 1 – 7. Higher total scores indicate more realized social identity based on membership in ascribed groups (e.g., gender, race, ethnicity, etc.). Convergent validity was demonstrated with moderate correlations to ego task orientation ($r = .44$), ego task esteem ($r = .36$), and individualism-collectivism ($r = .34$) (Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992). Preliminary evidence for divergent validity was established through a negative correlation with belief in discrimination ($r = -.17$). The internal consistency reliability for the CSES was between .71 - .88, and a test-retest reliability of .68 was reported. Reliability coefficients of .84 (total scale), .71 (Membership Esteem subscale), .72 (Private Esteem subscale), .81 (Private Esteem subscale), and .75 (Identity esteem subscale) were found for the sample used in this study.

3.2.4 Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSE)

The RSE (Rosenberg, 1965) is a global and affective evaluation of one’s self worth. The RSE consists of 10 items (e.g., “I feel that I am a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with other”) which are scored on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (4). Scores were calculated by summing the item scores and obtaining a mean. Scores range from 1 – 4, with higher total scores indicating higher levels of self-esteem. Rosenberg demonstrated evidence for convergent validity, with positive correlations to the self-regard ($r = .78$) and self-confidence ($r = .51$) subscales of the Self-Rating Scale. He also established divergent validity through
negative correlations with personal adjustment \((r = -.64)\) and depression \((r = -.59)\). The internal consistency reliability for the RSE has been reported as .86. Test-retest reliability for the RSE was .85 for college students (Silber & Tippett, 1965). A reliability coefficient of .89 was found for the sample used in this study.

3.2.5 Satisfaction With Life Scale (SWLS)

The SWLS (Diener, et al., 1985) is a measure of subjective well being that focuses on an individual’s global cognitive assessments of one’s life satisfaction. The SWLS consists of five items (e.g., “In most ways my life is close to my ideal”) which are scored on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7). Scores were calculated by summing the item scores and then obtaining a mean score. Scores can range from 1 – 7 with higher total scores indicating higher levels of subjective well being (satisfaction with life). Diener et al. demonstrated concurrent validity with moderate to high correlations with other measures of well-being (a single item measure of happiness, the Self-Anchorong Ladder, Andrews and Withey’s D-T scale, Bradburn’s Positive Affect Scale, and the well-being subscale of the Differential Personality Questionnaire). The study also demonstrated discriminant validity with low correlations to emotionality \((r = -.25)\), sociability \((r = .20)\), and social desirability \((r = .02)\). Diener et al. reported a coefficient alpha of .87 and a test-retest reliability of .82. A reliability coefficient of .91 was found for the sample used in this study.
3.2.6 *Attitudes Toward Multiracial Children Scale (AMCS)*

Designed by Jackman et al. (2001), the AMCS was created to measure adults’ attitudes toward the psychosocial adjustment of multiracial children. The AMCS measures attitudes toward four aspects of psychosocial adjustment – multiracial identity, multiracial heritage, self-esteem, and psychosocial adjustment. Sample items include, “Multiracial children benefit from learning the customs of both parents’ racial backgrounds”, “Multiracial children prefer to follow the cultural practices of only one parent”, “Multiracial children have a positive image of self”, and “Multiracial children think that other children are better than they are.” Both total scale score and subscale scores were examined during data analysis.

The AMCS consists of 23 items which are scored on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from *strongly disagree* (1) to *strongly agree* (2). Scores were calculated by adding the item scores and dividing by the total number of items. Total scores may range from 1 – 5. Higher total scores indicate more positive attitudes toward multiracial children. Jackson et al. (2001) reported a Cronbach’s alphas of .87 (total sample), .88 (white participants), and .83 (for minority participants). A 3-week test-retest reliability of .77 was also reported. Reliability coefficients of .91 (total scale), .79 (Self-esteem subscale), .72 (Multiracial Heritage subscale), .69 (Multiracial Identity subscale), and .87 (Psychosocial Adjustment subscale) were found for the sample used in this study.

3.2.7 *Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding (BIDR)*

The BIDR was developed by Paulhus (1984) to measure two components of socially desirable responding – self-deception and impression management. Self-
deception is conceptualized as desirability bias through self-report that is made honestly and unconsciously (without the responder’s awareness that there is bias). Impression management is conceptualized as conscious bias in which the responder is aware that they are answering in a desirable way. Sample items include statements such as, “It’s alright with me if someone happens to dislike me” (self-deception) and “I have never dropped litter in the street” (impression management).

The BIDR consists of 40 items which are scored on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from not true (1) to very true (7). Scores for the two subscales are calculated independently of one another by summing the item scores and dividing by the total number of items. Total scores may range from 1 – 7. Higher total subscale scores indicate higher levels on unconscious and conscious desirable responding. Paulhus (1991) reported internal consistency alphas ranging from .65 to .75 for the self-deception subscale and .75 to .80 for the impression management subscale. Correlation coefficients between the subscale ranges from $r = .05$ to $r = .40$. Reliability coefficients of .75 (Self-deception scale) and .79 (Impression Management scale) were found for the sample used in this study. Both subscales were examined during data analysis.

### 3.3 Procedure

Data were obtained via on-line collection. The on-line survey and project procedures were reviewed by the Institutional Review Board (IRB). Participation in the study was voluntary, and participants were made aware of their freedom to terminate their participation at any time. Solicitation of participants was accomplished through the creation of a recruitment letter with permission to post the letter on various on-line list
serves. Solicitation was also done through The Ohio State University’s Research Experience Program (REP). Minor differences existed in procedure between participants solicited through list-serves and those solicited through REP. The solicitation letter contained the contact information of the researchers (the graduate student and advisor). It also contained a brief description of the study, a request for participation from “interested individuals aged 18 and older” and an entreaty for the recipient to forward the message to other individuals who meet the criteria.

Individuals interested in participating in the study could link directly to the online survey via the solicitation letter. This directed potential participants to the first webpage of the survey, which provided details regarding informed consent, efforts taken to ensure anonymity, and reassurance that participants could exit their web browsers and withdraw from participation at any time. REP students who were interested in the study were required to sign up through REP. After sign up, REP participants were sent the solicitation letter via email. List serve participants were given the option of entering two lottery drawings to win $50 (for incentive purposes). Participants “registered” for the lottery drawings by providing their email address. Email addresses were kept in a separate database, unattached to participants’ item responses. When data collection was complete, two email addresses were selected randomly. These participants were contacted by their provided email addresses and asked to provide a mailing address to receive their $50 prize. REP participants were not given the lottery incentive. These participants received course credit for their participation.

All participants were required to be 18 years of age or older (in order to obtain an
adult sample). Because the survey was written in English, it was also required that participants be fluent in English. Participants were required to check a box in order to consent and agree to the terms of the study. Participants were also asked to provide their year of birth on the demographic questionnaire (validity check). After completion of the survey, participants were presented with a debriefing page explaining the intentions of the study. The debriefing information included the author’s contact information, and participants were invited to contact the author with questions or to request a more detailed description of the study.

