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The current study was an investigation of young adults’ attitudes toward interracial relationships. A vignette experiment was utilized to try to minimize the effects of social desirability bias. The four conditions of the experiment were: white male and white female, black male and black female, white male and black female, and black male and white female. The attitudes were measured using survey questions to assess the participants’ expectations for the couple regarding the level of conflict in the relationship, the duration of the relationship and the level of outside support that the couple would receive from friends and family. The study did not yield significant results. The author argues that social desirability bias was still influential in the research setting, despite the best efforts to avoid it. Evidence is provided to support this argument.
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INTRODUCTION

Since the 1950s, Americans have seen a cultural shift toward the decline of overt prejudices (Quillian 1996) and an adoption of current norms which express an acceptance of interracial relationships (Herman and Campbell 2011). However, there exists a contradiction between the expressed acceptance yet rare occurrence of interracial relationships. Many scholars have illustrated that this contradiction exists. Interracial relationships are far less frequent than would be expected by chance (Lee and Bean 2004) and are less frequent than relationships across other boundaries such as religious or ethnic differences (Qian 1997). Kalmijn (1998) explained that this gap between social norms and behavior could be the result of segregation; however he goes on to say that it is not enough to know that these groups do not interact, rather knowing why they do not is important. A social psychological explanation shows that people have an aversion to entering these types of relationships (Herman and Campbell 2011). Several scholars have proposed ideas that would partially explain this contradiction between social norms and actual behavior. Wilkins (2012) found that interracial relationships are viewed by others as less serious than same race relationships. Consistent with this perception, cross-race coupling is more common at younger ages and in less committed relationships (Joyner and Kao 2005). In addition, Joyner and Kao (2005) found that these types of relationships are more common at younger ages. These findings suggest that while people may be accepting of interracial relationships, it may be that this acceptance only applies to less committed relationships or relationships at younger ages. This conditional approval might explain some of the contradiction between norms which appear to approve of interracial relationships and behaviors which do not manifest this approval. While these scholars looked into the function
and timing of the relationship, others investigated attitudes toward this relationship type. Indeed, Herman and Campbell (2011) find that while people express acceptance of interracial relationships in general, they do not feel that it is an appropriate relationship type for them. These complex beliefs might account for why people, overall, approve of interracial relationships but do not enter these relationships themselves.

While these explanations give some insight into this contradiction between norms and behavior, they rely too heavily on explicit measures such as surveys. Self-report measures can often be affected by biases such as social desirability in which people will give answers that they feel will adhere to social norms (Quillian 2006). Respondents may also give answers for which they feel the researcher is looking. Therefore, respondents may not express ideas that they feel will make them appear to have racially biased views (Dasgupta 2009). The current research attempted to address this issue of biased responses by utilizing a less explicit measure in the form of an experiment. This vignette manipulation should have allowed the respondents to feel as though their responses can be justified by other factors contained within the story, thereby giving them the relief of believing that their opinions will not make them appear racially prejudiced. The research design and the assurance of confidentiality should have helped to reduce the risk of biases.

In addition to assessing racial attitudes with an experimental, I attempted to provide a theoretical advancement. I applied the group position theory proposed by Blumer (1958) and Bobo (1999) on group differences to a new area: interracial relationships. This theory discusses how group membership may influence people’s ideas about out-groups and the perception of their own social distance from members of different groups. I propose that these perceptions of
difference may lead people to believe that close, intimate relationships between members of different groups may not succeed in the long term. Therefore, while people might generally approve of interracial relationships, they may also believe that this type of relationship is more likely to face inherent difficulties.
LITERATURE AND HYPOTHESIS

Young Adult Relationships

Romantic relationships formed during adolescence and young adulthood create an important foundation for future relationships (Meier and Allan 2009). This period of development and relationship formation is of particular interest because there are currently many changes occurring in the transition to adulthood (Furstenberg, Kennedy, McLoyd, Rumbaut, and Settersen 2004). Meier and Allan (2009) emphasize the need for more research into this part of the life span and how changes have occurred in the process of relationship formation. Young adults are marrying later and spend more time dependent on, if not living with, their parents (Furstenberg et al. 2004; Rosenfeld and Kim 2005). This extension of dependency and postponement of marriage may affect partner selection, the available marriage pool and the extent to which these young adults are open to more diverse relationships. Rosenfeld and Kim (2005) investigated the tie between geographic mobility and partner selection and found that people who moved away from their hometowns are more likely to become involved in a non-traditional coupling. The current research looked at a similar situation: the racial attitudes of students as they enter the college life having likely recently moved away from home.

