AN INVESTIGATION OF MULTIRACIAL ADULTS' RACIALIZED

ATTITUDES TOWARDS INTERRACIAL MARRIAGE

by

Hayden Prince, B.S.

A thesis submitted to the Graduate Council of
Texas State University in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts
with a Major in Sociology
May 2020

Committee Members:

Audwin Anderson, Chair

Seoyoun Kim

Rachel Romero

Maneka Brooks

FAIR USE AND AUTHOR'S PERMISSION STATEMENT

Fair Use

This work is protected by the Copyright Laws of the United States (Public Law 94-553, section 107). Consistent with fair use as defined in the Copyright Laws, brief quotations from this material are allowed with proper acknowledgement. Use of this material for financial gain without the author's express written permission is not allowed.

Duplication Permission

DEDICATION

Words cannot illustrate the volume of gratitude and love I have for my parents and siblings who continuously inspire me to be my best, most authentic self. With my parents' support, I attended graduate school only to write a thesis inspired their relationship as an interracial couple. As an interracial family, our family story is both of the colonizers and the of the slaves; of both American born and bred but also a story of immigration and naturalization into United States. Our lineage contains multitudes that are too vast to be contained by the question "*where are you from*?". I am proud to be the person my parents raised, and I am so grateful to have cultivated a voice that is "mixed and proud" and decidedly anti-racist.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ABSTRACT

Given the rise in interracial marriages as well as the rise of the Two or More Races population (Morin 2015; Colby and Ortman 2015), social scientists are struggling to explore new means and theoretical frameworks for how these trends will impact the American society. Recognizing the unique perspectives, identities, and racialized experiences of multiracials has heightened fascination about how this population will impact broader race relations in the United States. This thesis explores the impact that racial identity, primarily a multiracial identity, has on the opinions of interracial marriage; first by comparing a Two or More Races group between five separate race groups, then again comparing racialized attitudes between a monoracial group and multiracial group. By positioning multiraciality in the center of the analysis, this study contributes sociological and demographic research in the emerging field of critical mixed race studies. Using Pew Research Center's public data from their Survey of Multiracial Adults, the findings suggest that people of Two or More Races hold opinions regarding the impact of interracial marriage is more like other people of color rather than white people. Further, the study finds that multiracial people are no more positive about the impact of interracial marriage than the average American—a sentiment that challenges the stereotype that multiracials are the panacea to a racially harmonious future.

I. INTRODUCTION

In 1967, the United State Supreme Court lifted the ban on interracial marriage, thus ending anti-miscegenation laws in the United States (Loving V. Virginia 388 U.S. 1). It all started when an interracial couple from Washington D.C. wanted their marriage to be legally recognized when they decided to move to Virginia then ended up in the supreme court to fight for the legal recognition of their union. Since then, there has been a strong and persistent increase in the number of interracial marriages as well as the population of multiracial Americans (Wang 2015; Patten 2015). Interracial marriages are typically classified as unions where either spouse is not in the same single race group as the other spouse, or if at least one spouse is in a multiple race group (Lofquist, Lugaila, O'Connell and Feliz 2012). Emerging literature demonstrates how this definition and these race categories are problematic for not measuring a full and inclusive scope of all interracial or interethnic marriages (Guzman and Nishina 2017).

Researchers from the Pew Research Center have shown trends indicating that as interracial marriages become more commonplace, public attitudes have become more accepting, but it is still considered "non-traditional" compared to heterosexual, same-race unions (Wang 2015; Livingston and Brown 2017). Although public opinion surveys indicate positive and progressive shifts in opinions on interracial marriage, leading research on this topic by Livingston and Brown (2017) have excluded the Two or More Races population as well as multiracial perspectives in their analyses. By recounting the United States' history of erasing multiraciality via the forbiddance of interracial marriage unions, this thesis explores the slow embrace of interracial marriage over time. Using data from Pew Research Center's Survey of Multiracial Adults (used by Morin 2015),

statistical tests were conducted to measure how the different racial groups view the societal impact of interracial marriage. Then, the results were examined through a theoretical lens that centers the multiracial identity and experiences. First, racialized attitudes about the about the impact interracial marriage has had on society were compared between of the Two or More Races group and the five other racial groups using a multinomial regression model. Second, a chi-square analysis was conducted to compare the racialized attitudes of the impact of interracial marriage between a non-mixed, monoracial group and a self-identified multiracial group. The results from the second test were used to draw a 1-sample t-test to compare if self-identified multiracials reflect more positively about interracial marriage compared to the general American public. The importance of centering multiraciality in this analysis is two-fold: 1) to posit multiracials as a viable category for racial demographic research, and 2) to see if the Two or More Races and the multiracial populations have racialized attitudes about the societal impact of interracial marriage compared to single-race groups.

<u>Terminology</u>

For clarity, it is important to discern some of the major terms used in this thesis. Firstly, the primary focus of this work is about the opinions in the societal influence of *interracial marriages*. Similarly, terms like exogamy or marrying-out portray synonymous meanings about marrying a partner outside a given community, culture, race, or nationality. A large part of this thesis relies on the work of Livingston and Brown (2017:1) who studied intermarriages which includes both cross-racial and cross-ethnic marriages where as the term interracial strictly describes cross-racial marriages.

When studying people who are of more than one race, there is an issue with

naming conventions of their identities. People who have multiple racial backgrounds can be challenging to study because not everyone who is of two or more races *identifies* themselves as mulitracial (Patten 2015). Attitudinal measures show that there are disparities between people who select multiple races on a racial questionnaire form, and those who identify and feel as though they are multiracial (Patten 2015). Additionally, people who are multiracial are known to have fluid identities that may change several times over their lifespan or even social situations (Harris and Sim 2002; Patten 2015; Morin 2015; Rockquemore and Brunsma 2002; Pew Research Center 2015). Due to these considerations of self-identity, this thesis makes distinctions between samples of people who are *Two or More Races* and people who self-identified as *multiracial.* Distinctions between Two or More Races and multiracial samples are realized through the wording of the survey questions provided by Pew Research Center's 2015 Survey of Multiracial Adults dataset. Further, this thesis uses the term *multiracial* instead of more colloquial terms like mixed or mixed race. The use of *mixed* to describe racial backgrounds alludes to a biological interpretation of race (Spencer 2014)—which is a sentiment the author does not want to reify.

II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

In order to understand why the *Loving v. Virginia* (1967) case was so monumental, one must begin to understand the historical significance of anti-miscegenation laws (meaning mixing of blood) and the persistence of systemic racism that prevented interracial relationships. I will briefly summarize two important legal decisions that showcase how the biological determination of race was enforced, then consequentially, allowed for anti-miscegenation laws to thrive. Following the history of anti-miscegenation laws, I will illustrate the current trends for which demographic groups are accepting of interracial marriage and which demographic groups are actually marrying outside of their race. Then, I will describe how the growing population of multiracials is impacting social research and challenging Americans' understanding of race and racism. Lastly, I will problematize the sentiment that interracial marriage is proof that racism is dying out, based on an analysis of the literature.

Legal History of Anti-Miscegenation

Contemporary social scientists identify race as a social construction (Omi and Winant 2014) which has challenged the biological understanding of race reinforced throughout history. In line with the rationalization of the Enlightenment Era, scientists who were interested in the classification and the evolution of species applied the same evolutionary logic towards humankind (Spickard 2015; Omi and Winant 2014). Much like how animals are categorized into species and families, the *homo sapiens* species was classified into different races. The distinctions of human variations were based on physical and phenotypical traits, but also arbitrary and subjective measures like intellect, attractiveness, and supposed moral qualities—such subjective measures were used to

4

draw broad and inaccurate differences between the so-called *race*s (Omi and Winant 2014; Spickard 2015). The invention of the races at the hands of white Europeans thinkers established a racial social hierarchy in which Europeans named themselves genetically and culturally superior to Africans and all other non-white populations (Khanna 2018; Spickard 2015). Therefore, in order to uphold the institutionalized ideology of white supremacy, it was believed that the purity of the white race must be protected against "mongrelization" with non-white blood who's offspring could threaten the racial order (Khanna 2018:134).

Racially mixed people were used to affirm the biological understanding of race; this is evident in the term *mulatto,* which is an adaptation of the word mule (Jordan and Spickard 2014). Mules, like most other cross-species offspring, are partially sterile; the same logic was applied to black-white biracials which resulting in the myth that mulattoes were infertile and genetically inferior (Jordan and Spickard 2014). Even the terms *mixed race* and *multiracial* suggests that the races are like different species with clear discernable, and mutually exclusive categories (Omi and Winant 2014). Despite the reaffirmation of the biological belief in race, multiracials (primarily white/non-white biracials) challenge the system of mutually exclusive racial categories which also threatens the white superiority status of the racial hierarchy (Khanna 2018; Pascoe 2009).

One of the influential court cases for this study and a prime example of the regulation of the biological understanding of race is *Plessy v. Ferguson* (1896). This case involved a white-passing octoroon (one-eighth Black) man, Homer Plessy, who challenged the segregated trolley carts in Louisiana by sitting in the whites-only section but did not deny his African heritage when asked. The *Plessy* case is a pivotal point in

U.S. history that solidified both the one-drop rule, and the Separate but Equal Clause into legal codes; resulting in the strengthening of legal legitimization of Jim Crow segregation (Golub 2005). The one-drop rule is a social regulation that regards any person that is believed to have any African ancestry or blood to be regarded as full black and therefore subjugated to the colored designation of within Jim Crow Segregation (Jordan and Spickard 2014).

