Effects of Multiracial Identification on Students' Perception of Racism

Zongli Tang

Marcus Ann

Larry Mullins

Kim Brackett

Nelya McKenzie

Department of Sociology

Auburn University Montgomery

In this paper, we compare the different perceptions of racism experienced by white, black, and white/black multiracial students on the urban campus of a Southern land grant university. Students self-identified their racial classification and answered questions about their experiences of racism in contacts with other students, with professors, and on the campus in general. This paper will discuss global issues/experiences of race on college campuses. Then we will present selections from the limited literature on multiracial persons in the US. Next, we will report the results of a campus wide survey of perceptions of racism. Finally, we will discuss the implications of the study findings.

While common sense holds that college campuses are insulated from the broader cultural realities, students and faculty members are aware of the inaccuracy of this perception, experiencing the university as a microcosm of social issues (Kent, 1996). An area where the campus community has experienced this "reality" first hand is race relations (Buttny, 1997). Campuses across the country, including Stanford University, Arizona State University, The University of Mississippi, and Auburn University have had to face racist incidents in recent years. In 1998, FBI statistics indicated 250 incidents of hate crimes were reported on college campuses (McGrew, 2000). Hate crimes vary widely in their severity and targets, but have been prominent on university campuses for the last two decades (cf. Downey & Stage, 1999 for a complete discussion).

There are many consequences to a campus climate of racial intolerance. Ethnic minority students often find themselves alienated from whites, and this is particularly true on a predominantly white campus (Fisher & Hartmann, 1995). Minority students are less likely to feel the university reflects their values and are more likely than whites to feel isolated (Loo & Rolison, 1986). Black students are also more likely to drop out of college than are white students (Suen, 1983). Altbach (1991) suggests, "White students remain liberal in their attitudes about races relations, although there seems to be an undercurrent of resentment against affirmative action and other special programs for minorities" (p. 4).

These different experiences of college life may perhaps be indicative of feelings of distrust or lack of communication between different racial/ethnic groups. A classic situation observed by Asante and Al-deen (1984) in their ethnographic study was ethnic clustering in the cafeteria. This clustering, viewed negatively by whites who equated it with racial segregation, was valued by minorities who saw it as a source of support in an otherwise unsupportive culture (Loo & Rolison, 1986). Feagin (1992) conducted in-depth interviews with black Americans in 14 cities across the US and concluded that racism is a significant problem for minority students on predominantly white campuses. The specific campus barriers he identified were: "(a) white students, (b) white faculty members, (c) white administrators and staff, and (d) white alumni" (p. 549). While the first two groups were found to have the most direct impact on the college experiences of minority students, all were thought to contribute to higher attrition among black students.

In examinations of personal experiences of prejudice and interracial contacts, both blacks and whites generally agree that it is important to make friends with people of other racial groups (Fisher & Hartmann, 1995). Social segregation is, however, the norm for most predominantly white campuses, with groups tending to cluster in certain organizations and spaces. Fisher and Hartmann (1995) reported that 44% of the black students in their study had been the targets of racial prejudice by other students. Seven and one half percent of white students reported experiencing racial prejudice. Of the prejudiced incidents reported by the black respondents, 41% involved spoken slurs and 34% involved whispers and nasty looks. Results were more optimistic in a study by Bunzel (1991) at Stanford University. Five percent of whites reported a first hand experience of racist behavior; just under 30% of blacks reported such an experience.

In a more recent exploration of racial discrimination, Biasco et al. (2001) surveyed a 10% sample of students at University of West Florida. Sixty-seven percent of the students surveyed reported experiencing discrimination at the university: 15% daily, 18% monthly, and 13% annually. When comparing black and white respondents, 66% of blacks reported experiencing

racial discrimination, compared to 41% of whites having that experience. While 85% of blacks and 74% of whites believed racial hostility exists, more blacks than whites (34% and 11%, respectively) felt that fraternities and sororities where a factor in discrimination. When asked about perceived discrimination from professors, 40% of blacks and 11% of whites reported a discrimination experience with faculty.

Racist incidents are not the only racial issue to impact universities. Increasingly, colleges and universities engage in dialogues about race because of the changing racial and ethnic composition of the student body. With the potential to select 126 different race/ethnic classification combinations on the 2000 Census, greater variety in racial and ethnic experiences are being recognized. The 2000 Census data indicate that 7 million Americans (2.4% of the US population) identify themselves as multiracial (Wellner, 2002). The largest group of multiracial persons (39.7% of the multiracials or 2,707,213 persons) was between 5 and 24 years of age. In terms of multiracial identity, those identifying as White/American Indian or Alaska Native was the largest specified group at 1,082,683. Persons indicating a multiracial White/Black identification numbered 784,764 (Multiracials: Population, 2002). In the study being reported in this paper, all persons claiming a multiracial identity were White/Black.