Interracial Interactions

While interracial couples of any racial composition are likely to elicit different reactions than same race couples, there are several reasons to justify initial research looking at black/white interracial couples. Qian and Lichter (2007) point out that prejudice against African Americans is still demonstrated through “physical and social distance” (p. 73). It has been shown that
contact with other racial groups decreases prejudice toward the group (Dixon and Rosenbaum 2004; Dixon 2006). As a result of continuing segregation, contact between groups is still not common enough to produce significant decreases in prejudice and social distance. The color line was formerly recognized as separating whites from all other racial groups, but it has since shifted to instead separate blacks from all other racial groups (Lee and Bean 2004). This shift in perceived distance has lead people to view blacks and whites as significantly different while whites and others are not believed to be as dissimilar as they once were (Lee and Bean 2004). Qian and Lichter (2011) found this trend in marriage frequencies as well: black/white intermarriage is less frequent than white/Asian or white/Hispanic. These continuing ideas of prejudice and social distance support the research design of testing attitudes toward black/white couples as they would be perceived as the most socially distant and thus elicit the strongest responses. If there are not significant results with black/white couples, it stands to reason that this design would be unlikely to garner significant results with any other combination of racial groups. Having made the case for the racial composition, I will now explain more explicitly the way prejudice and social distance were being conceptualized for this project.

We must begin by looking more generally at the relationship and interaction between racial groups when trying to understand the gap between norms of tolerance for interracial relationships and the infrequent occurrence of this type of relationship. Bobo (1999) asserts that a general state of racial equality has not risen even as Jim Crow racism has declined. On the surface, it appears that racism has subsided because norms discourage individuals from expressing blatant racial intolerance. While overt racism, what Sears (1988) referred to it as “old-
fashioned bigotry,” has diminished and is no longer socially acceptable, segregation continues. Some form of racial prejudice may still exist, encouraging this perpetuation of segregation.

Social Distance and Symbolic Racism

This inconsistency between a mainstream disapproval of racial prejudice but a continuation of various forms of spatial segregation, leads to the question of what the mechanism is driving these behaviors. One possible explanation is that while hierarchical prejudice (a perception that some groups are better or worse than others) has declined, there is still a horizontal dimension of prejudice at work leading people to perceive that blacks and whites are different from each other. Scholars have proposed several possible explanations for this current state of group relations.

The group position model proposed by Blumer (1958) and expanded on by Bobo (1999) is one such explanation. By including a socio-historical foundation as well as a social-psychological perspective, this theory is a complex and integrative way to conceptualize group relations. This explanation combines a structural schematic of group positions with a personal belief about the position of the in-group compared to out-groups (Minescu and Poppe, 2011). This theory states that prejudice involves much more than simply personal negative feelings toward a different race (Bobo 1999). Rather, feelings of racial prejudice are rooted in relational group positions, i.e., the perceptions of their own in-group’s position dictates where other groups belong in the social structure. Furthermore, out-group characteristics are defined by what the in-group is not, therefore these ideas may increase the extent to which people believe that out-groups differ from or are socially distant from their in-group. These group definitions lead to a
feeling of social distance between groups; in this way, groups are not necessarily ranked as better or worse, but simply different.

A variation of this group position perspective was proposed by other scholars. Individuals are influenced by the unexpressed descriptive social norms which give the impression of social distance (Karpinski and Hilton 2001; Dovidio, Kawakami, Johnson, Johnson, and Howard 1997). Wilkins (2012) found that young adults tend to believe that interracial relationships are temporary and less committed because of differences between groups, not because one group is necessarily better than another. As interracial relationships become more committed or occur at older ages, outsiders perceive that social distance will become more of an issue in the relationship (Joyner and Kao 2005). Moreover, perceptions of social distance continue to persist in our society with particular emphasis on differences between blacks and whites (Lee and Bean 2004).