Interestingly, the one-drop rule was constructed within the black/white binary, meaning that it only applied to the white/black mixed populations and not relevant to any other combination of white/non-white or non-white/non-white people (Jordan and Spickard 2014; Spickard and Dineen-Wimberly 2015). Due to the enforcement of the one-drop rule, the entirety of part-black race populations, specifically mulattoes (half-black), quadroons (quarter-black) and octoroons like Plessy were no longer legally distinguishable from each other because these types of ambiguously raced bodies threatened the existences and authority of distinct races and "thus are met by the law as a kind of problem to be contained" (Golub 2005: 567). The *Plessy* case ruled in favor of a white supremacist racial hierarchy (Khanna 2018; Pascoe 2009) that took control over bodies that did not fit the black/white racial binary. Another point worth noting is that the legal classification of Plessy as a colored man was meant he was legally barred from marrying a white woman.

Another impactful law was the Virginia Racial Integrity Act of 1924, the infamous statute that was overturned by the Lovings. This Act is known for its extreme enforcement of anti-miscegenation through several ordinances; one of which instituted a state registration of each residents' race (Sollors, 2000). The registration's definition of

the white category was most restrictive, which was limited to any Caucasian whose blood has no other trace besides European (with exceptions to a few Native Americans). This law also voided all existing interracial unions—barring all interracial couples from remarrying and punishing those who refused to separate. Since marriage licensing is a state institution, each state presided over their own definitions of anti-miscegenation between white/black or more generally white/non-white unions. Seeing how there were no clauses that restricted various non-white/non-white unions, it is clear that anti-miscegenation laws were written to preserve the purity, and therefore supremacy, of the white race (Khanna 2018; Golub 2005). The ramifications of such anti-miscegenation laws can still be felt today. Recently, the state of Virginia overturned a law that required all marriage license applicants to disclose their races. Three interracial couples sued the state of Virginia after being denied their marriage licenses for refusing to disclose their races (Silverman 2019).

<div align="center">Trends in Interracial Marriage</div>

As the years go by, there are more interracial marriages occurring and gradual acceptance of the practice. Between the years 2000 and 2010, the U.S. Census Bureau (2012) measured a 28% increase in households with interracial and interethnic married couples. The gradual social acceptance of interracial marriage can best be described as a "fading of a taboo" that did not happen overnight (Wang 2015:2). As Wang (2015:35) indicates, "As of 1987, two decades after the [*Loving v. Virginia*] Supreme Court ruling, just 48% of the public said it was 'alright for Blacks and whites to date each other.'" By 2009, that share had grown to 83% (Wang, 2015). In 2012, Gallup measured that "87% of Americans were accepting of marriage between blacks and whites, up from 4% in

1958 [nine years before legalization]" which also represents the largest shifts of public opinion in Gallup history (Newport 2012:1). In 2015, 39% of Americans thought that interracial marriages are a good thing for society (Wang 2015).

Across the literature on this topic, there are key factors and indicators that contribute to how certain groups of Americans feel about interracial marriage. It has been widely studied that young, white women and minorities who are politically progressive, less religious, come from racially tolerant and well educated families, have higher incomes, and live outside of the American South are consistently reported to have positive attitudes of others marrying outside of their race (Livingston and Brown 2017; Golebiowska 2007; Herman and Campbell, 2012; Johnson and Jacobson 2005; Rosenfeld 2007; Wilson and Jacobson 1995; Yancey and Lewis 2009). Despite the increased tolerance of the practice of interracial marriage, there are still large racial and gender disparities in who is accepting of interracial marriages *within* their own family. Between black families and white families, "more than half (54%) of black Americans are in favor of their close relative marrying a white person compared with nearly one-in-four (26%) white Americans who said they were in favor of their close relative marrying a black person" (Djamba and Kimuna 2014:529). Additionally, Djamba and Kimuna (2014) found that both white and black women were more accepting of their family members marrying outside of their race compared to both white and black men. White men were shown to be the least tolerant toward the idea of their family members marrying a black person (Djamba and Kimuna 2014). Comparably, multiracials overwhelmingly reported that interracial marriage doesn't make much difference to society —however, they believe interracial marriage is good for society at a higher rate than the general public

(Parker et al. 2015) This thesis examines if this difference between the multiracials and the general public is significantly different.

Alongside the increased intolerance of the practice, interracial marriages and relationships are on the rise. In 2015, intermarriages (marriage across racial and ethnic lines) accounted for 10% of all marriages in the United States and accounted for 17% of all newlyweds (Livingston and Brown 2017). Even a 2010 Census report on Households and Families found that interracial relationships we more common in *unmarried* partner households for both same-sex and opposite-sex couples (Lofquist et al. 2012).

As interracial marriages become more socially accepted and common place, it is important to observe the demographic breakdown of this upward trend. Aside from the people who claim to be accepting of interracial marriage, who are the people who are actually marrying outside of their race? Historically, Native Americans have had high rates of marrying-out to white partners (Qian and Litcher 2011), however, recent immigration patterns have had large impacts in the interracial marriage trends. Current trends indicate that Asian Americans and Hispanic Americans are more likely than black and white Americans to marry someone of a different race or ethnicity (Livingston and Brown 2017). In fact, about 29% Asian newlyweds and 27% of Hispanic newlyweds have a spouse of a different race or ethnicity (Livingston and Brown 2017). Despite Asian Americans having the highest marry-out rates, Hispanic-white unions make up 42% of all intermarried couples in the US (Livingston and Brown 2017).

Further, there are gender and sexual orientation breakdowns within these racial contexts. Amongst heterosexuals, multiracial men and women, Hispanic women, Asian women and black men are shown to date and marry white partners at higher rates than

black women, Hispanic men, and Asian men (Mishra 2018; Qian and Litcher 2011). Amongst online dating patterns for heterosexuals, both black women and Asian men are the most excluded amongst other online daters (Robnett and Feliciano 2011) which point to potential intersections of sexism and racism that paint black women and Asian men as less desirable that men and women of other races (Lin and Lundquist 2013; Robnett and Feliciano 2011). Inversely, Asian women and black men tend to date or hook-up with more interracial partners, potentially due to the fetishism or eroticism from their white counterparts (McClintock and McBride Murry 2010). Amongst gay, lesbian and bisexual identifying folks, interracial relationships and cohabitations are more common than heterosexuals (Horowitz and Gomez 2018). When interviewing same-sex interracial couples, Steinbugler (2012) found that the stigma of being homosexual can sometimes overshadow the racial stigmas.

Livingston and Brown (2017), of Pew Research Center, examined intermarriages, which include analyzing both race and ethnicity of couples; which brings up questions regarding which marriages *count* as interracial or not. When analyzing only interracial marriages that exclude Hispanic Americans, interracial marriages would be far less commonplace since Hispanic-white unions are the most common union amongst intermarrying newlyweds (Livingston and Brown 2017). Our current racial classification system presents challenges for which marriages can be considered interracial or not. Per standards of the Office of Budget Management (OBM) the Census is required to have five race categories: White, Black or African American, American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian or Asian American, and Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (Census Bureau 2018). The current census apparatus that includes the five race categories with the

additional Hispanic-Origin question have been heavily criticized for not accurately depicting the scope of diversity within the United States (Miyawaki 2016; Lowenthal 2014). For example, Arab Americans have historically been categorized as white, however, this classification does not resonate with all Arab Americans; especially in our post-9/11 society that is hostile towards visibly Muslim or Middle Eastern looking people (Arab American Institute 2018; Beydoun 2013). Due to the lack of clear representation in the Census forms, the Arab American Institute (2018) found that the U.S. Census Bureau undercounted Arab Americans by about 1.6 million people. On account of the racialization of Arab Americans face, it common to perceive white-Arab relationships as a cross-cultural or cross-ethnic union despite belonging to the same race according to the Census (Guzman and Nishina 2017). Similarly, there is a lack of coherence on how to consistently classify marriages where both spouses identify as multiracial. With multiracial-multiracial marriages, there is a question if the specific racial configurations of each spouse are different enough to be considered cross-group or if the matching multiracial label ought to be counted as a same-race marriage despite the specific racial backgrounds of each spouse (Guzman and Nishina 2017). These distinctions are important, especially because multiracial adults are also more likely than other adults to marry someone who is also multiracial (Parker et al. 2015)—which will inevitably have an impact the population.

<div align="center">The Multiracial Population and Its Implications</div>

Ever since the ruling of *Loving v. Virginia* that ending interracial marriages, demographers and social scientists report a "biracial baby boom" (Root 1996:xiv) of the multiracial population since the late 1960s but these reports should be taken lightly.