Within the last ten years, the possibility of claiming mixed race or multiracial as an identity has expanded rapidly. While Census 2000 was the first official accounting of multiracial persons, all subsequent government documents following Census format will permit persons to select more than one race/ethnic category to describe themselves (El Nasser, 2001). The changing of Census categories has ushered in a new concern by many different constituencies about the experiences of multiracial persons. Corporate business and marketing executives (Wellner, 2002), leisure service providers (Hibbler & Shinew, 2002), and educators (Nishimura, 1998) have asked how to best serve this increasing segment of the US population. Likewise, researchers want to know more about the attitudes and experiences of a group that does not fit readily into pre-existing racial categories.

Most research to date on multiracial persons has focused primarily on identity, not on attitude or experiential differences of a "multiracial" group. Available literature examines consequences of identity, identity confusion, and more recently, how a multiracial identity develops (Benedetto & Oliski, 2001). There has been little empirical exploration of differences between multiracials and monoracials, partly because it was assumed that one would ultimately select one of the monoracial ethnic groups with which to identify (Korgen, 1998). For example, the historical reliance on the "one drop rule" led researchers to conclude that most persons with one African-American parent would adopt African-American as their racial identity today (Spencer, 1999). Indeed, in a study of 194 high school students who were ethnically or racially mixed Phinney and Alipuria (1996) reported that more than 75% of students who had one Black parent referred to themselves as Black and among students who had one White and one Black parent, none labeled themselves as White.

The pressure to choose a racial identity often begins in the home (Nishimura, 1998; Wardle, 2000) and tends to be reinforced by bureaucratic practices that require single-race identification (Wardle, 2000). Despite the failure of both bureaucrats and scholars to view multiracial or multiethnic persons as a distinct population, recent evidence suggests that these persons often see themselves as unique and different from either of their parents (Hall, 2001, Nishimura, 1998). In fact, in an investigation of issues facing multiracial college students, Nishimura (1998) found that a primary concern of the subjects was lack of empathy from loved ones. The students reported that "...people, including their parents, do not know what it is like to be multiracial" (p. 49). In addition, these students indicated that participation in minority organizations or activities on campus (e.g., The African American Student Alliance) was not satisfying, because of the subtle pressure to "choose" a racial identity.

Multiracial persons clearly are a socially marginalized group. First, prior to the 2000 census there was no official recognition of them as a group at all, despite obvious evidence to the contrary. Secondly, according to Harris (2002), there is little evidence that minorities are any

less discriminatory towards multiracial persons than are nonminorities. Thus, multiracial persons are prone to experience discrimination from persons of their own races as well as persons of other races. Multiracial persons are "different," in that they are both and neither of their heritages. Being both and neither provides a unique standpoint or life experience.

Standpoint theory posits that social hierarchies are a universal phenomenon and that the position of a particular group within a hierarchy strongly influences the "...power, opportunities, and experiences..." of its members (Wood, 1997, p. 251). Simply put, your view of the world is influenced by where you, or your group, stand within the social hierarchy. Furthermore, some positions within the social hierarchy tend to provide more accurate depictions of events than do others. For example, standpoint theorist contend that members of groups in higher social positions often have less accurate knowledge of events than do those in lower positions. Those who occupy higher social positions and who through those positions establish the status quo, typically do not notice anything "wrong" with the current state. However, those who occupy lower social positions typically are more sensitive to environmental cues. Harding (1991, cited in Wood, p. 254) explains,

> ...people with subordinate status have greater motivation to understand the perspective of more powerful groups than vice versa. Economic security and survival, material comforts, and so forth depend on developing insight into the motives, expectations, values, and behavioral patterns of those who hold power. (p. 254)

Thus, "...our standpoints influence how we communicate and how we interpret the communication of others" (p. 255). For Black-White mixed race persons, these standpoints arise from a culturally subordinate position. They are not White, but neither are they Black.