Another theory of racial group relations was proposed by Sears in 1988. He believes that there is still racism at work, but it now exists in conjunction with a perceived threat to moral values. His work on this theory of symbolic racism focuses primarily on politics, specifically what drives white voters to oppose legislation that would aid blacks. It is believed that an anti-black affect combines with a perceived violation of moral values, such as individualism and hard work, to encourage whites to vote against legislation that would help blacks as a group. They believe that individuals should help themselves and any assistance to the group would help people who are not hard workers (Sears 1988). Symbolic racism theory allows people to maintain that it is not racism that drives their racial attitudes, but rather a difference in moral values that creates these perceptions of chasms between groups (Sears 1988).
**Hypothesis:** The respondents will rate interracial couples as less likely to stay together, more likely to quarrel, and less likely to have outside support than the same-race couples, regardless of whether the same-race couple is black or white.

These theories of group relations could also lend support to the idea that a hierarchical dimension of prejudice still exists. This assertion would mean that people still hold the belief that one racial group is inherently better than the other (Blumer 1958; Bobo 1999; Sears 1988). These attitudes could result from a perceived conflict over resources (Minescu and Poppe 2011; Bobo 1983) or could be a product of the cultural tide which still maintains some form of prejudice (Karpinski and Hilton 2001). Due to this complexity, I have included a second survey which will be introduced to the participants as an entirely separate study conducted simultaneously only for the purpose of saving time. This second survey will allow me to control for prejudice in my analysis, therefore ensuring that it is perceptions of social distance driving their assessment of the couples in the vignette.
METHODS

Sampling Procedure

The target population of interest is young adults in the United States because I am interested in how perceptions of interracial relationships may encourage the perpetuation of homogamous relationships during the transition to adulthood. The sampling frame is all students who are enrolled in Sociology 101 (Introduction to Sociology) at Washington State University, an entry-level course with no pre-requisites. I chose this sampling frame because these students are the age group in which I am interested, i.e., young adults in their late teens or early twenties. The sampling technique is a convenience sample of students who were willing to participate in the study for course extra credit.

It is important to study these young adults early on in their college experience for several reasons. As discussed in Sears’s (1986) article, teens are more likely to adhere to social norms and defer to authority. At this point in their lives, the students will have maintained the influence of their socialization process and be more likely to think of these things similarly to their parents. They will also be influenced by the perceived norms that their peers are following (Cialdini 2007). Dasgupta (2009) points out that as students progress in their college education, they begin to have more egalitarian beliefs (see also Quillian 1996). Thus, at the beginning of their college career they will likely have retained the beliefs instilled in them by their parents and through the amount of diversity they have experienced in their formative years.

Washington State University students are not a representative sample of the general population of young adults in the United States, as the racial composition is disproportionately white. Therefore, this sample is not generalizable to the larger population. This initial
experiment was done to develop the measurement tool, ensuring its reliability and validity, and to see if there is evidence to support my theoretical prediction. The initial survey was run as a cross-sectional study. The follow-up studies will be administered to new samples using the same questionnaires. In future studies when the sample is collected randomly, it will then be more broadly applicable. For the time being, I used convenience sampling, though it would be ideal in the future to collect a random sample of young adults in the United States. A representative random sample would allow for generalization and minimize coverage and sampling errors.

The students participated in a classroom setting during the current study. They were in a room with their peers but they were assured of the confidentiality of their responses. The survey itself was administered using paper copies with only the manipulations varying between copies. This format was used so that at a glance all packets appeared to be the same. The introduction to the study was a brief statement instructing the respondents to read a short passage followed by a questionnaire that will test their reading comprehension skills. There was a second survey included in the research materials. This survey was introduced as a separate study to avoid influencing the answers. The results of the second survey allowed me to control for prejudice in secondary analyses. Each participant received the same survey for this part of the study.