The response data were collected and maintained by a privately contracted web-manager. Although there is some risk regarding confidentiality with Internet data collection, confidentiality can be and was guaranteed once the researchers received the data. Risk was minimal in that participants were not required to provide identifying information. All information was password protected and stored on two separate computers (the contractor’s and the investigator’s). Only the contractor and investigator had access to the data.

Collecting data via the Internet has several advantages, such as obtaining a demographically diverse sample and increasing the accessibility of hard to sample populations. Conversely, this method has disadvantages, such as the increased potential for obtaining erroneous data (Schmidt, 1997). Several strategies were implemented to reduce the likelihood of erroneous data being collected and analyzed. Surveys were screened by examining the date, time, and origin of submission (Schmidt, 1997; Washington, 2003). IP addresses were also screened. All duplicate surveys were
excluded (two duplicate surveys were found). In order to control for inaccurate information and random responding, validity check items were included. Two items asking participants to indicate the race of their parents were included in check for consistent responding (one in the demographics page and one in the MEIM). In addition, an extra item was placed within the survey that instructed participants to select a specific item response.

3.4 Data Analysis

Reliability statistics for the measures in this study were obtained. Descriptive statistics were obtained for the entire sample and also for the Caucasian, monoracial minority, and biracial groups individually. Descriptive statistics for all measures (mean and standard deviation) were obtained. Correlation analyses were also conducted to examine the relationship between the measures. Four correlation analyses were conducted – one that included the entire sample and one analyses for each racial categorization (Caucasian, monoracial minority, biracial).

A one-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted to examine the relationship between race categorization (Caucasian, monoracial minority, biracial) and the measures of psychological well-being and attitudes toward biracial children. Post-hoc analysis was conducted (Tukey test analysis) to elaborate on statistically significant findings in variation between the racial categorization groups on the dependent variables.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

4.1 Descriptive Statistics

A total of 241 participants completed all the measures for this study. One-hundred &
twelve of the participants were solicited through listserves and the remaining 129 were
solicited through Ohio State University’s Research Experience Program. The breakdown
of participants based on sex, age, racial categorization, and interracial romantic
relationships is presented in Table 4.1. The participants in the study were predominantly
female (63.5%). Age was rather varied, with most respondents being between 18 – 19
years old (42.7%). The majority of respondents were 30 years old or younger (83.4%).
Race was broken down into three categories: Caucasian-Americans, Monoracial
Minority-Americans, and Biracial-Americans. The largest group of respondents was
Caucasian-Americans ($n = 145; 60\%$), followed by Monoracial Minority-Americans ($n =
53; 22\%$), then Biracial-Americans ($n = 43; 18\%$). Also, the majority of participants
reported no past or present romantic relationships with members of another race (62.2%).
Since some biracial individuals self-identify at monoracial, this question was also
applicable to biracial participants.
Table 4.1: Breakdown of Participants Based on Sex, Age, Racial Categorization, and Interracial Romantic Relationships.

A breakdown of the Caucasian-American participants based on sex, age, and interracial romantic relationships is presented in Table 4.2. The Caucasian participants were predominately female (n = 86; 59.3%). The majority of Caucasian respondents were 18 – 19 years-old (n = 79; 54.5%). Also, most Caucasian respondents reported never having a romantic relationship with a member of another race (n = 112; 77.2%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>63.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 – 19</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 – 30</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 and older</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Categorization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monoracial Minority</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biracial</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interracial Romantic Relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>62.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2: Breakdown of Caucasian-American Participants.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>59.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 – 19</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 – 30</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 and older</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interracial Romantic Relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>77.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2: Breakdown of Caucasian Participants Based on Sex, Age, and Interracial Romantic Relationships.

A breakdown of the monoracial Minority-American participants based on sex, age, and interracial romantic relationships is presented in Table 4.3. The monoracial minority participants were predominately female ($n = 39$; 73.6%). The majority of monoracial minority respondents were 20 – 30 years-old ($n = 26$; 49.1%). Also, approximately half of all monoracial minority respondents reported interracial romantic relationships ($n = 27$; 50.9%).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>73.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 – 19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 – 30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 and older</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interracial Romantic Relationship</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>50.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3: Breakdown of Monoracial Minority Participants Based on Sex, Age, and Interracial Romantic Relationships.

A breakdown of the Biracial-American participants based on sex, age, and interracial romantic relationships is presented in Table 4.4. The biracial participants were predominately female (n = 28; 65.1%). The majority of biracial respondents were 20 – 30 years-old (n = 26; 60.5%). Also, the majority of biracial participants reported having an interracial romantic relationship (n = 31; 72.1%).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>65.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 – 19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 – 30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>60.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 and older</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interracial Romantic Relationship</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>72.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4: Breakdown of Biracial Participants Based on Sex, Age, and Interracial Romantic Relationships.

Descriptive statistics for all measures (total scores and subscale scores) and age are presented in Table 4.5. Mean scores on the *Multiethnic Identity Measure* (total score and subscales), the *Collective Self-Esteem Scale* (total score and subscales), the *Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale*, the *Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding* (Self Deception subscale), and the *Attitudes Toward Multiracial Children Scale* (total score and subscales) are higher than the actual midpoints of the scales. Mean scores on the *Satisfaction With Life Scale* and the *Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding* (Impression Management subscale) fall near the actual midpoints of their respective scales.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiethnic Identity Measure - Total</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiethnic Identity Measure – Affirmation and Belonging</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiethnic Identity Measure – Ethnic Identity Achievement</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiethnic Identity Measure – Ethnic Behaviors</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiethnic Identity Measure – Other-group Orientation</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective Self-Esteem Scale - Total</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective Self-Esteem Scale – Membership Esteem</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective Self-Esteem Scale – Private Esteem</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective Self-Esteem Scale – Public Esteem</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective Self-Esteem Scale – Identity Esteem</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5: Descriptive Statistics for Measures and Age.
Table 4.5 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with Life Scale</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding – Self Deception</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding – Impression Management</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes Toward Multiracial Children Scale – Total</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes Toward Multiracial Children Scale – Multiracial Identity</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes Toward Multiracial Children Scale – Multiracial Heritage</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes Toward Multiracial Children Scale – Psychosocial Adjustment</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes Toward Multiracial Children Scale – Self-Esteem</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>24.84</td>
<td>10.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=241

4.2 Correlations

A 19x19 correlation matrix was created that examined all the measures for a total of 361 combinations. Type I error is a possibility due to the high number of correlations. Due to the high number of correlations (284 statistically significant correlations), only the correlations directly related to the hypotheses (A positive relationship exists
between psychological well being and attitudes towards biracials for biracial individuals) will be reported. Significance at the .05 level is most likely meaningful due to the relatively small biracial sample size ($N=43$).

Numerous correlations (31 significant correlations) were found when examining the biracial sample between measures of psychological well being (ethnic identity, individual self-esteem, collective self-esteem, and subjective well-being) and the Attitudes Toward Multiracial Children Scale. Most of these correlations supported the hypothesis that a positive relationship exists between psychological well being and attitudes towards biracials for biracial individuals. These correlations are described below.