Being not "fully" a particular race, places multiracial persons in a social grouping different from that of either parent. Although multiracial persons usually are assimilated into the identity or heritage of one parent (Wardle, 2000), they nevertheless face issues not experienced by their monoracial peers. For example, potential discrimination and rejection by monoracials,

possessing physical features which clearly indicate difference, and pressure to ignore or repress part of their identity (Nishimura, 1998). Such concerns, not experienced by more dominant groups, create for multiracial persons a lower social position than monoracials, regardless of race, and, consequently, a unique standpoint. Because of their unique position in the social hierarchy, we might expect multiracial persons to have perceptions or interpretations of events that differ from those of monoracials. In this particular study, we attempted to discern differences between self-identified Black, White, and Black-White mixed race persons in their perceptions or interpretations of events on a college campus. Based on Standpoint Theory, we would expect the three groups to differ.

Methods

Participants and Data Collection

A questionnaire was administered to students enrolled in 26 randomly selected classes at a small southern university during the spring quarter 1998. Using a proportionate stratified sampling approach, the 26 classes were selected from the total 555 class sections being taught that quarter. The sample resulted in representative classes from all of the academic schools and from all class periods, including day, night, and weekend periods.

The sample consisted of 16 day classes (60%), 9 night classes (35%), and one weekend class (5%). These percentages reflect the actual proportion of classes in these time periods. Instructors were asked for permission to administer the questionnaire during regular class time. Permission was denied for seven of the original 26 randomly selected classes. Consequently, an additional seven classes were randomly selected, taking into account class periods. Of these, permission was denied in one case and this class also was replaced.

A total of 496 students were enrolled in the 26 classes. Of these, 398 were present in class on the date the questionnaire was administered. All of those present voluntarily participated in the study for a return rate of 80%.

Collection of the data was performed by a member of the research team. Completion of the questionnaire by students took approximately 20 minutes and respondents were asked to complete the questionnaire without discussion with other class members. They also were assured that any information provided on the questionnaire would be confidential and anonymous.

Instrumentation and Measurement

Overall Instrument. The questionnaire used was designed specifically for this study. It was 19 pages in length, consisting of three discrete sections. In the first section, respondents were asked to provide basic demographic information about themselves. For example, sex, age, race/ethnicity, college classification, household income, and place of birth. The second section asked respondents about their membership in campus activities. For example, "Are you a member of any honor societies? a) Yes; b) No." The final section of the questionnaire concerned eight campus contexts. The contexts were campus at large, instructors, cafeteria, housing, classroom, campus police, university staff, and administration. On a campus with 33% minority enrollment, interracial interaction in these contexts is routine. In each campus context, respondents were asked to answer with regard to "individuals who are of a race other than your own."

Racial/Multiracial Measures. Examination of the data was restricted to students' conjoint determination of their racial/multiracial identification and three of the eight campus contexts indicated above. The racial/multiracial variable has three categories: African American Only (1), Multiracial (African American and White) (2), and White Only (3). The three categories were derived from responses to two items on the questionnaire: "Ethnic/racial origin" and "Do you feel that you are multiracial? a) Yes; b) No. If yes, please indicate which races." Only those respondents who indicated African American/Black or White were further considered in terms of racial/multiracial identification. Fifteen respondents who indicated ethnic/racial identification other than African American/Black or White were eliminated from the data set. Combining

responses to the ethnic/racial origin question and the multi-identification question revealed that 99 respondents self identified as African American Black only, 45 were Black and White mixed race, and 222 were White.

Results

In our analysis, we examined the differences that may exist between three racial identification categories with regard to three of the eight campus-related contexts measured by the questionnaire, i.e., the campus in general, with instructors, and with other students. Within the three contexts, items chosen for analysis where those for which at least four percent of the respondents indicated they had experienced the behavior or action in question. For example, "While on campus, I have found a flier with a racist message" or "An instructor has belittled my intellectual ability during a class." The majority of respondents indicated no experience with such racist behavior or actions. However, a four percent occurrence rate permits an examination of response differences to items from the three campus contexts.

Descriptive Results

Campus Specific Questions. Four of the questions relating specifically to the campus met the criterion of a four percent response rate. Approximately 8% of respondents had found on campus fliers or pamphlets with a racist message and 7.5% reported having been pushed, shoved, or elbowed. Having abusive words directed at them as they walked to class had been experienced by 6.2% of respondents one-to-two times and 1.1% reported it had happened to them three or more times. Abusive words shouted from a car had been experienced by 3.8% of respondents.

Instructor Specific Questions. Five of the questions relating to instructors "of a race other than the student's own" met the required four percent response rate. The most frequently reported event related to perceived unfair grading. Almost one third of the respondents indicated an instructor had been unfair in grading an exam. The majority of these (22.4%) fell in the one or two times category and 9.8% indicated three or more occurrences of unfair grading. Almost

27% of the respondents reported having an instructor belittle them in class (most in the 1-2 times category) and 17% reported belittlement of intellectual ability while talking privately. The fourth most frequently cited behavior was having an instructor ignore them in class when their hand was raised. Twenty percent reported being ignored, with approximately half of the respondents indicating this had occurred three or more times. Lastly, approximately 6% of the respondents reported receiving abusive words from an instructor during class.