The sample consisted of a total of 365 participants, with, at minimum, 89 participants in each of the four conditions. By using a similar experimental study as comparison (Horne and Tinkler 2013), I was able to calculate that for a study expected to have a medium effect size (i.e., 0.06) and a power of 0.80, that 44 participants per condition would be acceptable (Keppel 1991). Most vignette studies use 35 participants per condition, therefore 89 participants per condition should be a sufficient sample size.
Experimental Design and Manipulations

Prior to running the actual experiment, I conducted two types of pre-testing. The first pre-test materials consisted of a list of ten female and ten male names. The participants (72 undergraduate students) read the list and decided with which race they most commonly associate each name. This test provided me with the names that are the best cues for the race of the characters in the vignette. The process for choosing the names for the list and the vignette is described in Appendix D. The second pretest consisted of individual cognitive interviews with a small sample of nine undergraduate students. These students read over the vignette and questions. They then gave their reactions including a discussion of whether the race of the characters was salient and if they used this information in their decision making process. These interviews helped me to determine that the manipulations in my vignette were successful and gave me insight into some small changes that helped make the manipulation stronger.

The experimental design was a vignette with a manipulation of the racial composition of a young adult heterosexual couple. I used a cover story stating that the study was a reading comprehension test to distract from the real purpose of the study. I included in the story some elements unrelated to my interests to maintain the cover story and keep the participants from guessing the purpose of the story. This technique was used to help ease the participants away from the tendency to answer with socially desirable responses.

The participants were randomly assigned to one of four different versions of the vignette. The four conditions were: (1) both partners are black, (2) both partners are white, (3) the female partner is white, the male partner is black, and (4) the female partner is black, the male partner is
white. By having conditions that change both the gender and race, this design set controls in place for varying perceptions with regards to gender and race in couple composition. A copy of the vignette is included in Appendix A.

The basic design of the experiment was a vignette manipulation with a misleading introduction. The cover story for the experiment was that the respondents are to read a story about two young adults involved in a relationship and the questions that follow will test their reading comprehension skills. They were asked to look for foreshadowing cues that will help them predict the end of the story and thusly, the fate of the couple. The story outlined the development of a romantic relationship between the young adults. Cues regarding the racial composition of the couples were included throughout the story to ensure that race is a salient aspect of the story, though not overwhelming. The final piece of the story was an obstacle that the couple will need to overcome: the partners moving to different locations to take advantage of post-college opportunities.

Questions following the story featured some dummy questions that are consistent with the cover story, and helped to keep respondents from guessing the true purpose of the study. These questions included references to minor details or characters in the story following the idea of predicting outcomes from foreshadowing clues given in the excerpts.

Experiment: Dependent Measures

To measure the dependent variable, attitudes toward interracial couples, there were questions that asked whether this couple is emotionally close and committed to one another, whether the couple will overcome this adversity (moving to different locations, Washington D.C.)
and Atlanta, Georgia, to start toward establishing careers therefore creating a long-distance relationship scenario), whether they are likely to quarrel often, whether they will stay together, whether they will marry eventually, whether their families will support them (a copy of the survey is included in Appendix B). The questions about family and friend support provided measures of the dependent variable outside support. The dependent variable duration is provided by the questions of whether or not the couple will stay together through the internship, through graduate school and whether or not the couple will eventually marry. The dependent variable conflict was measured by the questions which ask how likely the couple is to agree on important decisions, share values and beliefs, how likely they are to argue, how emotionally close the couple is, and how committed they are to the relationship.

Respondents were assigned to different racial compositions of the couple, but the rest of the story and the questions were the same. This manipulation ensured that the variation in responses will depend solely on how they evaluate young adult relationships based on the racial composition of the couple. The responses were compared across conditions to see how people respond differently to interracial couples than they do to same-race couples.