### 4.2.1 Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM) and the Attitudes Toward Multiracial Children Scale (AMCS)

Eleven significant correlations were found between the MEIM and the AMCS (total scale and subscales) for biracial individuals. The MEIM Total scale was moderately correlated with the AMCS Total scale ($r=.34$, $p<.05$) and the AMCS Self-Esteem subscale ($r=.39$, $p<.05$). The MEIM Affirmation & Belonging subscale was moderately correlated with the AMCS Total scale ($r=.41$, $p<.01$), the AMCS Self-Esteem subscale ($p=.40$, $p<.01$), the AMCS Ethnic Identity subscale ($r=.32$, $p<.05$), and the AMCS Adjustment subscale ($r=.33$, $p<.05$). The MEIM Ethnic Identity Achievement subscale was moderately correlated with the AMCS Total scale ($r=.31$, $p<.05$) and the AMCS Self-Esteem subscale ($r=.40$, $p<.01$). Lastly, the MEIM Other Group Orientation subscale was moderately correlated with the AMCS Total scale.
(r=.41, p<.01), the AMCS Self-Esteem subscale (r=.36, p<.01), and the AMCS Adjustment subscale (r=.40, p<.01).

4.2.2 Collective Self-Esteem Scale (CSE) and the AMCS

Nine significant correlations were found when examining the relationship between the CSE and the AMCS (total scale and subscales) for biracial individuals. The CSE Total scale was moderately correlated with the AMCS Self-Esteem subscale (r=.33, p<.05) and the AMCS Heritage subscale (r=.36, p<.05). The CSE Membership Self-Esteem subscale was moderately correlated with the AMCS Total scale (r=.35, p<.05), the AMCS Self-Esteem subscale (r=.32, p<.05), and the AMCS Heritage subscale (r=.39, p<.05). The CSE Private Self-Esteem subscale was moderately correlated with the AMCS Heritage subscale (r=.31, p<.05). The CSE Public Self-Esteem subscale was moderately correlated with the AMCS Total scale (r=.31, p<.05) and the AMCS Identity subscale (r=.40, p<.01). Lastly, the CSE Identity Self-Esteem subscale was moderately correlated with the AMCS Adjustment subscale (r=-.32, p<.05). This was the only significant negative correlation found between the psychological well-being measures and the AMCS measure.

4.2.3 Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSE) and the AMCS

Four significant correlations were found between the RSE and the AMCS (total scale and subscales) for biracial individuals. The RSE scale was moderately correlated with the AMCS Total scale (r=.40, p<.01), the AMCS Self-Esteem subscale (r=.38,
4.2.4 Satisfaction With Life Scale (SWLS) and the AMCS

Four significant correlations were found between the SWLS and the AMCS (total scale and subscales) for biracial individuals. The SWLS scale was moderately correlated with the AMCS Total scale ($r = .42, p < .01$), the AMCS Self-Esteem subscale ($r = .39, p < .05$), and the AMCS Adjustment subscale ($r = .42, p < .01$). A small correlation was found between the SWLS and the AMCS Identity subscale ($r = .27, p < .05$).

4.2.5 Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding (BIDR) and the AMCS

Four significant correlations were found between the BIDR and the AMCS (total scale and subscales) for biracial individuals. The BIDR Self Deception subscale was moderately correlated with the AMCS Total scale ($r = .43, p < .01$), the AMCS Self-Esteem subscale ($r = .36, p < .05$), the AMCS Heritage subscale ($r = .35, p < .05$), and the AMCS Adjustment subscale ($r = .42, p < .01$).

4.3 MANOVA

A one-way MANOVA was conducted to examine the relationship between one multi-level independent variable (race) and multiple dependent variables of psychological well-being and attitudes toward biracial children. The multivariate test indicated the presence of significant associations between the race classifications and the dependent measures, $F(32, 446) = 4.68, p < .01$. Examination of between-subjects effects indicated significant variance in dependent measure scores based on race (monoracial majority,
monoracial minority, biracial). Significant variance was found in eight out of 19 measures (including subscales) – MEIM Total, MEIM Affirmation & Belonging, MEIM Identity Achievement, MEIM Behaviors, MEIM Other Group Orientation, CSE Public Self-esteem, CSE Identity, and SWLS.

Tukey post hoc analyses of these measures revealed that biracials scored significantly higher ($M = 3.02$) than monoracial minorities ($M = 2.60$) and whites ($M = 2.25$) on the MEIM Total scale, with monoracial minorities also scoring significantly higher than whites on the scale. Biracials also scored significantly higher ($M = 3.11$) than monoracial minorities ($M = 2.57$) and whites ($M = 2.06$) on the MEIM Affirmation & Belonging subscale, with monoracial minorities scoring significantly higher than whites. On the MEIM Identity Achievement subscale, biracials scored significantly higher ($M = 3.05$) than monoracial minorities ($M = 2.62$) and whites ($M = 2.39$). On the MEIM Behaviors subscale, both biracials ($M = 2.66$) and monoracial minorities ($M = 2.61$) scored significantly higher than whites ($M = 2.24$). On the MEIM Other Group Orientation subscale, biracials scored significantly higher ($M = 3.43$) than monoracial minorities ($M = 2.39$) and whites ($M = 2.06$).

In addition to the MEIM and its subscales, significant variance in scores based on race was found for the CSE Public Self-esteem subscale, the CSE Identity subscale, and SWLS. For the CSE Public Self-esteem subscale, whites scored significantly higher ($M = 5.54$) than monoracial minorities ($M = 4.87$) and biracials ($M = 4.98$). For the CSE Identity subscale, monoracial minorities scored significantly higher ($M = 5.03$) than whites ($M = 4.47$), with no significant difference between biracials ($M = 4.76$) and whites.
or monoracial minorities. Lastly, biracials scored significantly higher ($M = 4.96$) than monoracial minorities ($M = 3.97$) and whites ($M = 3.22$), with monoracial minorities also scoring significantly higher than whites on the SWLS.
The present study compared biracial individuals and monoracial individuals on measures of psychological well-being, ethnic identity, and attitudes towards biracial people. This study extended previous work by challenging the historical emphasis of the biracial experience as negative, by attempting to identify potential “advantages” of being biracial, and by examining the current perceptions of biracial people. The study also improved upon previous work by soliciting a non-clinical, adult sample and by categorizing participants by the reported race of their parents instead of relying solely on self-assigned labels.

5.1 General Research Question

Addressing the general research question before the specific hypotheses, results indicated that there were significant differences in ethnic identity, collective self-esteem, and one’s satisfaction with life between the biracial and monoracial groups. Findings indicated that biracial adults have a more realized ethnic identity than monoracial adults and monoracial minorities have a more realized ethnic identity than Whites. This finding is consistent with past research (Martinez & Dukes, 1997) which has found that minority
groups have more realized ethnic identity than Whites. The belief is that self-reflection and exploration around identity and race is more salient for people of color than it is for Whites (due to sociological realities such as White Privilege).