Student Specific Questions. Three of the questions regarding perceived student behavior by someone of a race other than your own were analyzed. First, approximately 26% of the respondents reported that a student had directed a racist remark toward them; 17% indicated they had been ignored in class by a student of a different race; and, 6% indicated students of a different race had refused to allow them to be a study cohort.

Comparisons of Racial/Multiracial Categories

This research examined the difference between three racial identification categories in terms of respondents' perceptions of racist or racially influenced behavior. Twelve questions across three contexts, campus in general, instructors, and other students were included in the analysis. Given the 4% response rate as a criterion for inclusion in the analysis, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used as an analytic technique. Using the one-way ANOVA, the following questions were addressed:

a) Are there significant differences in the mean responses to each item between the three racial identification categories ($p<.05$)?

b) If there is such a difference for an item, between which categories do the differences exist ($p<.05$)?

The one-way ANOVA results are shown by item in Table 2. For this discussion, we will look in turn at each of the three racial identification categories.

Campus Specific Questions. Among the campus specific items, three of the four questions that met the 4% response rate show a statistically significant difference between at

least two of the mean scores in the racial identification categories. Only "flier with racist message" did not have a statistically significant difference between any mean scores.

Examining the specific differences between the means among the three items with a statistical significance shows that reports of occurrence do differ by racial identification category. The Black Only students indicated a greater incidence of occurrence than did the White Only students with regard to the item of receipt of abusive words (from those of another race) while walking to class. Mixed Race students reported a greater incidence of the receipt of abusive words (from those of another race) shouted from a car on campus than did the White Only students. The report of being pushed, shoved, or elbowed (by those of another race) shows that Mixed Race students reported a significantly greater occurrence than both the Black Only and White Only students, while the White Only students reported greater occurrence than did the Black Only students. The student group with the highest report of occurrence overall (with one exception) were those in the Mixed Race category.

Instructor Specific Items. Each of the five questions that were analyzed shows an overall significant difference, i.e., the F score is significant at least at $p<.05$. In each instance, also, the category with the highest mean scores, i.e., indicating greater occurrence, is the Mixed Race category. A significantly greater percentage of students in the Mixed Race category than students in the White Only category perceived that they had received abusive belittlement or unfair treatment from instructors of a race other than their own.

Additionally, for two items, i.e., abusive words in class and ignored in class, there was a significant difference in the reported occurrence between the Black Only and White Only students. In both cases the Black Only students indicate a higher level of occurrence than did the White Only students.

Student Specific Items. Two of the three items in this category show a significant difference in the general effect. The Mixed Race students indicated a significantly greater occurrence of feeling ignored in class by students of a different race and perceiving that different

race students refused to study with them. Similarly, Black Only students' assessments differed from the White Only students' assessments for the same two variables and in the same direction as the results for Mixed Race versus White Only students. Additionally, for these three items there were no significant differences between Black Only and Mixed Race students.

Generalizing from the above findings, it is clear that Mixed Race (in this case Black/White) students perceive a greater degree of racial difficulty on campus, with instructors, and with other students. For nine of the twelve items analyzed, this group differed significantly from the assessment of occurrence indicated by White Only students and once in comparison to Black Only students. Further, in only one instance is the mean assessment of occurrence not the highest among the three racial categories, i.e., abusive words while walking to class, and here it is not statistically significant from the assessments in the other two categories.

The counter points to the Black/White Mixed Race group is the White Only group. Only two items, i.e., pushed, shoved, or elbowed on campus and racist remarks in class from other students, are not the lowest indication of occurrence. The Black Only students' perceptions generally fall between those of the Mixed Race and White Only students.

Discussion/Conclusion:

In our survey, twelve questions are examined in three contexts, including campus specific items, instructor specific items, and students specific items. The first context, i.e., campus items, deals with the overall racial situation on campus and the other two contexts involve the specific situation in relations with students and professors. It can be found in Table 3 that both the average scores and the average deviations of the means for mixed race students in the first context are smaller than those in the other two contexts. The same thing occurs to black students. The average scores of the means for black students in the first context are lower than those in the other two contexts too. This may indicate that while prejudice or discrimination is less prevalent in public space today, it still remains widespread in less public settings or personal occasions.