Additional Measures

I also included measures of traditional racism and social distance. This survey was run immediately following the experiment using the same sample. It was introduced as a short survey asking about their opinions on different groups in the United States. Furthermore, it was stated that these studies are unrelated and that the reading comprehension test should be completed before participant received a copy of the second survey. The same questionnaire was
given to every participant. Included is this survey were standard measures of social distance and prejudice. The participants were given a list of statements and asked to indicate the extent to which they agree with each of the statements. One of these statements was adapted from scales developed by Bobo and Hutchings (1996); it was based on their questions of perceived threats to resources: “I feel that I have been excluded from opportunities because they were unfairly given to a member of a minority” (Bobo and Hutchings 1996: 969). I also used their three stereotyping questions asking whether the racial groups (African American, Asian, Hispanic and Caucasian): prefer to be self supporting or live off of welfare, were easy or difficult to get along with and were intelligent or not intelligent (Bobo and Hutchings 1996: 969). Three of the other questions were taken directly from the General Social Survey (GSS) I used these questions directly so that my results could be compared to the results the GSS obtained from a large, random sample of Americans. These three questions asked about the participant’s beliefs: that members of the same ethnic group are similar to one another, that ethnic groups are distinct from one another, and that whites are distinct from other ethnic groups. The feeling thermometer question was modeled after versions used by both the GSS and Bobo and Hutchings (1996). A copy of all of the questions included in the current survey appears as Appendix C. The questions taken from the GSS are the first three questions under the heading “Social Distance.”

In addition, the first survey of the experiment packet concluded with some basic, demographical questions inquiring after the age, gender, race/ethnicity, year in school, major and birthplace (U.S. or not) of the respondents.
RESULTS

*Early Analyses*

The data from the respondents was entered into Stata. I first used the “tabulate” function to develop a table of means for each variable in each of the four conditions (see Table 1 below). There appear to be few if any differences across conditions.

[Table 1 about here]

The next analysis directly tested the hypothesis that interracial couples would be perceived more negatively than same race couples. I collapsed both same race couples into one category and both mixed race couples into a second category. I compared these two categories and, again, found no significant results.

[Table 2 about here]

In order to assess whether responses may differ across conditions separately, rather than in collapsed categories, I ran a series of regression analyses. I set up a model that compared the data for the same race white and black couples (separately) compared to both mixed couples together (having collapsed the two mixed couples together, see Table 3). In these analyses, I tested each of the dependent variables. For the white couple compared to the mixed couples, the only variable approaching significance was the response to the question regarding whether or not the couple would get married. The white couple was believed to be more likely to get married.
with a coefficient of 0.478, standard error 0.2534 (p<.0603). For the same race black couple compared to both mixed couples together (having collapsed the two mixed couples together, see Table 4) yielded no statistically significant results.

[Table 3 about here]

A further series of analyses compared the black same race couple to the mixed race couples individually (rather than collapsed as they were in earlier analyses) and another analysis compared the white same race couple to each of the mixed race couples individually (see Tables 4 and 5). The results of these analyses did show three statistically significant results, though they did not follow a pattern. Compared to the black male/white female couple, the white same race couple was believed to agree more on important decisions (coefficient= 0.5331, s.e.=0.2950, p= 0.0724) and the white couple was thought to be more likely to marry (coefficient= 0.565, s.e.=0.2913, p= 0.054). Compared to the white male/black female couple, the same race black couple was believed to be less likely to last through the internship of the female member of the couple, a duration of one year (coefficient= -0.4425, s.e.=0.2634, p= 0.0946). These results offer a minimal amount of support for ratings of the white couple being the highest, followed by the mixed race couples, then the black couple being rated the lowest. This order was not as predicted.

[Tables 4 and 5 about here]
While these results are inconsistent with my hypothesis and proposed theoretical framework, I have reason to believe that these results were tainted by social desirability bias rather than truly reflecting the attitudes of the respondents. Some support for my idea of social desirability bias is as follows.

**Social Desirability**

**Experimental settings.** I did two sets of pre-tests. The first established that the names used in the vignette were associated with the desired racial groups. A second, more in-depth, pre-test was done one-on-one with a small sample of students. The participants were informed that they should follow the instructions for the experiment and that we would be having a short conversation afterward about their thoughts on what they had read. They were also informed ahead of time that the results and the content of the discussion afterward were all confidential. Nearly every student in the pre-test said that they had noticed the race of the couple and used it in their analysis. The only student who said that they had not noticed race was one that had the white/white condition and the student was, herself, white. Therefore, it seemed more natural that the race of the characters would not stand out to her. Because of their awareness of the race of the couple, and many having said without prompting that they had used the race of the couple to inform their answers, it provided good evidence that the race cues were obvious. These students were told that their participation in the research would take at least a half hour, perhaps encouraging them to take their time. These students were also honors students who would be more likely to take the experiment seriously. I think that these factors combined with the one-on-one setting provided a better environment for more thorough, candid and open responses.
The statistically insignificant results found in the main experiment were inconsistent with not only the original framework but also with the early tests of the experiment.