More interesting is the finding that biracial individuals have a more realized ethnic identity than that of monoracial minorities. This runs contradictory to Bracey et al.’s (2004) finding that monoracial minorities have a more realized ethnic identity than biracials. An important difference between the two studies is that Bracey et al. examined adolescents (Age: $M = 15.6$) and the present study examined adults (Age: $M = 24.8$). Bracey et al. speculated that biracial adolescents’ may explore their ethnic identity more than their white peers, but less than their monoracial minority peers. Bracey et al. also speculated that biracials may encounter more exploration difficulties such as “confusion, less commitment, or inconsistency in their feelings about ethnicity” which lead to lower scores. These ideas can be reflected on from a developmental perspective. Developmentally, although level of identity exploration may be similar, monoracial minorities may resolve struggles and conflicts with identity more quickly than biracial adolescents. Given the additional complexities involved with a multiracial identity, this interpretation rings true. It looks as if it may take longer for biracial individuals to “successfully” navigate self-identity. So what do we make of the present study’s finding that biracial adults have a more realized ethnic identity than monoracial minority adults?

Again, reflecting on potential developmental differences seems most informative. If you combine the findings from Bracey et al. and the present study, it appears that biracials developmentally “pass by” monoracial minorities when considering ethnic
identity. This finding may be present for the very same reason biracial adolescents were found to have a less realized ethnic identity: increased complexity. More specifically, the increased complexities of ethnic identity for multiracial people may elongate the developmental process, but it may also take multiracial people to “deeper” levels of exploration and discovery. This deeper level of exploration explains why the biracial adults in the study have a more realized ethnic identity than the monoracial minority adults – additional complexity leads to additional understanding and awareness. This would also explain why the biracial adults who participated in the study scored as high as or higher than the monoracial minority group on the MEIM subscales as well.

These findings are exciting and important because they support the speculation that identity development for biracials may mirror language development for bilingual individuals. Research on bilingual individuals discovered that they were developmentally “delayed” early on compared to their monolingual counterparts, but that their language skills surpassed monolinguals later in development. The possibility of a similar developmental course has been discussed for biracials and ethnic identity. The results of the present study indicate that this may be the case. It supports the view and begs for further exploration.

As mentioned above, there were also significant racial differences found when examining collective self-esteem and satisfaction with one’s life. Findings indicated that although all three groups exhibited positive esteem, White adults perceived the groups that they identified with as being more positively viewed by others (outgroups) than did biracials or monoracial minorities. There was no significant difference between biracial
and monoracial minorities. One could speculate that this difference surfaces because of race. Arguably, all three groups in the sample are equally distributed across identifying groups such as religious affiliation, class, education level, sexual orientation, sex, etc. Moreover, while biracial and monoracial minorities can share the identifying groups “person of color” or “ethnic minority”, Whites are restricted from this identification. It is common knowledge that there is more of a negative valance for perception of ethnic minority groups as compared to Whites in the United States. People of color are aware of the negative attitudes towards their groups and this may be reflected in the found results.

Another finding related to collective self-esteem was that group affiliations were more important to self-concept for monoracial minorities than they were for Whites. As discussed earlier, ethnic minorities appear to be more salient of the impact of their race/ethnicity on their lives than Whites. It is possible this awareness may lead monoracial minorities to think more about the importance of the groups they identify with than Whites. Confusing the matter is the finding that biracial adults did not significantly differ from monoracial minorities or Whites in respect to the importance of their group affiliations to self-concept. This “middle ground” finding is confusing because biracials and monoracial minorities in the study both reported significant difference from Whites on the matter of ethnic identity. Is this an indication that some of the biracial adults in the study mirrored their monoracial minority counterparts, and that others mirrored their white counterparts on this matter? If so, it may indicate multiple developmental courses for biracial individuals.
Lastly, the results of the study indicated that biracials were more satisfied with their lives than monoracial minorities and Whites, and that monoracial minorities were more satisfied with their lives than Whites. In fact, the White participants were slightly under the midpoint of the scale used with both biracial participants and monoracial minority participants being above the actual midpoint. Direct interpretations of this result are not clear. Why would there be differences in the three groups’ cognitive and affective evaluations of their lives?

To summarize, the general research question has been successfully examined, and the findings do not support the perpetuated stereotype or the historical theories that biracial individuals are less psychologically healthy than their monoracial counterparts. In fact, some potential “strengths” were uncovered. It appears biracial adults may have more fully realized ethnic identities than their monoracial counterparts. The findings of the present study suggest that biracial individuals may have a more nuanced understanding of how race and ethnicity affect their experience. This understanding could also mean they have more awareness of how race and ethnicity affect the world around them. The present study is further evidence against the long held belief that biracial people are maladjusted and suffering from some sort of biological and/or sociological deficit.

5.2 Specific Hypotheses

Three hypotheses were formulated for exploration. The first was that the present study would replicate the results of the Bracey et al. (2004) study. More specifically, biracial individuals would be found to be as psychologically well adjusted as monoracial
persons. The results supported this hypothesis with no reservations. Although there were some differences found between monoracials and biracials, most of these differences were actually to the advantage of biracials instead of vice-versa. Traditional beliefs about the biracial experience must continue to be challenged. This study adds to the body of research which refutes the negative stereotypes against biracial individuals developed through a history of racism and monoracial bias.

The second hypothesis stated that biracial individuals would have more positive attitudes towards biracials than would monoracial individuals. This hypothesis was not supported. No significant difference in attitudes towards biracials was found between the three comparison groups. All three groups expressed generally positive attitudes towards biracials as indicated by scores above the midpoint on the AMCS (both total scale and subscales). This result comes as somewhat of a surprise, and there are various interpretations. It is possible that social desirability was a factor (monoracial participants recognizing that they should respond positively to statements about biracial persons), but this seems unlikely due to the correlations found between the BIDR and the AMCS across the three groups. For monoracial minorities, there was no relationship between scores on the BIDR and the AMCS. For Whites, there was only a small positive correlation between their AMCS total scores and impression management (conscious bias in which the responder is aware that they are answering in a desirable way). For biracial participants, there was a moderate positive correlation between their AMCS total scores and self-deception (bias through self-report that is made honestly and unconsciously; without the responder’s awareness that there is bias). This does not support the
speculation that monoracial minorities and Whites consciously or unconsciously elevated their attitudes towards biracials. It does indicate that on an unconscious level, it is important for biracial individuals to think positively of themselves and biracials in general. This finding is not surprising. In most cases, people think positively about the group they identify with, or at the very least, will protect their self-esteem by expressing positive attitudes towards the group in question. So, this finding may have more important implications. Support for the null hypothesis would suggest that monoracial individuals may have more positive attitudes towards biracials than they did in the past. This may be an indication that the historical racism and negative bias against biracial persons is diminishing. If this interpretation is correct, it is most encouraging.