The twelve questions or items can be further classified into two categories. Items A1, A2, A3, A4, B1, and C1 deal with striking and violent discriminatory activities such as abusive words, pushing, shoving, elbowing, and written racist messages found on campus. All the other items involve indistinct or subtle discriminatory activities such as ignoring, refusing, and unfairness in grading. We discovered that mixed race students in answering the second category questions reported a greater level of racial bias than in answering the first category questions. Having gone through Civil War and Civil Rights Movement, we may find less direct or blatant racism on campus. However, in a hidden way, racism would invariably seek opportunities to assert itself. This shift, as McConahay (1986) pointed out, may have suggested that a "old-style racism" had been replaced by a much more guarded "modern racism."

As shown in Table 3, the highest degree of deviation of the means between mixed race students and the other two racial groups take place in such items as B3 (belittled ability in class), B4 (belittled ability privately), C2 (ignored in class), and C3 (refused studying). For instance, deviations of the means between mixed race and black students are 0.29 for B3, 0.21 for B4, 0.21 for C2, and 0.19 for C3. The assessment of racial discrimination involved in these items is strongly affected by psychological characteristics of individuals. The high incidence of racial bias may reflect less self-confidence for multiracial students.

Multiracial persons are unique in that they are both and neither of their parents' racial groups. This generates confusion with identity. In our survey, respondents were asked questions with regard to perception of discrimination from individuals who were of a race other than their own. In answering such questions, it was very likely for mixed race students to view neither of whites and blacks as their own race. As a result, the range of the category "the race other than your own" was enlarged, increasing the possibility for these students to feel discriminated racially. This could be one reason why the degree of racial difficulty reported by mixed race students is so high.

Table 3 shows that the general average of means for the twelve items in measuring racial discrimination for mixed race students is 0.431, just about the sum of the means for the other two racial groups (the mean for blacks is 0.281, and for whites 0.153). That is to say, while white students experience discrimination from non-whites and black students perceive the similar thing from non-blacks, mixed race students find what are suffered by both whites and blacks because of their confusion with identity.

In addition, it is possible that mixed race students are more sensitive to situation that is considered unfriendly to them. Questions in our survey were to ask students' feelings of racial environment around them. Responses to these questions would be highly affected by psychological receptivity of individuals. According to standpoint theory as mentioned in the first section, people who are members of low social class would be more sensitive to environmental cues. We are not sure whether multiracial Americans, multiracial black/white in particular, situate at the low position or even lower than pure blacks economically and socially. However, since they are not accepted by either of black and white, they may feel more isolated in the society, and therefore, more sensitive to racial environment.

People who occupy higher social positions do not notice anything "wrong" with the current state because they experience less difficulty in their life. On the contrary, people who with subordinate status tend to be more sensitive for they suffer too much in their daily life. The same could be true to multiracial persons. Their high sensitivity to racial issues is transformed from what they have experienced in society. The high degree of racial difficulty reported by mixed race students is not only a perception but also reality. These students indeed experience more discriminatory behavior against them.

One factor in determining inferior status for minorities is their relative group size although we cannot deny the fact that a numerical minority could become a dominant group in the social-economic-political sense. The relative group size of multiracial persons, black/white

in particular, is even smaller than that of monoracial minorities. It makes their voice so week that they are more likely to be exposed to all kinds of discrimination.

Mixed race students are children of intermarriage. For long time, interracial marriage or marital assimilation has been considered the most difficult way as well as a critical step in achieving full integration. In Gorden's theory of assimilation subprocesses, as marital assimilation advances, identificational assimilation will follow, then intergroup prejudice and discrimination will decline, and "the descendants of the original minority group become indistinguishable from the majority group" (Gordon 1964:80). However, our findings tell us a different story. Discriminatory behavior toward multiracial persons is not diminishing but rising. Identificational assimilation does not appear as expected but identificational isolation emerges.

Some would argue that occasional intermarriage does not necessarily denote marital assimilation. According to Gordon (1964), marital assimilation occurs only when there is widespread intermarriage between two racial groups, and it requires two preconditions: 1) a very uneven sex ratio among whites as it existed in the early colonial period in Mexico and Brazil, and 2) no racial segregation and overt discrimination. Obviously, such conditions cannot be satisfied in the USA. Therefore, there is no room for marital assimilation, and correspondingly no hope for identificational assimilation and declining discrimination.