Methodologically speaking, there has been little-to-no data collection of the multiracial

population since the mulatto category was dropped from the U.S. census in 1930 as a

consequence of the one-drop rule (Hochschild and Powell 2008). Between 1930 to the

year 2000 when the One or More Option clause was added (U.S. Census Bureau 2018)

there is no reliable census data of multiracials because multiracials were effectively

erased from America history. Due to a massive lack of data, demographic estimates of the

multiracial population from before 2000 are not too reliable. It is too inconclusive to

definitively say there has been a boom of multiracials if long term demographic data does

not exist. Additionally, Spencer (2005) is especially critical of other multiracial scholars

who position *Loving* as a paradigm shift in interracial marriages and the as the foundation

of the multiracial identity. He argues that the impact of *Loving* was mostly symbolic

because interracial marriage was already legal in 34 states in 1967 and that the upward

trends in Black/white interracial marriages after the case was merely a "continuation of

an already occurring trend" (Spencer 2005: 67). Further, he rejects the commonly held

belief that the "Children of Loving" (Moran 2001:9) are the first-generation of biracial

Americans because of the hundreds of years of racial mixing between racial mixed

African Americans due to the one-drop rule (Spencer 2005; Daniel, Kina and Dariotis

2014). Despite Spencer's (2005) argument, Daniel emphasizes how the *Loving* decision

is emblematic of the start of recognizing both interraciality and multiraciality within

American consciousness that allowed for racially mixed people to publicly identify as

multiracial (Daniel 2002).

Due to public pressure from mixed race activist groups, the Census 2000 was the

first American national census that included that Choose One or More Clause to the race

question instructions instead of adopting an entirely new category for multiracial people (Brunsma 2006; Daniel 2002). The caveat of the Choose One or More Clause is that it recognizes "multiraciality as *more than one* race rather than *as* a race" (Littlewood McKibbin 2014:2185). Additionally, the Choose One or More Clause on the U.S. Census and other legal documents purports the idea that multiraciality is a chosen identity whereas being of a single race, especially being black, is an ascribed identity (Littlewood McKibbin 2014). Menzey (2003) argues that the lack of recognition of a multiracial identity on official forms leads multiracials to feel like they exist in liminal spaces not only on the forms, but in their families, in their communities, and in the national imagination. The decision to not include a multiracial category on the U.S. Census was highly contentious, especially for black activist groups and community leaders who feared the loss of support and political power from their half-black biracial followers (Spickard 2015).

Having an official multiracial category on the census would have a significant impact on collecting demographic data. Patten (2015), of Pew Research Center, found that the size of the multiracial population can be manipulated depending on the degree of mixed-ness and the method of data collection. Using data from Pew Research Center's Survey of Multiracial Adults, the report suggested that the census apparatus that included the One or More Option for race captured the multiracial population at around 4.8%; however, when taking into account of the respondents' parents' and grandparents' races, up to 16% of the U.S. population could be technically be considered multiracial but choose not to (Patten 2015). The report also tested attitudinal measures of whether a person may consider themselves multiracial or mixed; the results show that only 12% of

people who are classified as Two or More Races consider themselves multiracial or mixed (Patten 2015). Even the degree of mixed-ness influences an individual's perception of their own racial identity. The report found that respondents whose grandparents are different races often do not identify with the multiracial label as strongly as respondents whose parents are of different races (Patten 2015). Due to the robustness of data about the multiracial identity used in Patten's (2015) study, this thesis uses the same dataset.

Nevertheless, it is highly observed that the multiracial population is growing and will continue to grow. It is estimated that the Two or More Races population is projected to increase from 8 million to 26 million between 2014 and 2060 (Colby and Ortman 2015); however, there are some controversies about the size of the population and how to properly count this population. For instance, the standard convention for capturing multiracial Hispanics is if respondents indicate both Hispanic-origin ethnicity *and* selects two or more racial categories (Parker, Horowitz, Morin and Lopez 2015). Typically, Latino and Hispanic adults view their Hispanic background as a racial background; so, when asked about their race, many Latinos and Hispanics are forced to choose a U.S. Census racial category (black, white, Asian etc.) that may or may not reflect their actual identities (Parker et al. 2015). Because many Latinos understand their Hispanic background as a race, it is argued that being Hispanic and one other race is, effectively, *mixed race* (Parker et al. 2015). The discrepancy between defining multiracial status as Hispanic and one race verses Hispanic and two or more races would raise the U.S. multiracial population from 6.9% to 8.9% (Parker et al. 2015).

What makes the multiracial population challenging to capture is because their identities are known to be fluid and highly contextualized within several social factors. It's been heavily observed that factors like age, gender, education level, socioeconomic status, skin tones and phenotypes, the racial composition of their community and region, the racial composition of their families, and the relationships they have with their parents are all factors that contribute to how people of Two or More Races identify as being multiracial or not (Harris and Sim 2002; Root 1998; Liebler 2016; Khanna 2012; Brunsma 2005; Rockquemore and Brunsma 2002; Herman 2004; Pew Research 2015; Strmic-Pawl 2014). People of Two or More Races can face challenges with their racial identities that go beyond that the pressure of *choosing a side*. It's also been observed that some biracials do not see themselves within the confines of race and see themselves along transcendent labels like *human* and may opt out of choosing their races on forms (Rockquemore 1999). Further, multiracial have been observed to change their racial identity over the course of their lifetimes and even within different social settings (Rockquemore, Brunsma, and Delgado 2009; Pew Research Center 2015). To add to the complexity, there are different terms used to describe specific racial combinations such as "hapa, *hāfu*, *mestizo*, Eurasian, Métis, mulatto, mixed-blood" (Daniel, Kina and Dariotis 2014:26). It is hard to paint all multiracials with the same broad brush because "each category points to distinct histories of contact among the racialized groups involved and their attendant political, social, and cultural dynamics" (Daniel, Kina and Dariotis 2014:26). An example of the differing political, social, and cultural dynamics between multiracial groups is lack of universal rules of hypodescent. Since the one-drop rule only pertained to black-white individuals, many white-Asian and white-Hispanic families feel

15

more free to identify their children as either multiracial or even white, while black-white couples feel more inclined to identify their children as black more so than multiracial or white (Lee and Bean 2012). The immense diversity and within the multiracial population and the necessary contextualization of this diversity poses a challenge to social researchers.

With the rise of the half-white/half-non-white population, there are speculations about the racialized politics that multiracials bring to the table. Though some multiracials may resist the convental race-based classification systems, they are not free from participating within the power structure within the racial hierarchy (Strmic-Pawl 2016). Critics of the multiracial movement "argue that advocacy of a multiracial interpretation encourages individuals to flee identification with communities of color and seek a middle social position, lightened by recognition of their ancestral multiplicity" (Spickard 2015:295). The multiracial movement has been accused of not only creating social distances from a racialized identity but also re-affirming a biological understanding of race or refuting the notion of race entirely (Spencer 2005). The racialization processes of different multiracial groups are in-line with Bonilla-Silva's (2002) theory of the Latin Americanization of racial stratification in the US. Bonilla-Silva (2002) suggests that with the increased Latinx, Asian, and mixed race diversity within the US, the black/white binary racial hierarchy will be adopted into a tri-racial system between whites, honorary whites, and the collective black. This tri-racial system reflects not only differences in skin tones, but also models of assimilation into whiteness, economic stratification, and overall racial attitudes; with these considerations, Bonilla-Silva (2002) relegates multiracials amongst the whites and honorary whites categories. In a comparative study of both

Asian-white and black-white multiracials, Strmic-Pawl (2016) found, in general, Asian-whites adopt similar sentiments to white racial logics, such as supporting colorblind sentiments, meritocracy, and belief in self-segregation. She argues that Asian-white biracials theoretically have "White Enough status that allows them to have the many privileges and opportunities of whiteness" (Strmic-Pawl 2016:103) while still facing instances of racial discrimination or prejudice. In the same study, she found that some black-white biracials choose to occupy position in the racial hierarchy that is closest to blacks because of their proximity to and solidarity with black communities (Strmic-Pawl 2016). Many black-white biracials acknowledge that despite being multiracial, the world may read their race as full black, thus making blackness a salient part of black-white biracials' racialization process (Strmic-Pawl 2016). Strmic-Pawls' (2016) work does both affirm and challenge aspects of Bonilla-Silva's (2002) theory about how multiracials may fit into a three-tiered racial hierarchy. So, where do multiracials actually fall in a three-tiered racial hierarchy? Again, the answer might need to be contextualized within the specific histories of race relations and the racial composition of different multiracial groups; as demonstrated between the differences between Asian-white and black-white biracials (Strmic-Pawl 2016). Further, some argue that part-black biracials are trying to distance themselves from blackness by claiming a multiracial identity and are privileged with having fluid identities (Daniel et al. 2014). Spickard (2015) argues that multiraciality does not inherently 'lighten' or white-wash anti-racist advocacy. Instead, he encourages that "The important issue for monoracial communities of color is not whether multiracial people claim their multiraciality but whether, having done so, [if] they continue to serve the needs of those communities of color" (Spickard 2015: 301).

The implications of the growing multiracial population are hotly debated, which begs the rhetorical question, is America's acceptance of interracial couples a sign that we are moving towards a post-racial society? Some believe that with the rise of the multiracial and multiethnic populations will be the key to addressing race relations in the future because of their more flexible understanding of identity and multicultural backgrounds (Daniel 2009; Pew Research 2015; Vasquez-Manoff 2017). Many multiracial adults feel that their diverse racial backgrounds make them more tolerant and felt more open to other cultures (Pew Research Center 2015). Additionally, the election of President Barack Obama has also been falsely cited as evidence that America can become post-racial (Bonilla-Silva and Dietrich 2011). Even President Obama's multiracial background has been used to explain why he was able to transcend so many American voters (Daniel 2009). It would be naive and optimistic to assume that the increase in approval of racial intermixing is evidence of racism coming to an end.