The third and last hypothesis stated that biracial persons who were psychologically “well” (as indicated by higher scores on measures of psychological well-being) would have more positive attitudes towards biracials. The results found in the present study support the hypothesis. Moderate positive correlations were found between biracial participants’ attitudes towards biracials and measures of psychological well-being. More specifically, positive relationships were found between attitudes towards biracials and ethnic identity, individual self-esteem, satisfaction with life, and certain aspects of collective self-esteem (member esteem and public esteem). This finding is not surprising – positive relationships between the constructs have been reported for monoracial individuals in past studies (Brouillard & Hartlaub, 2005; Renee & Ponterotto, 1997; Yuh, 2005).
To summarize, the data provided confirmatory support for the first and third hypotheses. Together, the three hypotheses provide us with more information on the biracial experience. Three of the most important interpretations are:

1. Biracial individuals are as psychologically adjusted as monoracial individuals.
2. The negative bias towards biracials from monoracial persons may be weakening.
3. As with monoracial individuals, there is a positive relationship between psychological well-being and one’s attitudes toward their identified racial/ethnic group.

Future research should be conducted that attempts to replicate these results. More studies that focus on comparative analysis between monoracial individuals and biracial individuals are recommended.

5.3 Other Findings of Interest – Correlational Findings

The correlational data were examined and numerous interesting findings were found. Generally speaking, the correlational data indicated differences in the relationship between constructs depending on the racial categorization. One of the most interesting differences in the correlational data appeared when examining the relationship between ethnic identity and attitudes towards multiracial individuals (the MEIM and the AMCS). For biracial individuals, several significant positive correlations were found between the MEIM and the AMCS, and their respective subscales. These positive correlations indicated that a more realized ethnic identity for biracial individuals related to more positive attitudes towards multiracial individuals. It is important to highlight this relationship because it was not found for Whites or the monoracial minorities group.
For Whites, a clear pattern emerged. A positive correlation was found for the MEIM Other-group Orientation subscale and all iterations for the AMCS (the total scale and each subscale). To review, the MEIM Other-group Orientation subscale is intended to measure an individual’s attitudes towards and interactions with people from different ethnic groups than the one(s) they identify with. Knowing this, the relationship makes sense. Whites who tend to have more negative attitudes towards people ethnically different than themselves also tend to have more negative opinions of multiracial individuals. One plausible explanation is that White Privilege plays an important role in the relationship. In the U.S., Whites are afforded certain systemic advantages such as having more say in whether or not they are exposed to different ethnicities. People of color do not have the same choice – they must exist within the majority culture and are exposed to environments that are dominated by Whites. This systemic “advantage” may play out as a disadvantage for Whites, meaning their minimized exposure to other ethnic groups may make them more likely to develop guarded and/or relatively negative attitudes towards multiethnic environments and interactions. So, the negative relationship between the MEIM Other-group Orientation subscale and the AMCS is not found for people of color because more exposure to and substantial interpersonal interactions with those that are ethnically different from themselves is more likely. This interpretation is indirectly supported by demographic information collected. Participants in the study were asked to indicate whether or not they have been involved in a romantic interracial relationship. White participants (22.8%) were far less likely than monoracial minorities (50.9%) and biracial participants (72.1%) to indicate being romantically
involved with someone they perceived as being racially different from themselves. This is one example of comparatively less exposure by Whites to substantial interpersonal interactions with people different from themselves when compared to people of color.

For monoracial minorities, The AMCS Heritage and Identity subscales are highlighted. Although no significant correlation was found between the MEIM and the AMCS total score, a negative correlation was found between the MEIM total score and two AMCS subscales – AMCS Heritage and Identity. The AMCS Heritage subscale measures an individual’s attitude regarding whether or not multiracial persons have and can develop a sense of their multiracial heritage (and whether or not it is important). The AMCS Identity subscale measures an individual’s attitude regarding whether or not a multiracial person can develop a healthy multiracial identity. So, monoracial minorities who have more realized ethnic identities tend to also have more negative attitudes towards multiracial heritage and multiracial identity. One possible interpretation of this finding is that monoracial minority Americans have invested in the “oneness” of their ethnic group – they perceive their group as unique and distinct from any other group. Multiracial heritage and identity threaten this uniqueness, this oneness. This would explain why their attitudes are more negative towards heritage and identity, but not a multiracial individual’s ability to achieve high self-esteem or adjust and develop in a healthy manner (the other two subscales). Self-esteem and adjustment are treated as constructs less affected by one’s heritage and identity.
5.4 Limitations

As with most methodologies, there are certain limitations that should be addressed with the present study. Although web-based surveys are becoming more accepted, there are still concerns about their implementation. A commonly cited disadvantage of web-based surveys is loss of control by the experimenter. There is no doubt that a researcher limits his control of a web-based survey compared to an onsite “paper & pencil” survey. The present study sacrificed “on site” control for greater ability to solicit a diverse range of participants. This was considered a reasonable compromise, because as the internet expands and becomes increasingly complex, it allows experimenters to maintain more control than in the past. Communication between researcher and participant is easier than ever, and savvy entrepreneurs are developing “fee for survey” businesses that simplify the creation and maintenance of web-based surveys.

Also, the integrity of data collected via online method is often treated with additional scrutiny. Potential problems such as data security, multiple submissions, improper coding, and incomplete responses are often cited. Unquestionably, these are valid concerns. These concerns have led to and continue to motivate the development of online methodologies which address the difficulties. Web-based surveys have never been as secure and reliable as they are today. As mentioned in the Methods section, several strategies were implemented in the present study to reduce the likelihood of erroneous data being collected and analyzed (screening methods involving IP addresses, date, time, and validity check items). These strategies increase confidence in data collected via online survey and make the compromise reasonable.
Another potential limitation is the relatively small sample size \( (N = 241) \). While the total number of participants appears ideal, the number of minority participants, both monoracial \( (N = 53) \) and biracial \( (N = 43) \), was limited. Soliciting people of color for research projects is often difficult, especially when referring to biracial individuals. This difficulty arises due to large variations in the size of the target populations – the smaller the target population, the more difficult it is to obtain an equal number of participants for that population. At this time, the only consistently effective strategy for obtaining ideal sample sizes from small target populations is to minimize time restrictions on the data collection process. For example, spending two years collecting data as opposed to one year will guarantee more satisfactory sample numbers.

Lastly, generalizing the results of the present study should be done with caution. Due to the online format, participation was limited to those with access to a computer with web-browsing capabilities. One must assume that individuals of lower socio-economic status (SES) would have less opportunity to participate in the study because of less access to computers. Interestingly, demographic information collected for the present study indicated that 52.7% of the sample made less than $12,000 a year. This would suggest that even individuals with low SES had a reasonable chance of participating. Of course, 67.6% of participants reported having “some college” experience. Although one cannot speculate that all of these participants are currently in college, a large number most likely are. This would explain why such a large proportion of the sample reported being of low SES and yet they still had access to a computer. Another interpretation is that people of low SES have more access to computers than in
the past. It is a fact that many state and federal funded public facilities now include computers with internet access (such as libraries and recreation centers). One must also be mindful that individuals who participate in this type of study may be more interested in issues concerning ethnicity and race than other people. Although there is no way to prove that the sample was more interested in the research topic than non-participants, the question of participant interest is often a concern for researchers.