Even though intermarriage does not indicate marital assimilation as a group, some may argue, it should work toward that direction. In other words, prejudice and discrimination toward multiracial persons should decline. However, we did not find any positive evidence in our survey. One possible explanation is that when a racial hostility exists between two groups, intermarriage could be considered a traitorous action to one's group. Intermarried couples and their descendants would be probably despised and isolated by both groups. To extricate themselves from the predicament, multiracial persons, white/black in particular, may need to use intermarriage to regain their identification for their descendants by getting closer to either white or black biologically.

Our survey was conducted in a college of Alabama. It was reported that the proportion of white/black intermarriages was three times higher in the north than in the south (McDaniel 1996). According to the 2000 census, there were 6194 residents in Alabama who reported their race as black/white, making up only 0.14 percent of the total population, remarkably lower than the national average of 0.3 percent. It could be that there is less tolerance to white/black intermarriage in the south than in the north. As a result, the degree of discrimination against multiracial persons is greater in the south than in the north. This may need to be further examined by a comparative study among regions with regard to racial experience for mixed white/black students.

Our findings also raise a number of questions that need to be answered in the future. First, cultural assimilation, defined as "the majority and minority groups are adopting a common culture and social structure," is considered the first and also a prominent step in integration. The common culture and social structure are eventually for the most part those of the dominant group. In any cases, however, intermarriage would be the best tool to achieve the objective of cultural assimilation. But, how much role does cultural assimilation play in reducing racial prejudice? From what we discovered in this study, there is no evidence that there are less prejudice or discriminatory behavior toward multiracial persons than toward monominorities. It seems that efforts made by minorities in cultural assimilation as reflected on intermarriage were not necessarily rewarded by good will from the dominant group

Consequently, racial disadvantage as reported by mixed race students in this study could be simply attributed to a fact that these students are physically different from either black and white. To a great degree, one's genetic composition or physical appearance rather than one's social role and cultural attributes determine group identity. People dislike someone merely because someone's color is not the same as theirs. Under the circumstances, color becomes the target of racism. Prejudice and discrimination will decline only when interracial marriages are continuous and the color of their descendants is closer to that of the majority.

Second, statistics show that out-marriages among blacks have been less common than out-marriages among other racial and ethnic groups although the rate of black-white intermarriages has gone up since the 1960s. For example, in the 2000 census, there were about 4.5 million people who reported their racial category as two races (Hispanics not included). The majority of them were whites with Native-Indians and Asians, and white/black accounted only fifteen percent. We are not sure whether discrimination against white/black persons, as shown in this study, is distinguishable, and it discourages white/black intermarriage. It would be helpful for us to answer this question when a research is conducted for non-black mixed race students with regard to their racial experience on campus.

References

Altman, A. 1993. "Liberalism and campus hate speech: A philosophical examination." Ethics 103: 302-317.

Asante, M.K. & H.S.N. Al-deen. 1984. "Social interaction of black and white college students: A research report." Journal of Black Studies 14: 507-516.

Benedetto, Amy E., & Olisky, Teri (2001). "Biracial youth: The role of the school counselor in racial identity development." Professional School Counseling, 5. Retrieved May 28, 2003 from Academic Search Elite database.

Biasco, F., E.A. Goodwin, & K.L. Vitale. 2001. "College students' attitudes toward racial discrimination." College Student Journal 35: 523-529.

Bunzel, J.H. 1991. "Black and white at Stanford." The Public Interest 105: 61-77.

Buttny. 1997. "Reported speech in talking race on campus." Human Communication Research 23: 477-506.

Downey, J.P. & F.K. Stage. 1999. "Hate crimes and violence on college and university campuses." Journal of College Student Development 40: 3-9.

El Nasser, Haya. February 28, 2001. "Census to define multiracial in myriad ways: New categories reflect diversity, add to red tape." USA Today, 8D.

Feagin, J.R. 1992. "The continuing significance of racism: Discrimination against black students in white colleges." Journal of Black Studies 22:546-578.

Fisher, B.J. & D.J. Hartmann. 1995. "The impact of race on the social experience of college students at a predominantly white university." Journal of Black Studies 26: 117-133.

Gordon, Milton. 1964. Assimilation in American Life. New York;Oxford University Press.

Hall, Ronald E. (2001). "The Tiger Woods phenomenon: a note on biracial identity." The Social Science Journal, 38, 333-336.

Harris, Henry L. (2002). "School counselors' perceptions of biracial children: A pilot study." Professional School Counseling, 6. Retrieved May 28, 2003 from Academic Search Elite database.

Hibbler, Dan K., and Kimberly J. Shinew. 2002. "The role of leisure service providers in enhancing multiracial families' leisure experiences." Parks & Recreation 37 (2): 26 (8)

Kent, N. J. 1996. "The new campus racism: What's going on?" Thought & Action 12(2): 45-57.