Multiracials have always been present in America; what is new, however, is their visibility and recognition of having different identities and experiences in comparison to people who are of a single race. Due to the increased visibility, multiracials are being commodified as "emblems of multiculturalism," (King-O'Riain 2014:ix) or "vaccines against the tribalism" (Velasquez-Manoff 2017:1) as if their mere existences are the antidote to racism. Johnson and Nadal (2010:135) recount how comments like "You look so exotic" and "I wanna marry someone of another race so I can have beautiful babies" seem like harmless compliments but, in fact, are microaggressions that exotify and objectify multiracials, particularly multiracial women. Furthermore, the objectification of

multiracials reinforces the false image of multiracials being the "poster children of a post-racial society" (Johnson and Nadal 2010:135).

The Persistence of Racism

If America is not becoming less racist, then why do numerous studies indicate such a significant change toward racial tolerance? The rise of colorblind racism could theoretically explain the gradual change in public opinion about interracial marriage. As Bonilla-Silva (2017) explains, colorblindness is a more covert and implicit style of racism; so covert that traditional explicit survey questions about bigotry and prejudice are no longer adequate tools for studying racism. People who are described as colorblind racists do not want to appear or think of themselves as being racist, bigoted, hateful, or intolerant, so they adopt a *non-racist* appearance. Adopting non-racists attitudes and rhetoric helps a person avoid the social backlash of being openly racist while also permitting no critical examination of their own racist beliefs or actions. The rise of colorblindness proves challenging to social researchers because traditionally straight-forward questions about racism (such as, do you approve or disapprove of interracial marriage?) are becoming increasingly unfit to ask respondents. To avoid appearing immoral, ignorant, bigoted, or racist, respondents will give in to social desirability bias, which is "the tendency to admit to socially desirable traits and behaviors and to deny socially undesirable ones" (Krumpal 2013:2028). Despite the challenges of combatting colorblindness and social desirability bias, Perry (2013) still finds that the general public still considers interracial marriages to be *nontraditional* unions compared to same-race marriages.

As previously stated, the idea that the nation is moving towards a more perfect union via interracial marriage is very naive and blind to the persistence of racism. Anderson (2014) is critical of the view that interracial marriage and colorblindness will absolve the issue of racism in America. She says,

"While the presence of mixed race persons complicates racial categorization, the elimination of racial categories without addressing the underlying causes of racial inequity is not a response in the interests of racial justice. In this way, the liberal view of a colorblind or post-racial ideal (particularly with regard to the experiences of mixed race persons) fails to forward the cause of justice" (Anderson 2014:11).

Similarly, Steinbugler (2012) is also critical of interracial marriage as the cure for racism because the power of *love*, alone, cannot absolve systemic racial and class differences and the existences of multiracial people cannot nullify racial divisions. There is a false assumption that racial mixing, can bring the races together to erode the distances and differences between social groups then, eventually, the differences will disappear altogether (Steinbugler 2012).

There are still many forms of resistance to a more multiracial future. Recently, a candidate for a City Council position in Marysville, Michigan ran on a platform to ban on minorities and interracial families moving into the town; using her Christian belief as the only justification of her position (Brice-Saddler 2019). Similarly, a Mississippi event hall refused to host a wedding ceremony of a black and white interracial couple (Zraich 2019). The sister of the groom candidly recorded her exchange with the location owner, and then after posting online, the video went viral. In the video,

the location owner can clearly be heard saying "We don't do gay weddings or mixed race [weddings], because of our Christian race, I mean our Christian belief" (Zraich 2019).

Another afront to colorblind racism ideologies is the existence of racism from within and around interracial relationships. Often, black men are characterized as *Uncle Tom*s, *Oreo*s, *Sell-outs*, or *Race-traitors* when they marry white women (Steinbugler 2012). Similarly, white women who date and marry black men are often stereotyped as *slutty*, *immoral*, and *trashy*. The sexual politics of interracial relationships are highly linked to gender and sexuality; particularly because these stereotypes do not apply to white men or interracial gay or lesbian relationships (Steinbugler 2012). Within heterosexual interracial marriages, some couples adopt a race-neutral or colorblind stance on why each partner decided to marry outside of their race; such as a white partner positioning their black spouse as "atypical, exceptions to their race, or just not like that kind of black person" (Steinbugler 2012:110).

In an effort to combat negative stereotypes about interracial marriages, some straight interracial couples will adopt colorblind ideologies that minimize the salience or significance of race within the relationship. According to Steinbugler, colorblind statements like "we are just like any other couple" or "I would love him no matter what his color" help heterosexual interracial couples relate to other heterosexual same-race couples, but in doing so, also reduce the salience of race within society (Steinbugler 2012:117). Bonilla-Silva (2017) argues that taking such a race neutral stance does not combat racism enough to affect any change.

The appearance of racial harmony in interracial or cross-ethnic couples may be overexaggerated because these couples tend to have greater likelihoods in divorce due to

lack of social support, lack of understanding between partners, and societal pressures (Guzman and Nishina 2017, Kang Fu and Wolfinger 2011). Based on the above literature, race and racism will not disappear on its own if more race mixing takes place; also, being in an interracial relationship is not equivalent to being racially progressive.

Theoretical Framework

The newly emerged discipline, critical mixed race studies (CMRS) is a branch of Critical Races Studies (CRS) Movement (Daniel et al. 2014). Critical Race Studies is still a relatively recent theoretical framework that emerged in the 1970s from a movement of the merged critical legal studies, ethnic studies, and radical feminism (Delgdo and Stefancic 2017). Critical Race scholars, or "Crits" as Delgado and Stefancic (2017:27) call them, take a realist perspective that posits that racism is the norm and default of society—it is in our everyday interactions and within our seemingly neural systems and institutions. Under the umbrella of CRS, other subsects of specific topics have emerged, like Latcrit and QueerCrit and femcrit that use critical analysis to study Latinx, LGBTQ+, and feminist issues, respectively--critical mixed race studies is no different.

By centering the multiracial perspectives on the influences of interracial marriages, CMRS offers specific perspectives that Critical Race Theory cannot. CMRS offers unique perspectives on race because it stresses the "critical analysis of the institutionalization of social, cultural, and political structures based on dominant conceptions of *race*," while also

> "analyzing the racial consciousness among racially mixed people, the
> world in which they live, and the ideological, social, economic, and
> political forces, as well as policies that impact the social location of

mixed-race individuals and inform their mixed-race experiences and identities" (Daniel et al. 2014:8).

Much like the preceding school of thought from Critical Race Studies, CMRS adopts similar analytical and cross-disciplinary tools to focus on matters pertaining to racial mixings; from interraciality, multiraciality, transracial adoption. Instead of calling attention to the biological rigidity of race, CMRS "stresses that racial categories and racial designations are 'unstable' and 'decentered' complexes of sociocultural meanings that are continuously being created, inhabited, contested, transformed, and destroyed (Daniel et al. 2014:8). In critiquing racists systems and structures, CMRS does not seek to diminish the salience of race; in fact, one of its' founders says that CMRS scholars must "speak out against notions of premature post-raciality and naive colorblindness" (Spencer 2014: 63). Ultimately, CMRS uses intersectional thinking that interrogates racial essentialism and the social construction of racial hierarchies in both American and international contexts.

The foundation of CMRS is rooted in psychology, social psychology, and ethnic studies disciplines with a heavy emphasis in studying and theorizing about multiracial identities and racial consciousness (Rockquemore, Brunsma, and Delgado 2008). Some of the foundational works of the discipline have focused on the racial identity formation process and socialization of multiracial children and adults (Daniel et al. 2014). Dr. Maria P.P. Root (1998), known as one of the pioneers of CMRS, theorized how the multiracial experiences in terms of Anzaldúa's (1987) "Borderlands" theory. Root (1998) suggested that people who are multiracial occupy the borders of the five recognized race groups and they navigate the world through different types of "border-crossings" (p.xx).

With the border-crossing analogy, multiracials can choose to stand on either side of their racial borders, stand on both sides equally, move freely between both sides, or consciously stand directly in the middle (Root 1987). Now, Root's theory has developed more broadly into what is now known as the Ecological Framework Approach for understanding multiracial identity (Rockquemore et al. 2009:20). The Ecological Approach focuses on the different individual and social conditions that contextualize different racial boarder-crossings. Even within families, Root (1998) uncovered how siblings from the same parents can have different identities. In 2019, it is becoming more widely affirmed that people of two or more races have fluid identities (Morin 2015).

Another groundbreaking work in the field is Spickard's (1984) book "Mixed Blood: Intermarriage and Ethnic Identity in Twentieth-Century America." Spickard (1984) did groundbreaking multigenerational research on intermarriage patterns between Jewish, Japanese and African Americans. His findings challenged the popular notion that intermarriage was the ultimate act of assimilation and integration into whiteness, but rather his findings indicated the opposite to be true. Intermarriage did not result in the erasure or loss of ethnic identities but rather affirmed identities and created opportunities for new multiethnic identities (Spickard 1984).