5.5 Conclusion and Future Directions

Despite the limitations of the study, significant results were obtained. The purpose of the study was to compare biracial individuals to monoracial individuals on measures of psychological well being, ethnic identity, and attitudes towards biracial people. In doing so, specific questions were formulated for examination - the general research question was answered, and two out of the three hypotheses were supported by the data. The findings of the current study expand the literature by further breaking down the traditional biases held towards biracial individuals – that they are not as psychologically healthy/adjusted as their monoracial peers. The contribution is unique and an extension of Bracey et al.’s (2004) results because it provides quantitative data for a biracial adult non-clinical sample. This is the first known study to compare biracial individuals and monoracial individuals on measures of psychological well being using an adult non-clinical sample. It suggests that while biracial children may have unique developmental challenges, as adults they do not end up worse off than their monoracial counterparts. More research should focus on biracial adults. “Adulthood” is the endpoint for many developmental processes such as ethnic identity and general self-concept.
Exploring differences and similarities between biracial and monoracial adults helps us answer the question, “Regardless of the unique challenges growing up biracial, how do they compare as adults?”

Results from the study also allude to the possibility of certain advantages for biracial adults. Higher scores than their monoracial peers on the ethnic identity measure and the life satisfaction measure point to potential “strengths” that develop through the biracial developmental process. At least, this study sends the message that biracial individuals should not be studied with a deficit perspective in mind – assume a null hypothesis viewpoint and explore any potential difference from there. The finding that ethnic identity may mirror the bilingual developmental course (bilingual children developmentally behind their monoracial peers early on, then “pass” them later in life) begs further research.

The study also expands the literature by being the first known study to compare monoracial and biracial individuals’ attitudes towards multiracial people. Surprisingly, no significant differences in attitudes were found. While this is encouraging, it is also questionable. Future studies should use larger and more representative samples to examine attitudes towards multiracial individuals. They should also explore what, if anything, lowers or bolsters attitudes for a particular group. For example, the current study found that Whites who had more negative attitudes towards ethnic groups they did not identify with also had more negative attitudes towards multiracial individuals. What other factors could influence attitudes towards multiracial individuals? Another interesting question that begs examination is, “What do biracial people believe about
monoracial people’s attitudes towards them?” More generally, “What are biracial individuals’ perceptions and attitudes towards their monoracial counterparts?”

This study brings more insight into biracial individuals and the biracial experience. It should help mental health professionals better understand that while the challenges growing up are unique, biracial adult clients are likely to be as happy and well-adjusted as their monoracial counterparts. Clinicians should breathe a sigh of relief—biracial individuals can and do navigate the challenges in their lives as successfully as monoracial individuals. This interpretation applies to those people demographically similar to the present study’s sample; primarily, individuals with some degree of post-secondary education. Mental health professionals often focus on positive change, so this is important. Related to change, clinicians can explore their attitudes towards people of mixed race, as well as their assumptions and biases. This study suggests that monoracial individuals generally have positive attitudes towards people of mixed race. While this may be true, it is important to recognize as a clinician that biracial individuals still face developmental challenges due to the U.S.’s long held, rigid conceptualization of race. Mental health professionals must understand the historical context in order to appreciate any defensiveness their mixed race clients may have around discussions of identity. Clinicians should pay special attention to literature on mixed race individuals. This is a new area of study and every piece of research provides us with more answers (and questions) at this time. As the mixed race population continues to grow, clinicians will be increasingly likely to encounter them in counseling. Just as straight clinicians are
beginning to grasp the nuances of work with gay clients, monoracial clinicians need to approach and advance their knowledge of mixed race clients.
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APPENDIX A

SURVEY SOLICITATION LETTER
Looking for Interested Individuals!!

Hello all,

My name is Peter Adams, and I am a graduate student in the Counseling Psychology Ph.D. Program in the Department of Psychology at The Ohio State University. Along with my advisor, Pam Highlen, I am conducting a research study on monoracial (parents of same race) and biracial individuals (parents of two different races) and I am looking for interested individuals to participate in my online survey. The requirements for the study are that you are 18 years of age or older, and that you speak and read English fluently.

The general purpose of this study is to better understand the psychological well-being and ethnic identity of monoracial and biracial adults. In addition, the study seeks to examine people’s perceptions of biracial children. By participating and sharing your experiences, you will be contributing invaluable information that will lead to a better understanding of race dynamics in the United States.

If you choose to participate in this study, please click on the link below. The survey will take approximately 15 – 30 minutes to complete. If you choose to participate, you will have the option to enter two lottery drawings in which individuals will win $50 giftcards. The only requirement for entering the lottery is that you complete the survey and provide your e-mail address. After completing the survey, you will be asked to enter your e-mail address if you would like to participate in the lottery drawing. You are only required to provide this information if you choose to enter the drawing.

Due to the nature of Internet research, the security of the survey data during transmission cannot be guaranteed; however, you are not required to submit any identifying information. If you choose to enter your email address for the lottery, this information will be collected separately and will not be connected to your survey responses. Security is guaranteed once the researchers receive the survey data. Your responses will be kept strictly confidential and only I will have access to your results. If you would like further information about this study, please do not hesitate to contact me at adams.482@osu.edu. You may also contact my advisor Dr. Pamela Highlen at highlen.1@osu.edu.

The methods of this research and the plan for protection of rights of participants have been reviewed and approved by the Office of Responsible Research Practices (http://www.orrp.ohio-state.edu/), which oversees all research activities conducted at The Ohio State University. This plan received Institutional Review Board approval on 09/19/06.

Please feel free to forward this email and link to other individuals who may be interested in participating.

If you have read this email and would like to take the survey, please click on the URL below: http://www.adams-survey.com/

Thanks for your time and participation!

Sincerely,
Peter J. Adams, M.A.
APPENDIX B

REP SOLICITATION LETTER
Looking for Interested Individuals!!!

Hello all,

My name is Peter Adams, and I am a graduate student in the Counseling Psychology Ph.D. Program in the Department of Psychology at The Ohio State University. Along with my advisor, Pam Highlen, I am conducting a research study on monoracial (parents of same race) and biracial individuals (parents of two different races) and I am looking for interested individuals to participate in my online survey. The requirements for the study are that you are 18 years of age or older, and that you speak and read English fluently.

The general purpose of this study is to better understand the psychological well-being and ethnic identity of monoracial and biracial adults. In addition, the study seeks to examine people’s perceptions of biracial children. By participating and sharing your experiences, you will be contributing invaluable information that will lead to a better understanding of race dynamics in the United States.

If you choose to participate in this study, please sign up through REP. I will then contact you via email with further instructions. The survey will take approximately 15 – 30 minutes to complete and you will receive one hour of REP credit.

Due to the nature of Internet research, the security of the survey data during transmission cannot be guaranteed; however, you are not required to submit any identifying information. Security is guaranteed once the researchers receive the survey data. Your responses will be kept strictly confidential and only I will have access to your results. If you would like further information about this study, please do not hesitate to contact me at adams.482@osu.edu. You may also contact my advisor Dr. Pamela Highlen at highlen.1@osu.edu.