I believe that the research setting rather than the design actually caused the results to be skewed in a more positive direction. In contrast to the one-on-one pre-test, the experiment had a group setting within a classroom which was not ideal. Although it allowed for a larger sample size and a higher response rate, some other issues arose. Because of the presence of both peers (15-30 other students) and the graduate student discussion leader for the course section, it seems that there may have been some issues with students doubting their answers would remain confidential and anonymous. Also, they seemed to be more aware of their peers, how quickly they were finishing, how closely they were paying attention, etc. It seems as though in order to keep up with their peers, and knowing that this assignment would not be graded, they may have been more likely to rush. Because of this lack of attention to detail, they may have missed the race cues or failed to properly think through their responses. As a result of the research setting including a classroom of peers of various racial backgrounds, students may have been moved by social desirability bias. Despite their answers being private, students may still have thought it necessary to skew their answers so as not to appear racist. Because of the presence of not only their peers, but also their discussion leader, I feel that the students were influenced by social norms which would lead them to give more positive assessments on race related topics.

Comparing the black and white same race couples. The next series of analyses were conducted to see if differences existed between the two same race couples. I ran an analysis for each of the dependent variables, comparing the data for the black and white couples after having
dropped the data for the mixed couples (see Table 6). In this analysis, the response to whether the couple agreed on important decisions came back with a coefficient of -0.4595 (s.e.= 0.2741) and a p value of 0.0953. This result showed that respondents believed that the black couple was less likely to agree on important decisions. The black couple was viewed as less likely to make it through an internship held by the female member of the couple (which was said to last a year). The coefficient for this finding was -0.5411 (s.e.= 0.2669) with a p value of 0.0441. Likewise the black couple was viewed as less likely to make it through graduate school (for the male member of the couple) which was said to last four to five years (coefficient= -0.5736, s.e.= 0.2711, p= 0.0357). The black couple was also viewed as less likely to get married compared to the white couple, (coefficient= -0.5419, s.e.= 0.2901, p= 0.0634).

[Table 6 about here]

It is possible that the vignettes with the interracial couples made race more salient to the participants than did the vignettes with the same race couples. Because interracial couples are uncommon, seeing one in a story may have triggered the respondents’ desire to follow social norms which would assert a “color blind” and accepting mentality toward the couple. Following these social norms, the interracial couples were rated more positively. Whereas when a participant read about the black same race couple, because this couple type is more common it would be less striking, therefore not calling “color blind” social norms to mind. It follows that when rating this couple, the participants’ unconscious biases were less censored by social
desirability. Those unconscious biases may have caused the respondents to have more negative responses to the couple.

Results without the data for the international students. Another analysis may shed more light on the differences in ratings between white and black same race couples. I re-ran the analysis comparing black and white same race couples dropping the data for all of the international students. In this analysis, only one of these results remains significant (see Table 7). The question about whether the couple will get married still comes in statistically significant with a p value of 0.0791. The coefficient is -0.5219 (s.e.=0.2955), showing that blacks are believed to be less likely to marry than whites. This change between the models seems to show one of two things, either the international students have stronger feelings about the interaction of race and relationships or they are more willing to admit their attitudes about race. I think that the latter is more likely. This explanation would still fit within some of the purposed framework as those who were not socialized to the U.S.‘s norms will be less susceptible to social desirability bias in the same way as U.S. born participants. If one does not adhere to the prevalent belief system in the U.S. which states that race does not matter, then they would not answer the questions in a way that follows this belief system.

[Table 7 about here]

On the other hand, the participants who were born in the U.S. would likely be more hesitant to admit to attitudes which may be interpreted as counter to the prevalent social norms.
Their default answers might not be based on their true feelings about race and relationships, but because the answers were given in a social setting, they might constrain their answers to what they feel that the group would find acceptable.