More recent literature within the CMRS framework are pushing for the more demographic, sociological, and political science orientations to add to the field (Daniel et al. 2014). Buggs (2017) calls attention to how previous research, especially topics pertaining to sex/sexuality, dating, and marriage have largely ignored the growing multiracial population. Campbell (2018) criticizes how the census race question that separates racial identity from Hispanic origin is not actually differentiating between those

who are just Latinx and required to indicate a race from those who view themselves as mixed-Latinx (such as White-Latinx or Afro-Latinx)—the repercussions of this confusion are resulting in inaccurate demographic projections in places like Texas.

What is consistent throughout the literature is that different social characteristics have significant influence on the attitudes and perceptions of interracial marriage (Perry 2013; Johnson and Jacobson 2005; Herman 2004; Golebiowska 2007; Djamba and Kimuna 2014). Although the percentages of the multiracial and multiethnic populations in America may be small, each year the numbers are growing until they can no longer be ignored. This study will contribute to the growing body of literature around attitudes about interracial marriage using the insights from the critical mixed race studies framework. By centering the attitudes of the multiracials, this research also contributes space for the multiracials to be included in social research as a standalone category.

<div align="center">Hypotheses</div>

My two hypotheses are as follows: first, people of Two or More Races feel no different about the impact interracial marriage has had on society compared to other racial groups. Secondly, self-identified multiracials believe more strongly in the positive impact interracial marriage has had on society compared to the 39% national average (Wang 2015) of those who believe the same thing.

III. METHODOLOGY

Dataset

Public data from the Pew Research Center's Survey of Multiracial Adults was used for this analysis. The information in the dataset was appropriate and vital to this analysis because unlike other nationally representative datasets, it has a more nuanced measure of race that go beyond black, white, and other. The data was collected via online, cell phone and landline calls, and mail-in surveys that span from 2014 to 2015 with other supplemental datasets. The entirety of the dataset consists of 21,224 American adults, in which Pew Research identified a sample of 1,555 multiracial Americans ages 18 and older. Additionally, the Pew Research Center's data collectors decided oversampling was necessary for some various non-white groups. The combination of multiple methodological data collection processes and the sheer number of respondents make this dataset nationally representative for the United States (Kehaulani Goo 2015; Patten 2015).

Table 1.
Description of Samples

Sample		N	*Marginal Percentage*
Interracial Marriage Opinion	A good thing for society	439	37.0%
	A bad thing for society	109	9.2%
	Doesn't make much difference	638	53.8%
Self-reported race	White Only	570	48.1%
	Black/African American Only	130	11.0%
	Asian/Pacific Islander/Native Hawaiian	119	10.0%
	American Indian	29	2.4%
	Hispanic Origin--no race	65	5.5%
	2 or More Races	273	23.0%
Total		1186	100.0%
Interracial Marriage Opinion	A good thing for society	1181	35.1%
	A bad thing for society	321	10.4%
	Doesn't make much difference	1672	54.3%
Multirace	Yes, mixed race or multiracial	790	25.3%
	No, not mixed race or multiracial	2284	74.3%
Total		3074	100.0%

Table 2.
Description of Variables

	Variable	Type	Description
Test 1	Self-Reported Race	Independent, Categorical	What Is Your Race? • White Only, • Black Only, • Hispanic Only, • Asian Only, Native Hawaiian And Pacific Islander Only, • Native American, • Two Or More Races
	Interracial Marriage Opinion	Dependent, Categorical	In General, Do You Think That More People of Different Races Marrying Is… • Good for Society, • Bad for Society, • Doesn't Make Much Difference
Test 2	Multirace	Independent, Nominal	"Do You Consider Yourself to be Mixed-Race or Multiracial, that is More Than One Race?" • Yes • No
	Interracial Marriage Opinion	Dependent, Categorical	In General, Do You Think That More People of Different Races Marrying Is… • Good for Society, • Bad for Society, • Doesn't Make Much Difference

The statistics software program, SPSS, was used to compare the racialized perceptions on the impact of interracial marriage across the various racial groups, then again between a monoracial and a multiracial group. The dependent variable for both tests was prompted by the question "In general do you think [more people of different races marrying] is a good thing for our society, a bad thing for our society, or doesn't make much difference?" (Pew Research Center 2015) This variable, named 'Interracial

Marriage Opinion,' remains the constant dependent variable when tested amongst two separate independent variables. The specifics of each hypothesis and the corresponding tests are described below.

<center>Analytical Plan</center>

H0: There is a difference in opinions about the influence of interracial marriage has on society between the racial groups.

To test the first hypothesis, the variable 'Self-Reported Race' was tested against the constant dependent variable, 'Interracial Marriage Opinion.' An initial chi-square analysis indicated significance in this relationship (see in Appendix), which prompted a multinomial logistic regression to determine the nuances between race groups while also controlling for the relevant covariates like gender, education, age, political party, and marital status (Golebiowska 2007; Herman and Campbell 2012; Johnson and Jacobson 2005; Rosenfeld 2007; Wilson and Jacobson 1995; Yancey and Lewis 2009). To control for the covariate influences, the gender, education, political afflication, and marital status variables were dichotomized. Gender was dichotomized between man and woman; education by not college educated and college educated; marital status by married and not married (not married meaning single or separated); and political affiliation by Democrat leaning and Republican leaning.

There were several race-based responses variables in the dataset to choose from; the 'Self-Reported Race' variable happened to include Hispanic-origin and Two or More Races groups alongside the other groups which were Black-only, White-only, Asian-only, Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander, and Native American. Some recoding was necessary to adjust the sample sizes of each race group; due to the small size of the

<center>29</center>

Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander group, this group was recoded with the Asian group to combine Asian, Hawaiian, and Pacific Islander group. Additionally, all non-responses and invalid responses were recoded out of the variable.

Including the Hispanic-origin ethnicity amongst the racial groups is another key feature of this study. Amongst academics, Hispanic-origin is understood as an ethnicity, however, amongst non-academics it is commonly thought of as a race. In fact, when the Hispanic respondents within the dataset were asked about their Hispanic identity, 51.4% of respondents indicated that being Hispanic was a part of both their racial and ethnic identity—compared to the 23.5% who correctly identified their Hispanic-origin as an ethnicity. Due to the heightened confusion amongst the respondents understanding between race, ethnicity, and even national origin, it is best for all intents and purposes of this study to include the Hispanic-origin group along with the other race groups. Additionally, the exclusion of the Hispanic-origin group would drastically lessen the diversity of responses as well as the number of responses. Including the Hispanic-origin category provided 250 additional valid responses to the sample.

H1: Self-identified multiracials will believe more strongly that interracial marriage is positively impacting society compared to the national average (40%).

The second hypothesis was conducted two statistical tests, also using SPSS. First, the variable named 'Multirace' was chosen because it was derived from the question nominal variable, "Do you consider yourself to be mixed-race or multiracial, that is more than one race?" (Pew Research Center 2015). The Multirace variable was chosen because it positively identified the number of respondents who identify themselves as multiracial rather than the generic Two or More Races identity. This variable was compared against the 'Interracial Marriage Opinion' variable in a chi-square test. The results from the chi-

square indicated the proportion of people in the data of people who identify themselves as multiracial *and* believe that interracial marriage has positively influenced society. The results from the chi-square prompted a one-sample proportional test, which examined the difference of how this sample of self-identified multiracials positively feel about interracial marriage when compared to the national average of Americans who also believe that interracial marriage is a good thing for society, which has been indicted at 39% (Wang 2015).

IV. FINDINGS

Test 1

Table 3.
Multinomial Regression Output of Interracial Marriage Opinions Based on Race

Interracial Marriage Opinion		B	Significance	Exp(B)
A Bad thing for Society	Intercept	-2.232	.000	
	Gender	-.252	.270	.777
	Age	.020	.005	1.020
	Education	-1.106	.000	.331
	Marital Status	-.113	.634	.893
	Political Party	1.095	.000	2.990
	White	.632	.027	1.880
	Black	.427	.317	1.532
	Asian/PI/NH	-1.316	.086	.268
	Native American	.358	.684	1.431
	Hispanic	-.637	.337	.529
Doesn't Make Much Difference	Intercept	.429	.103	
	Gender	.084	.523	1.087
	Age	.008	.0523	1.008
	Education	-.981	.000	.410
	Marital Status	-.369	.007	.691
	Political Party	.553	.000	1.738
	White	.341	.036	1.407
	Black	-.075	.749	.928
	Asian/PI/NH	.104	.654	1.110
	Native American	1.037	.047	2.820
	Hispanic	-.409	.170	.665

*The reference categories *A Good Thing for Society* and *Two or More Races*

The sample size for this test had 1,185 valid responses. The sample was predominantly white, making up 48% of the sample. The next largest race group is the Two or More Races group with 273 respondents (23% of the sample). The black/African American Only category accounted for 11% or 113 people. Similarly, ten percent of the

sample identifies as Asian/Pacific Islander/Native Hawaiian. The smallest group, Native American, accounted for 2.4% or 29 people. For the independent variable, over half of the sample (53.8%) indicated that interracial marriage *doesn't make much difference* on society while 37% thought it to be *a good thing for society*. Only 9.2% reported interracial marriage as *a bad thing for society*.