Korgen, Kathleen Odell. 1998. From Black to Biracial: Transforming racial identity among Americans. Praeger: Westport, CT.

Loo, C.M. & G. Rolison. 1986. “Alienation of ethnic minority students at a predominantly white university.” Journal of Higher Education , 57: 58-77.

McConahay, J.B. “Modern Racism, Ambivalence, and the Modern Racism Scale.” In Dovidio and Gaertner, eds., Prejudice, Discrimination, and Racism, pp.91-125. Orlando, Fla:Academic Press, 1986.

McDaniel, Antonio. “The Dynamic Racial Composition of the United States. “ in Obie Clayton, Jr., ed., An American Dilemma Revisited: Race Relations in a Changing World, pp.267-268. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1996.

McGrew, J. (2002, June 19). “Campus hate, bias higher.” The Montgomery Advertiser, pp. 1A, 4A.

“Multiracials: Population.” November 2002 Supplement, American Demographics 24 (10).

Nishimura, Nancy J. 1998. “Assessing the issues of multiracial students on college campuses.” Journal of College Counseling 1(1): 45-53.

Phinney, Jean S. & Linda L. Alipuria. 1996. “ At the interface of cultures: multiethnic/multiracial high school and college students.” Journal of Social Psychology 136(2): 139-158.

Spencer, Rainier. 1999. Spurious Issues: Race and Multiracial Identity Politics in the United States. Westview Press: Boulder, CO.

Suen, H. K. 1983. “Alienation and attrition of black college students at a predominantly white campus.” Journal of College Student Personnel 24:117-121.

Wardle, Francis (2000). “Multiracial and multiethnic students: How they must belong.” Multicultural Perspectives, 2, 11-16.

Wellner, Alison Stein. 2002. “The Census Report.” American Demographics 24 (1): S3-7.

Wood, Julia T. (1997). Communication theories in action. Belmont CA: Wadsworth Publishing.

Table 1. Frequency Distributions of Included Variables

A. Campus Specific Items

A1. Abusive words directed toward me (by a person of a race other than my own) while I walk to class
(Abusive Words Walking to Class)

	N	%
Never	368	92.7
1-2 times	25	6.3
3-4 times	3	0.8
5+ times	1	0.3
(missing+1	397	100.0

A2. Abusive words shouted at me (by a person of a race other than my own) from a car on campus
(Abusive Words from Car)

Never	382	96.2
1-2 times	10	2.5
3-4 times	4	1.0
5+ times	1	0.3
(missing=1)	397	100.0
(missing=1)	397	100.0

A3. Found a flier with a racist message on campus
(Flier with Racist Message)

Never	365	91.9
1-2 times	24	6.0
3-4 times	4	1.0
5-10 times	2	0.5
10+ times	2	0.5
(missing=1)	397	100.0

A4. Been pushed, shoved, or elbowed on campus (by a person of a race other than my own)
(Pushed, Shoved, or Elbowed)

Never	368	92.7
1-2 times	20	5.0
3-4 times	5	1.3
5-10 times	1	0.3
10+ times	3	0.8

B. Instructor Specific Items

B1. Abusive words from an instructor (of a race other than my own) during class
(Abusive Words in Class)
(Belittled Ability Privately)

N	%	
Never	373	94.0
1-2 times	22	5.5
3-4 times	1	0.3
5-10 times	1	0.3
(missing=1)	397	100.0
(missing=0	398	100.0

B2. An instructor (of a race other than my own has ignored me when my hand was raised in class
(Ignored in Class)

Never	319	80.4
1-2 times	43	10.8
3-4 times	22	5.5
5-10 times	6	1.5
10+ times	7	1.8
(missing=1)	397	100.0

B3. An instructor (of a race other than my own) has belittled my intellectual ability during class
(Belittled Ability in Class)

Never	292	73.4
1-2 times	74	18.6
3-4 times	21	5.3
5-10 times	6	1.5
10+ times	5	1.3
(missing=0)	398	100.0

B4. An instructor (of a race other than my own) Belittled my intellectual ability while talking with me privately

Never	332	83.4
1-2 times	46	11.6
3-4 times	15	3.8
5-10 times	2	0.5
10+ times	3	0.8

B5. An instructor (of a race other than my own) been unfair to me in grading an exam
(Belittled Ability Privately)

Never	270	67.8
1-2 times	89	22.4
3-4 times	22	5.5
5-10 times	12	3.0
10+ times	5	1.3
(missing=0)	398	100.0