The methods of this research and the plan for protection of rights of participants have been reviewed and approved by the Office of Responsible Research Practices (http://www.orrp.ohio-state.edu/), which oversees all research activities conducted at The Ohio State University. This plan received Institutional Review Board approval on 09/19/06.

Please feel free to inform other REP individuals who may be interested in participating.

Thanks for your time and participation!

Sincerely,

Peter J. Adams, M.A.
APPENDIX C

DEBRIEFING STATEMENT
Thank you for participating in the study!

Historically, biracial individuals have often been thought of as “marginal” people. Biracial individuals are often considered to be at a disadvantage when considering identity development and general well-being because of their mixed racial background. Being a biracial individual myself, I am more interested in exploring the entire biracial experience, not just its’ disadvantages. Surely, there are advantages?

Being biracial in this day and age is an experience full of questions and fuzzy answers. We are currently in a stage of validating our existence to those who do not really understand it. Ultimately, it is my intention to study biracial individuals and provide a confident answer for the question, “Are there experiences and/or trends unique to biracial individuals?”

The purpose of this study is to examine the biracial experience and to extend past research by providing meaningful quantitative data on this population. This project is examining potential differences and similarities between monoracials and biracials on constructs such as psychological well-being and ethnic identity. It is also examining Americans current attitudes towards biracial individuals.

If you would like more information on my study, if you would like to have an intelligent conversation about being biracial, or if you just have some general question, please email me at adams.482@osu.edu

Once again, thank you for participating. Feel free to submit your email address to enter the raffles. Just type in your address and hit the “submit” button.

Much Thanks,

Peter Adams, M.A.
The Ohio State University
APPENDIX D

SURVEY INTRODUCTION
Hello Participant,

These questionnaires ask you questions about psychological well-being, ethnic identity, and attitudes towards biracial individuals (parents of two different races).

Although the confidentiality of on-line responses cannot be guaranteed, no identifying information is required. Furthermore, your responses will be kept strictly confidential once the researchers receive the data.

*** Please answer all items in the survey ***

*** Please answer all items honestly ***

By completing this survey completely and honestly you will be contributing to much needed knowledge about monoracial and biracial individuals.

If you would like to discontinue your participation in this survey, you may close your browser window to exit the survey.

Thanks for your participation!
APPENDIX E

CONSENT FOR PARTICIPATION
The Ohio State University Consent to Participation in Research

Protocol title: Survey of Psychological Well-being, Ethnic Identity, & Perception

Protocol number: 2006E0621

Principal Investigator: Dr. Pamela Highlen

I consent to my participation in research being conducted by Peter Adams and Pamela Highlen of The Ohio State University.

The investigators have explained the purpose of the study, the procedures that will be followed, and the amount of time it will take. The researchers have also explained the possible risks (e.g., confidentiality cannot be guaranteed on-line) and benefits (e.g., valuable information regarding race/ethnic dynamics in the United States) of my participation.

Furthermore, I understand that I may refuse to participate in this study without penalty or loss of benefits to which I am otherwise entitled. I am free to withdraw consent at any time and to discontinue participation in the study without prejudice to me. By checking the “Yes, I consent.” Button at the bottom of this page, you do not give up any personal legal rights you may have as a participant in this study.

Finally, I acknowledge that I have read and fully understand the consent form. I am aware that I am being asked to participate in a research study. I have had the opportunity to ask questions and have had them answered to my satisfaction. I can contact the investigators at adams.482@osu.edu or highlen.1@osu.edu at any point with questions/concern. I voluntarily agree to participate in this study.

For questions about my rights as a participant in this study or to discuss other study-related concern or complaints with someone who is not part of the research team, I may contact Ms. Sandra Meadows in the Office of Responsible Research Practices at 1-800-678-6251.

If you agree with the above please indicate your agreement by checking “Yes, I consent” to continue with the study.
APPENDIX F

DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE
Please provide the following information by filling in the blank or checking the appropriate response(s). If you do not feel comfortable providing any of these details, leave the space blank.

For the purposes of this study, **race** specifically refers to an individual’s bloodline. **Ethnicity** refers to one’s identity based on a combination of one’s race, language, and culture. Therefore, it is possible for biracial individuals to claim one ethnicity if you feel that most accurately describes your identity (e.g. “Even though I’m Black/White, I often think of myself as Black and my culture is an Afro-American culture.”).

When answering questions related to ethnic groups, answer the questions based on how **you ethnically identify yourself**.

What is your age? __________

What is your race(s)? (Include more than 1 if applicable) __________

What is your sex?
___ Female
___ Male
___ Other: __________

What is your year of birth? ________

Which state do you reside in? ________

Have you or are you in a romantic relationship with someone of a different race? ______

What is your current education experience?
___ Non-high school graduate
___ High school graduate
___ Some college experience
___ College graduate
___ Graduate/Professional School

What is your socioeconomic status (annual income)?
___ Below $12,000
___ $12,001 - $25,000
___ $25,001 - $40,000
___ $40,001 - $60,000
___ Over $60,001

What is the race of your mother? __________

What is the race of your father? __________
APPENDIX G

MULTIGROUP ETHNIC IDENTITY MEASURE
(Phinney, 1992)
In this country, people come from a lot of different cultures and there are many different words to describe the different backgrounds or ethnic groups that people come from. Some examples of the names of ethnic groups are Mexican-American, Hispanic, Black, Biracial, Hapa, Asian American, American Indian, Anglo-American, and White. Every person is born into an ethnic group, or sometimes two groups, but people differ on how important their ethnicity is to them, how they feel about it, and how much their behavior is affected by it. These questions are about your ethnicity or your ethnic group(s) and how you feel about it or react to it.

Please fill in:

In terms of ethnic group(s), I consider myself to be_______________________________

Use the numbers given below to indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

4: Strongly agree  3: Somewhat agree  2: Somewhat disagree  1: Strongly disagree

1. I have spent time trying to find out more about my own ethnic groups, such as its history, traditions, and customs.

2. I am active in organizations or social groups that include mostly members of my own ethnic group.

3. I have a clear sense of my ethnic background and what it means for me.

4. I like meeting and getting to know people from ethnic groups other than my own.

5. I think a lot about how my life will be affected by my ethnic group membership.

6. I am happy that I am a member of the group I belong to.

7. I sometimes feel it would be better if different ethnic groups didn’t try to mix together.

8. I am not very clear about the role of my ethnicity in my life.

9. I often spend time with people from ethnic groups other than my own.

10. I really have not spent much time trying to learn more about the culture and history of my ethnic group.

11. I have a strong sense of belonging to my own ethnic group.
4: Strongly agree  3: Somewhat agree  2: Somewhat disagree  1: Strongly disagree

12. I understand pretty well what my ethnic group membership mean to me, in terms of how to relate to my own group and other groups.