This test isolated how racial identity, alone, can determine the opinion of interracial marriage while accounting for the influence of covariate variables such as age, gender, marriage status, and political party. The test results were significant (.000) with an alpha at the .05 level. Additionally, the negelkerke value of .124 indicated that the model is sound; meaning that the test accurately measured the isolated influence of race and on interracial marriage opinions.

Race Findings

The initial chi-squared statistic indicated that race was a significant variable (.001) in this test. When comparing the categories, the white racial category showed the most dramatic results. The white group was 88% more likely to report interracial marriage is a bad thing for society than a good thing compared to the Two or More Races group. Alternately, the white group showed 40.7% more likely to report interracial marriage does not make much difference compared to it being a good thing for society. Almost all of the other race groups had non-significant findings, with the exception of Native Americans who showed a 182% more likely to say interracial marriage *doesn't make much difference* compared than a good thing for society than the Two or More Races group. There were no significant findings between the Two or More Races group compared to the black, Hispanic-origin, and the Asian, Pacific Islander, and Native

Hawaiian groups. Because significant difference between the races were found, the null hypothesis was rejected.

Covariate Findings

The age variable, a continuous variable, shows significance (.005). Consistent with previous research, the relationship shows that older age corresponds with more negative views of interracial marriage (Livingston and Brown 2017). Education showed to be highly influential in this analysis; with a strong .000 significance. Respondents who were college educated were 67% less likely to say interracial marriage is a bad thing for society compared to respondents who were not college educated. Consistent with the literature, this finding affirms that college education, or mere the exposure to diversity that comes from attending college, results in more positive reflections and acceptance of interracial marriage (Livingston and Brown 2017).

Political party was also significant (.000). Respondents who were Republican leaning were 199% more likely to say interracial marriage is a bad thing for society, compared to Democratic leaning; this finding is consistent with literature showing Republicans and Republican-leaning people feel interracial marriages are bad or society or don't make much difference (Livingston and Brown 2017). The gender covariate did not have significant findings, which contradicts past findings that men believe more strongly that interracial marriage is a good thing for society than women who feel more strongly for the opposite (Livingston and Brown 2017). Interestingly, respondents who are married were 30.9% more likely to say that interracial married *doesn't make much difference* compared to respondents who were not married.

Table 4.
Chi-Square Output of Interracial Marriage Opinions by Multiracial Identification

		Interracial Marriage Opinion			
		A Good Thing for Society	A Bad Thing for Society	Doesn't Make Much Difference	Total
Do you consider yourself Mixed Race, Multiracial, that is more than one race?	Yes, Mixed Race or Multiracial	337 31.2%	48 15.0%	405 24.2%	790 25.7%
	No, not Mixed Race or Multiracial	744 68.8%	273 85%	1267 75.8%	2284 74.3%
	Total	1081 100%	321 100%	1672 100%	3074

The second analysis was conducted in two parts in order to determine how if multiracial people feel more positively about the impact of interracial marriage on society compared the general public's national average. First, a variable was selected that separated respondents who identify themselves as mixed race or multiracial from those who are monoracial. For clarity and focus, those who chose not to answer or identified as something else were recoded out of the sample. Out of the 3,074 people in the sample, 790 people positively identified themselves as multiracial and 2,284 people did not identify as not multiracial; meaning that the sample was overwhelmingly monoracial (74.5%) compared to the 25.7% that were multiracial. The multiracial and monoracial variable tested against 'Interracial Marriage Opinion' using a chi-square test. Within the sample, the majority of respondents (54%) indicated that interracial marriage *doesn't make much difference* on society compared to 35% who said it was *a good thing for*

society. Only 10% of the whole sample said that interracial marriage was *a bad thing for society*.

The results of the chi-square test indicated significance (.000) and the .05 alpha level which demonstrates that there is a difference between multiracial people and monoracial people in their beliefs about the impacts of interracial marriages. As indicated in Table 3, both groups had most respondents indicate that interracial marriage *doesn't make much difference to society*. Monoracials were more than double to say that interracial marriage was *a good thing* and three times more likely to say that it *doesn't make much difference* compared to multiracials. Most significantly, monoracials were reported that interracial marriage was *a bad thing for society* at a rate 5.5 times higher than multiracials. Put differently, of the 10% people in the sample that believe interracial marriage is *a bad thing for society*, 85% of them were monoracial.

The second part of the test was isolating the percentage of multiracials that had a positive view of interracial marriage and compare that percentage to the national average of people who also thing positively of interracial marriage (39%) (Wang 2015). Amongst multiracials, 42% of the sample said that interracial marriage was *a good thing for society*. Next, I conducted a 1-sample proportional t-test against a .39 test statistic, representing the general publics' positive view of interracial marriage. The test results showed significance (0.035) at the .05 alpha level. The one-sample proportions test indicates that multiracials are proportionally more positive about interracial marriage than the general public, therefore, this finding fails to reject the hypothesis. The combination of these two tests support that multiracials hold different views from both non-multiracials (monoracials) and the general public.

V. CONCLUSION AND DICUSSION

The results from the first test show that race is a significant and impactful indicator for determining interracial marriage opinions. In comparing each race to the Two or More Races group, the white group was the only race group to show significant difference in interracial marriage opinions. No other race group (besides Native Americans) showed significant differences in their reflections about interracial marriage compared to multiracials. Interestingly, these non-significant findings speak more volumes than the significant findings. The non-significant findings illustrate how the Two or More Races group has views that are more align with the other people of color groups rather than the white group. With no significant differences amongst the non-white groups may, this finding could indicate that Two or More Races group could be adopting a racialized politics that is more akin to the Collective Black status, rather than Bonilla-Silva's (2002) suggestion that multiracials would be more aligned with the White and Honorary White status. In connection with the other CMRS theories, these findings could be portraying a larger trend of racialization of multiracials.

There were a handful of shortcomings that may have influenced the results and interpretation of the first hypothesis test. Firstly, sample of Native Americans were noticeably smaller than the rest of the race groups. The twenty-nine Native Americans in the sample were not recoded into a different group like with the Asian Americans, Native Hawaiian, and Pacific Islanders. Keeping the small group of Native Americans in the sample was done in the spirit of inclusivity, visibility, and acknowledgement despite the potential for the results to be over (or under) inflated. The test results indicated that Native Americans were 182% more likely than multiracials to say that interracial

marriage does not make much different compared to it being a good thing. Any comparison of the multiracial group to the Native American group should be taken lightly, as the Native American group sample is too small to make any substantive inferential conclusions. Though the Pew Research Center's dataset was nationally representative and oversampled non-white populations, more Native American respondents would have made the comparisons between Native Americans and multiracials more salient and statistically reliable.

Moreover about the sample, including the Hispanic-Origin ethnicity amongst the racial groups is another key feature of this study. Amongst academics, Hispanic origin is understood as an ethnicity, however, amongst non-academics it is commonly thought of as a race. In fact, when the Hispanic respondents within the dataset were asked about their Hispanic identity, 51.4% of respondents indicated that being Hispanic was a part of both their racial and ethnic identity—compared to the 23.5% who correctly identified their Hispanic-origin as an ethnicity. Due to the heightened confusion amongst the respondents understanding between race, ethnicity, and even national origin, it was decided to include the Hispanic-origin group along with the other race groups. Additionally, the exclusion of the Hispanic-origin group would drastically lessen the diversity of responses as well as the number of responses. Including the Hispanic-origin category provided 250 additional valid responses to the sample.

Another shortcoming from the dataset is the wording of the survey questions that lead to ambiguity for the respondents to interpret for themselves. For my analysis, the primary dependent variable derives from the survey question "In general, do you think more people of different races marrying is…[Good for society, Bad for society, or

Doesn't make much difference]?" (Pew Research Center 2015). The wording of the survey question does not distinguish between races or ethnicities; therefore, the respondents could have interpreted this question to also include ethnic considerations. Knowing that Hispanic-white unions are one of the most common *intermarriage* types of union in the United States, my inclusion of Hispanic origin respondents in my sample could have also considered the impact of cross-ethnic unions within their consideration of the impact of interracial marriages.

Though this thesis found how race, specifically, impacts the views about interracial marriage, this study cannot begin to theorize the nuances of these views. Though the Two or More Races group appear more similar to other people of color, these results should not be interpreted using racial essentialist stance. Keeping in line with the tenants of CMRS, the findings of this test need to be further contextualized. A continuation of this study should explore the nuances of why people of color, in general, believe that interracial marriage has been good for society and the rationales behind this belief. Similarly, more research should be developed to explore the 'doesn't make much difference' opinion on interracial marriage. A continuation of this study would examine qualitatively explore the rationales behind the various sentiments of interracial marriage opinions to see if these opinions are informed. Additionally, more research should explore if interracial marriage opinions, and other socio-political views in general, differ between various multiracial groups—such as black/white biracials compared to Asian/white or Hispanic/white biracials.

Next, the findings from the second test failed to reject the hypothesis which suggested that self-identified multiracials, being produced from interracial relationships,

would overall have a more positive view on the impact of interracial marriages compared to the general public. The results of this test are impactful for the critical mixed race studies field by demonstrating how multiracials how multiracials can be studied as a stand-alone population while also illustrating how multiracials are different from the general public. Again, future research should explore the specific nuances of these beliefs and how they might differ from monoracials despite holding the same beliefs on paper. Further, this test should be replicated to see if multiracials are also different from the general public regarding the other two response categories (a bad thing for society or doesn't make much difference).