Table 1 (continued) Frequency Distributions of Included Variables

C. Student Specific Items

C1. A student (of another racial group) has made a racist remark to me in class
(Racist Remark in Class)

	N	%
Never	270	68.5
1-2 times	89	22.6
3-4 times	10	2.5
5-10 times	5	1.3
(missing=4)	394	100.0

C2. Students (of a different race) have ignored me by not taking to me in class

Never	300	76.7
1-2 times	41	10.5
3-4 times	17	4.4
5-10 times	8	2.1
(missing=8)	390	100.0

C3. Students (of a different race) have refused to allow me to study with them
(Refused Studying)

Never	371	94.4
1-2 times	13	3.3
3-4 times	4	1.0
10+times	5	1.3
(missing=5)	393	100.0

Table 2. ANOVA Results: Racial Categories by Selected Items Racial Identification

	Black (1)			Mixed (2)			White (3)			
	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	F
A. Campus Specific Items										
A1. Abusive Words Walking to class	.14[3]	.45	99	.11	.38	45	.05[1]	.23	222	3.23*
A2. Abusive words from car	.09	.48	99	.16[3]	.48	45	.02[2]	.18	222	3.75*
A3. Flier with Racist Message	.10	.34	99	.22	.60	45	.08	.35	222	2.50
A4. Pushed, Shoved, or Elbowed	.04[2]	.20	99	.29[1,3]	.79	45	.10[2]	.44	222	4.80**
B. Instructor Specific Items										
B1. Abusive Words in Class	.12[3]	.36	98	.18[3]	.54	45	.03[1,2]	.18	220	6.24**
B2. Ignored in Class	.50[3]	.99	98	.64[3]	1.13	45	.23[1,2]	.6[2]	220	7.14**
B3. Belittled Ability in Class	.47	.86	98	.76[3]	1.13	45	.29[2]	.6[2]	220	7.57**
B4. Belittled Ability Privately	.31	.68	98	.53[3]	1.04	45	.15[2]	.45	220	7.77**
B5. Unfair Grading	.61	1.02	98	.73[3]	1.10	45	.38[2]	.68	220	4.71*
C. Student Specific Items										
C1. Racist Remark in Class	.17	.65	94	.31	.76	45	.18	.54	218	0.99
C2. Ignored in Class	.72[3]	1.34	94	.93[3]	1.41	45	.35[1,2]	.92	218	7.14**
C3. Refused Studying	.17[3]	.67	94	.36[3]	.91	45	.02[1,2]	.17	218	10.29**

* p<.05
** p<.01

[1]The superscripts next to the mean scores (M) refer to a statistically significant difference (at least at p<.05) using the Tukey test, between the reported mean scores for each variable between the racial identification categories. For example, for variable A1 the mean of .14 among Black respondents is significantly different from the mean of .05 among White respondents.

Table 3 Means and Deviations among Racial Groups

	Mixed Students			Black Students		White Students
Questions asked	Mean	Deviation of Mean with Black	Deviation of Mean with White	Mean	Deviation of Mean with White	Mean
A. Campus Specific Items						
A1. Abuse Words Walking to Class	0.11	-0.03	0.06	0.14	0.09	0.05
A2. Abuse Words from Car	0.16	0.07	0.14	0.09	0.07	0.02
A3. Flier with Racist Message	0.22	0.12	0.14	0.1	0.02	0.08
A4. Pushed, Shoved, or Elbowed	0.29	0.15	0.19	0.04	-0.06	0.1
Group Average	0.195	0.078	0.133	0.093	0.03	0.063
B. Instructor Specific Items						
B1. Abusive Words in Class	0.18	0.06	0.15	0.12	0.09	0.03
B2. Ignored in Class	0.64	0.14	0.41	0.5	0.27	0.23
B3. Belittled Ability in Class	0.76	0.29	0.47	0.47	0.18	0.29
B4. Belittled Ability Privately	0.53	0.21	0.38	0.31	0.16	0.15
B5. Unfair Grading	0.73	0.12	0.35	0.61	0.23	0.38
Group Average	0.568	0.164	0.352	0.402	0.186	0.216
C. Students Specific Items						
C1. Racist Remark in Class	0.31	0.14	0.13	0.17	-0.01	0.18
C2. Ignored in Class	0.93	0.21	0.58	0.72	0.37	0.35
C3. Refused Studying	0.36	0.19	0.34	0.17	0.15	0.02
Group Average	0.53	0.18	0.35	0.35	0.17	0.18
General Average	0.431			0.281		0.153