13. In order to learn more about my ethnic background, I have often talked to other people about my ethnic group.

14. I have a lot of pride in my ethnic group and its accomplishment.

15. I don’t try to become friends with people from other ethnic groups.

16. I participate in cultural practices of my own group, such as special food, music, or customs.

17. I am involved in activities with people from other ethnic groups.

18. I feel a strong attachment towards my own ethnic group.

19. I enjoy being around people from ethnic groups other than my own.

20. I feel good about my cultural or ethnic background.

21. My ethnicity is  
   (1) Asian, Asian American, or Oriental  
   (2) Black or African American  
   (3) Hispanic or Latino  
   (4) White, Caucasian, European, not Hispanic  
   (5) American Indian  
   (6) Mixed; parent are from two different groups

22. My father’s ethnicity is  
   (1) Asian, Asian American, or Oriental  
   (2) Black or African American  
   (3) Hispanic or Latino  
   (4) White, Caucasian, European, not Hispanic  
   (5) American Indian  
   (6) Mixed; parent are from two different groups
23. My mother’s ethnicity is (use numbers above)
   (1) Asian, Asian American, or Oriental
   (2) Black or African American
   (3) Hispanic or Latino
   (4) White, Caucasian, European, not Hispanic
   (5) American Indian
   (6) Mixed; parent are from two different groups
APPENDIX H

COLLECTIVE SELF-ESTEEM SCALE
(LUHTANEN & CROCKER, 1992)
We are all members of different social groups or social categories. Some of such 
social groups or categories pertain to gender, race, religion, nationality, ethnicity, and 
socioeconomic class. We would like you to consider your membership in those particular 
groups or categories and respond to the following statements on the basis of how you feel 
about those groups and your memberships in them. *There are no right or wrong answers 
to any of these statements*; we are interested in your honest reactions and opinions. Please 
read each statement carefully and response by using the following scale. Please circle the 
appropriate number to the right of each item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I am a worthy member of the groups I belong to……………………………………..

2. I often regret that I belong to some of the groups I do……………………………

3. Overall, my groups are considered good by others………………………………

4. Overall, my group membership have very little to do with how I feel about myself…

5. I feel I don’t have much to offer to the groups I belong to…………………………

6. In general, I’m glad to be a member of the groups I belong to………………………

7. Most people consider my groups, on the average, to be more ineffective than other 
groups…………………………………………………………………………………

8. The groups I belong to are an important reflection of who I am……………………

9. I am a cooperative participant in the groups I belong to…………………………….
10. Overall, I often feel that groups of which I am a member are not worthwhile…….. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

11. In general, others respect the groups I am a member of………………………… 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
12. The groups I belong to are unimportant to my sense of what kind of a person I am... 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
13. I often feel I’m a useless member of my groups…………………………………….. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
14. I feel good about the groups I belong to…………………………………………… 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
15. In general, others think that the groups I am a member of are unworthy………… 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
16. In general belonging to groups is an important part of my self-image…………….. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
APPENDIX I

ROSENBERG SELF-ESTEEM SCALE
(ROSENBERG, 1965)
1: Strongly disagree  2: Disagree  3: Agree  4: Strongly agree

1. I feel that I am a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others.
2. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.
3. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.
4. I am able to do things as well as most people.
5. I feel I do not have much to be proud of.
6. I take a positive attitude toward myself.
7. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.
8. I wish I could have more respect for myself.
9. I certainly feel useless at times.
10. At times I think that I am no good at all.
APPENDIX J

SATISFACTION WITH LIFE SCALE
(DIENER ET AL., 1985)
Instructions: Please use one of the following numbers from 1 to 7 to indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements.

7: Strongly agree
6: Agree
5: Slightly agree
4: Neither agree or disagree
3: Slightly disagree
2: Disagree
1: Strongly disagree

1. In most ways my life is close to my ideal.
2. The conditions of my life are excellent.
3. I am satisfied with my life.
4. So far I have gotten the important I want in my life.
5. If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing.
6. Please answer with “5” in the following box.
APPENDIX K

ATTITUDES TOWARD MULTIRACIAL CHILDREN SCALE
(JACKMAN ET AL., 2001)
1. Have a positive image of self.
2. Have difficulty discussing their racial background.
3. Are leaders in school.
4. Will have difficulty adjusting to adulthood.
5. Identify with the racial heritage of each parent.
6. Are confused concerning their racial identity.
7. Feel awkward in social situations.
8. Are popular with children of the opposite sex.
9. Enjoy participating in the cultural celebrations of both parents’ racial heritages.
10. Benefit from having parents of different racial backgrounds.
11. Think that other children are better than they are.
12. Prefer to follow the cultural practices of only one parent.
13. Are confused by the differing cultural traditions of their parents.
14. Are respected by their classmates.
15. Resent being the offspring of parents from different racial backgrounds.
16. Have a good relationship with both parents.
17. Feel ashamed of their mixed racial heritage.
18. Will graduate from high school and attend college.
19. Are proud of their multiracial identity.
20. Are satisfied with their physical appearance.
21. Possess a multiracial identity that is based on each parent’s race.
22. Benefit from learning the customs of both parents’ racial backgrounds.
23. Will grow up to be successful adults.
APPENDIX L

BALANCED INVENTORY OF DESIRABLE RESPONDING
(PAULHUS, 1984)
Instructions: Please read each item carefully. Using the scale below, decide the extent to which the following statements are true. Your response number indicates how much you agree with each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not True</th>
<th>Somewhat True</th>
<th>Very True</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My first impressions of people usually turn out to be right.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. (It would be hard for me to break any of my bad habits.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I don’t care to know what other people really think of me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. (I have not always been honest with myself.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I always know why I like things.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. (When my emotions are aroused, it biases my thinking.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Once I’ve made up my mind, other people can seldom change my opinion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. (I am not a safe driver when I exceed the speed limit.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I am fully in control of my own fate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. (It’s hard for me to shut off a disturbing thought.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I never regret my decisions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. (I sometimes lose out on things because I can’t make up my mind soon enough.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. The reason I vote is because my vote can make a difference.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. (My parents were not always fair when they punished me.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I am a completely rational person.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. (I rarely appreciate criticism.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I am very confident of my judgments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. (I have sometimes doubted my ability as a lover.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. It’s all right with me if some people happen to dislike me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. (I don’t always know the reasons why I do the things I do.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. (I sometimes tell lies if I have to.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I never cover up my mistakes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. (There have been occasions when I have taken advantage of someone.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I never swear.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. (I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. I always obey laws, even if I’m unlikely to get caught.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. (I have said something bad about a friend behind his or her back.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. When I hear people talking privately, I avoid listening.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. I have received too much change from a salesperson without telling him or her.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. I always declare everything at customs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. (When I was young I sometimes stole things.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. I have never dropped litter on the street.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. (I sometimes drive faster than the speed limit.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. I never read sexy books or magazines.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. (I have done things that I don’t tell other people about.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. I never take things that don’t belong to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. (I have taken sick-leave from work or school even though I wasn’t really sick.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. I have never damaged a library book or store merchandise without reporting it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. (I have some pretty awful habits.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. I don’t gossip about other people’s business.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

98