This study was heavily informed by the racialized identity process of multiracials; however, the impact of this research broadens the literature about how multiracials act as a social group—something that the CMRS discipline is currently moving towards (Daniels et al. 2014). The first finding of this study indicate that the Two or More Races group holds similar racialized attitudes about interracial marriage that are more akin to people of color groups rather than the white racial group. The second finding demonstrates how multiracials hold more different and more positive views of interracial marriage than the average American. Without trying to essentialize race, this thesis contributes to the growing body of literature about how multiracials act as a stand-alone racialized group. While controlled the influence of age, gender, education, and political leanings, these findings could open gates to more studies to compare racialized attitudes between multiracials and other groups for other socio-political questions.

Though this was a quantitative study, conscious efforts were made to not entirely decontextualize the many multiracial identities by choosing variables that emphasized

self-identification rather than taking liberties to combining various multiracial sub-groups together to form a monolithic multiracial group. Having a variable that captures self-identifying multiracial was a pivotal part of the process because as other research has shown, about 16% of Americans *could* recognize themselves as multiracial but only 4% choose to identify as such. An essential part of the multiracial experience is having the freedom and right to choose how you identify yourself rather than being identified by others (Root 1996); these rights were carefully considered within the variable selection.

As explored in the literature, the identities and experiences of multiracials are reliant on social contexts (Rockquemore and Brunsma 2002). Therefore, the findings of these two tests must be contextualized within the year of data collection. The survey data was collected throughout the 2015 and the social contexts and forces in the past four years could have impacted the way some people of Two or More Races identify. In addition, 2015 was the start of the 2016 U.S. presidential election cycle and the departure of President Barack Obama; it was the year of the Rachel Dolezal scandal, a white women who posed as black to become a NAACP chapter president; the year gay marriage became legalized in the U.S.; and the rise of the Black Lives Matter movement after several high profile police brutality cases. Since then, a number of other major social events could have impacted the way multiracials may identify, such as the Colin Kaepernick National Anthem kneeling protests, the election of Donald Trump and his subsequent policies against Muslim and Mexican immigrants; the Dakota Access Pipeline protest movement against oil rigs through Indigenous land of Standing Rock Indian Reservation; the rise of white-nationalist and neo-Nazi hate crimes in America, as well as American biracial actress, Meghan Markel marrying into England's royal family. Any

number of these events could have numerous impacts on racial formation processes, and also could have impacted this samples' politics and attitudes towards interracial marriage. Therefore, future research should refer to the findings of this study as a 2015 cohort of Two or More and/or multiracial Americans. A re-examination of this cohort for longitudinal study or future replications of this dataset would greatly contribute to the critical mixed race studies field.

Table 5.
Covariate Results of Multinomial Regression Output

Variable	Reference Categories	Significance
Age		.012
Gender	0=Man 1=Woman	.284
College Educated	0=Not College Educated 1=College educated	.000
Marriage Status	0= Married 1= Not Married	.020
Political Party	0=Democratic leaning 1=Republican leaning	.000

REFERENCES

Anderson, Celia Rousseau. 2014. "What Are You? A CRT Perspective on the
Experiences of Mixed Race Persons in 'Post-Racial' America." *Race Ethnicity and
Education* 18(1):1–19.

Anzaldúa, Gloria. (1987). *Borderlands: The New Mestiza = la frontera*. Aunt Lute
Books.

Arab American Institute (AAI). 2018. "Demographics."
(http://www.aaiusa.org/demographics)

Beydoun, Khaled, 2013. "Between Muslim and White: The Legal Construction of Arab
American Identity" (Published November 22, 2014). 69 N.Y.U. Ann. Surv. Am. L.
29

Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. 2017. *Racism Without Racists: Color-Blind Racism and the
Persistence of Racial Inequality in America*. 5th ed. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield
Publishers, Inc.

Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. 2002. "We Are All Americans!: The Latin Americanization of
Racial Stratification in the USA." *Race & Society* 5:3–16.

Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo and David Dietrich. 2011. "The Sweet Enchantment of Color-
Blind Racism in Obamerica." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and
Social Science* 634(1):190–206.

Brice-Saddler, Michael. 2019. "This city wanted to be welcoming. Then a candidate
vowed to 'keep Marysville a white community.' *The Washington Post*, August 23,
2019. Retrieved September 1, 2019.
(https://www.washingtonpost.com/nation/2019/08/24/this-city-wanted-be-
welcoming-then-candidate-vowed-keep-marysville-white-community/)

Brunsma, David L. 2005. "Interracial Families and the Racial Identification of Mixed-
Race Children: Evidence from the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study." *Social
Forces* 84(2):1131–57.

Brunsma, David L. 2006. "Public Categories, Private Identities: Exploring Regional
Differences in the Biracial Experience." *Social Science Research* 35(3):555–76.

Buggs, Shantel Gabrieal. 2017. "Does (Mixed-)Race Matter? The Role of Race in
Interracial Sex, Dating, and Marriage." *Sociology Compass* 11:1–13.

Campbell, Mary. 2018. "Latinx Multiracial Groups and the 2020 Census: Projections and
Demographics" Presented at Population Association of America in April 2018.
Retrieved June 2018

Census Bureau. 2018. "About Race." retrieved from
(https://www.census.gov/topics/population/race/about.html revised Jan. 23, 2018.)

Colby, Sandra L. and Jennifer M. Ortman. 2015. "Projections of the Size and
Composition of the US Population: 2014 to 2060." *Current Population Reports*
p.25-1143.

Daniel, G. Reginald. 2002. *More Than Black? Multiracial Identity and the New Racial
Order.* Philadelphia: Temple.

Daniel, G. Reginald. 2009. "Race, Multiraciality, and the Election of Barack Obama:

toward a More Perfect Union?" *The Black Scholar* 39(3-4):51–59.

Daniel, Reginald G., Laura Kina, and Wei Ming Dariotis. 2014. "Emerging Paradigms in

Critical Mixed Race Studies." *Journal of Critical Mixed Race Studies* 1(1):6–65.

Delgado, Richard and Jean Stefancic. 2017. *Critical Race Theory: An Introduction*. Third

Edition. New York University Press, New York.

Djamba, Yanyi K. and Sitawa R. Kimuna. 2014. "Are Americans Really in Favor of

Interracial Marriage? A Closer Look at When They Are Asked About Black-White

Marriage for Their Relatives." *Journal of Black Studies* 45(6):528–44.

Golebiowska, Ewa A. 2007. "The Contours and Etiology of Whites' Attitudes Toward

Black-White Interracial Marriage." *Journal of Black Studies* 38(2):268–87.

Golub, Mark. 2005. "Plessy as 'Passing': Judicial Responses to Ambiguously Raced

Bodies in Plessy v. Ferguson." *Law and Society Review* 39(3):563–600.

Guzman, Natalie S. de and Adrienne Nishina. 2017. "50 Years of Loving: Interracial

Romantic Relationships and Recommendations for Future Research." *Journal of

Family Theory & Review* 9:557–71.

Harris, David R. and Jeremiah Joseph Sim. 2002. "Who Is Multiracial? Assessing the

Complexity of Lived Race." *American Sociological Review* 67(4):614–27.

Herman, Melissa. 2004. "Forced to Choose: Some Determinants of Racial Identification

in Multiracial Adolescents." *Child Development* 75(3):730–48.

Herman, Melissa R. and Mary E. Campbell. 2012. I wouldn't, but you can: Attitudes

toward interracial relationships. *Social Science Research* 41(2):343–58.

Hochschild, Jennifer L. and Brenna Marea Powell. 2008. "Racial Reorganization and the

    United States Census 1850-1930: Mulattoes, Half-Breeds, Mixed Parentage,

    Hindoos, and the Mexican Race." *Studies in American Political Development*

    22(1):59–96.

Horowitz, Adam L. and Charles J. Gomez. 2018. "Identity Override: How Sexual

    Orientation Reduces the Rigidity of Racial Boundaries." *Sociological Science*

    5:669–93.

Johnson, Bryan R. and Cardell K. Jacobson. 2005. Contact in context: An examination of

    social settings on whites' attitudes toward interracial marriage. *Social Psychology*

    Quarterly 68(4):387–99.

Johnston, Marc P. and Kevin L. Nadal. 2010. "Multiracial Microaggressions: Exposing

    Monoracism in Everyday Life and Clinical Practice." Pp. 123–144 in

    Microaggressions and Marginality: Manifestation, Dynamics, and Impact, edited

    by D. Wing Sue. New York: Wiley & Sons.

Jordan, Winthrop D. and Paul Spickard. 2014. "Historical Origins of the One-Drop

    Racial Rule in the United States." *Journal of Critical Mixed Race Studies* 1(1):98–

    132.

Kang Fu, Vincent and Nicholas H. Wolfinger. 2011. "Broken Boundaries or Broken

    Marriages? Racial Intermarriage and Divorce in the United States." *SOCIAL*

    SCIENCE QUARTERLY 92(4):1096–1117.

Kehaulani Goo, Sara. 2015. "How Pew Research Conducted It's Survey of Multiracial

    Americans." *Pew Research Center* Fact Tank. June 11, 2015.

Khanna, Nikki. 2012. "Multiracial Americans: Racial Identity Choices and Implications
for the Collection of Race Data." *Sociology Compass* 6(4):316–31.

Khanna, Nikki. 2018. ""But What About the Children?' Understanding Contemporary
Attitudes Towards Interracial Dating and Marriage" Pp. 133-148 in *Getting Real
About Race Second Edition,* edited by Stephanie M. McClure and Cherise A. Harris.
SAGE Publications Inc.

King-O'Riain, Rebecca Chiyoko. 2014. *Global Mixed Race*. New York: NYU Press.

Krumpal, Ivar. 2013. "Determinants of Social Desirability Bias in Sensitive Surveys: A
Literature Review." *Qual Quant* 47:2025–47.

Lee, Jennifer and Frank D. Bean. 2012. "A Postracial Society or a Diversity Paradox?
Race, Immigration, and Multiraciality in the Twenty-First Century." *Du Bois Review*
9(2):419–37.

Liebler, Carolyn A. 2016. "On the Boundaries of Race: Identification of Mixed-Heritage
Children in the United States, 1960 to 2010." Sociology of Race and Ethnicity
2(4):548–68.

Lin, Ken-Hou and Jennifer Lundquist. 2013. "Mate Selection in Cyberspace: The
Intersection of Race, Gender, and Education 1." *American Journal of Sociology*
119(1):183–215.

Littlewood McKibbin, Molly. 2014. "The Current State of Multiracial Discourse The
Current State of Multiracial Discourse." *Journal of Critical Mixed Race Studies*
1(11).

Livingston, Gretchen and Anna Brown. 2017. "Intermarriage in the U.S. 50 Years After
Loving v. Virginia." *Pew Research Center* 1–35.

Lofguist, Daphne, Terry Lugalia, Marin O'Connell, and Sarah Feliz. 2012. "Households

and Families: 2010" *2010 Census Briefs*

https://www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/briefs/c2010br-14.pdf

Loving v. Virginia, 388 U.S. 1 (1967)

Lowenthal, Terri Ann. 2014. *Race and Ethnicity in the 2020 Census: Improving Data to

Capture a Multiethnic America*. Report for the Leadership Conference Education

Fund.

McClintock, Elizabeth Aura and Velma McBride Murry. 2010. "When Does Race

Matter? Race, Sex, and Dating at an Elite University." *Journal of Marriage and

Family*, 72(1), 45–72.

Mezey, Naomi. 2003. "Erasure and Recognition: The Census, Race and the National

Imagination." *Northwestern University Law Review* 97 (4): 1701–68.

Mishra, Neha. 2018. "Asian Americans: Eurogamy by Asian Women." *American

Behavioral Scientist* 62(14):1988–2006.

Miyawaki, Michael Hajime. 2016. "Part-Latinos and Racial Reporting in the Census: An

Issue of Question Format?" *Critical Analyses of Race, Measurement, and

Methodology* 2(3):289–309.

Moran, Rachel F. 2001. *Interracial Intimacy: The Regulation of Race & Romance*.

University of Chicago Press.

Morin, Rich. 2015. "Among Multiracial Adults, Racial Identity Can Be Fluid" *Pew

Research Center*. Retrieved January 9, 2019 (http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-

tank/2015/06/16/among-multiracial-adults-racial-identity-can-be-fluid/).

Newport, Frank. 2013. "In U.S., 87% Approve of Black-White Marriage, vs. 4% in

    1958." *Gallup.com*. Retrieved April 19, 2018

    (http://news.gallup.com/poll/163697/approve-marriage-blacks-whites.aspx).

Omi, M. and H. Winant. 2014. *Racial Formation in the United States*. Taylor & Francis.

Parker, Kim, Juliana Menasce Horowitzrich, Rich Morin and Mark Hugo Lopez. 2015.

    "Multiracial In America: Proud, Diverse and Growing in Numbers" Washington

    D.C.: *Pew Research Center*

Pascoe, Peggy. 2009. *What Comes Naturally: Miscegenation Law and the Making of*

    Race in America. New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Patten, Eileen. 2015. "Who Is Multiracial? Depends on How You Ask: A Comparison of

    Six Survey Methods to Capture Racial Identity." Washington, D.C.: *Pew Research*

    Center, November. http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2015/11/06/who-is-

    multiracial-depends-on-how-you-ask/

Perry, Samuel L. 2013. "Religion and Whites' Attitudes Toward Interracial Marriage with

    African Americans, Asians, and Latinos." *Journal for the Scientific Study of*

    Religion. Retrieved April 20, 2018

    (http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/jssr.12020/abstract).

Pew Research Center. 2015. "Multiracial in America: Proud, Diverse and Growing in

    Numbers." Washington, D.C.: June

Plessy v. Ferguson, 163 U.S. 537 (1896)

Qian, Zhenchao and Daniel Lichter. 2011. "Social Boundaries and Marital Assimilation:

    Interpreting Trends in Racial and Ethnic Intermarriage." *American Sociological*

    Review, 72, 68–94.

Robnett, Belinda and Cynthia Feliciano. 2011. "Patterns of Racial-Ethnic Exclusion by
    Internet Daters." *Social Forces*, 89(3), 807–828.

Rockquemore, Kerry Ann. 1999. "Between Black and White: Exploring the Biracial
    Experience." Race and Society 1:197-212

Rockquemore, Kerry Ann and David L. Brunsma. 2002. "Socially Embedded Identities:
    Theories. Typologies and Processes of Racial Identity among Black/White
    Biracials." *The Sociology Quarterly* 43(3):335–56.

Rockquemore, Kerry Ann, David L. Brunsma, and Daniel J. Delgado. 2009. Racing to
    Theory or Retheorizing Race? Understanding the Struggle to Build a *M*ultiracial
    Identity Theory." Journal of Social Issues Vol. 65(1):13-34

Root, Maria P. P. 1996. *The Multiracial Experience: Racial Borders as the New
    Frontier.* Ed. Maria P.P. Root. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Root, Maria P. P. 1998. "Experiences and Processes Affecting Racial Identity
    Development: Preliminary Results from the Biracial Sibling Project." *Cultural
    Diversity and Mental Health* 4(3):237–47.

Rosenfeld, Michael J. 2007. *The Age of Independence: Interracial Unions, Same Sex
    Unions, and the Changing American Family*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University
    Press.

Silverman, Hollie. 2019. "3 Couples are Suing Virginia After Being Denied Marriage
    Licenses Because They Refused to Disclose Their Race." CNN September 10,
    2019. Retrieved September 20, 2019.
    (https://www.cnn.com/2019/09/10/us/virginia-marriage-license-race-
    question/index.html)

Sollors, Werner. 2000. *Interracialism Black-White Intermarriage in American History, Literature, and Law*. Oxford : Oxford University Press.

Spencer, Rainier. 2005. *Challenging the Multiracial Identity*. Lynne Rienner Publishers

Spencer, Rainier. 2014. "'Only the News They Want to Print': Mainstream Media and Critical Mixed-Race Studies." *Journal of Critical Mixed Race Studies* 1(1):162–82.

Spickard, Paul R. 1984, *Mixed Blood: Intermarriage and Ethnic Identity in Twentieth-Century America.* Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press

Spickard, Paul R. 2015. *Race In Mind: Critical Essays*. Indiana : University of Notre Dame Press.

Spickard, Paul and Ingrid Dineen-Wimberly. 2015. "It's Not That Simple: Multiraciality, Models, and Social Hierarchy." Pp. 308–29 in *Race In Mind: Critical Essays*. University of Notre Dame Press.

Steinbugler, Amy C. 2012. *Beyond Loving Intimate Racework in Lesbian, Gay, and Straight Interracial Relationships*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Strmic-Pawl, Hephzibah 2014. "The Influences Affecting and the Influential Effects of Multiracials: Multiracialism and Stratification" *Sociology Compass* 8 (1) pp: 63-77.

Strmic-Pawl, Hephzibah. 2016. *Multiracialism and Its Discontents: A Comparative Analysis of Black- White and Asian-White Multiracials.* Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

US Census Bureau. 2018. "About Race." *About*. Retrieved April 20, 2018 (https://www.census.gov/topics/population/race/about.html).

US Census Bureau. 2012. "2010 Census Shows Interracial and Interethnic Married

    Couples Grew b7 28 percent over a Decade"

    https://www.census.gov/newsroom/releases/archives/2010_census/cb12-68.html

Velasquez-Manoff, Moises. 2017. "What Biracial People Know." *The New York Times*.

    Retrieved April 18, 2018

Wang, Wendy. 2015. "Interracial Marriage: Who Is 'Marrying out'?" *Pew Research

    Center*. Retrieved (https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2015/06/12/interracial-

    marriage-who-is-marrying-out/).

Wilson, Deborah S. and Cardell K. Jacobson. 1995. "Whites attitudes towards black and

    white interracial marriage." In *American families: Issues in race and ethnicity*,

    edited by Cardell K. Jacobson, pp. 353–67. New York: Garland.

Yancey, George and Richard Lewis. 2009. *Interracial families: Current concepts and

    controversies*. New York: Routledge.

Zraich, Karen. 2019. "Mississippi Event Hall Refuses to Host Interracial Wedding, Then

    Apologizes". *New York Times,* September 3, 2019. Retrieved September 6, 2019

    (https://www.nytimes.com/2019/09/03/us/mississippi-interracial-couple-

    wedding.html)