This idea is consistent with comparisons of my results to results found in the 2002 General Social Survey (GSS). Some of the questions on my second survey (about social distance and prejudice) were taken directly from the GSS for sample comparison purposes. Questions 1-3 on the second survey (listed below in Appendix C: Survey 2 in full as they appeared to my participants and in the GSS) regarding whether people in the same ethnic group were similar to each other, whether minority groups were similar to one another and whether whites were different from minority groups, all showed more positive results in my study than they did in the GSS. Even when controlling for age (18-22 years as 344 of my 364 participants were, data missing for one participant) and education level (between high school graduate and four years of college, which all of my participants were), my respondents still showed a more positive skew than did the GSS respondents of similar ages and education levels. This comparison of results supports the idea that my participants were influenced by social desirability bias, which lead to the results that were inconsistent with my hypothesis.
CONCLUSION

The results in this study did not show support for my hypothesis. Overall, there were very few significant results. The small amount of significant results seemed to indicate that feelings of prejudice rather than social distance were driving the results (the opposite of my hypothesis). There was limited support for the white same race couple being rated higher than the black same race couple. This pattern ran counter to my expected results that the same race couples would both be rated highly and that the mixed race couples would be rated lower.

As stated earlier, I believe the situation in which the experiment was administered triggered social desirability bias in the participants. Because they were reading and responding to the study materials in a room with their peers, I believe their perception of social norms was higher than if they had worked alone in a room or cubicle. These perceptions of social norms then moved the participants to respond in more positive ways to the overtly race related survey and with “color blindness” to the less explicit survey. I feel that the results of the experiment were heavily influenced by the context of the study. Had the research taken place in a more isolated setting where the participants were less aware of their peers, I believe the results would have been more significant.

I think that a better test of young adults’ attitudes toward interracial relationships would be to use the same experiment design with a new sample. I think that an online sample (using Qualtrics or Amazon Mechanical Turk) would be better in a number of ways. The setting would be private, therefore there would not be the influence of peers. Also, having the research removed from any influence of the classroom setting including lingering beliefs that their performance or answers could in some way influence their grades for the course, or the possible
effect of the presence of the discussion leader. Another benefit to this technique would be getting results from a more diverse sample of young adults rather than only college students might give a more varied perspective.

My related future research will work on bettering the implementation of the experiment. If similar insignificant results are found in other iterations, then these results will stand and the experimental design will need to be improved upon. I believe the design was found to be sound through the extensive work on the front end of the project and the pre-tests that were done with smaller samples. For these reasons I believe it would be worth while to check these results with another sample. Given similar results in future iterations, I will have to rethink the theoretical framework, perhaps the theories of Blumer (1958) and Bobo (1988) are not applicable in the context of relationship formation.
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Table 1: Table of Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Condition 1: Same Race Black</th>
<th>Condition 2: Same Race White</th>
<th>Condition 3: Black Male &amp; White Female</th>
<th>Condition 4: White Male &amp; Black Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support From Friends</td>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>n=91, 7.55 (1.8)</td>
<td>n=91, 7.84 (1.76)</td>
<td>n=89, 7.67 (1.67)</td>
<td>n=93, 7.49 (1.72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support From Families</td>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>n=92, 7.67 (1.83)</td>
<td>n=91, 8.05 (1.62)</td>
<td>n=89, 7.63 (1.97)</td>
<td>n=92, 7.86 (1.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agrees on Important Decisions</td>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>n=92, 5.82 (1.78)</td>
<td>n=91, 6.27 (1.92)</td>
<td>n=89, 5.74 (2.04)</td>
<td>n=93, 6.18 (1.87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shares Values and Beliefs</td>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>n=92, 6.7 (1.67)</td>
<td>n=91, 6.92 (1.5)</td>
<td>n=89, 6.67 (1.80)</td>
<td>n=93, 6.89 (1.47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple is Emotionally Close</td>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>n=92, 7.77 (1.5)</td>
<td>n=91, 7.92 (1.45)</td>
<td>n=89, 7.76 (1.69)</td>
<td>n=92, 7.73 (1.58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committed to Relationship</td>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>n=92, 7.46 (1.6)</td>
<td>n=91, 7.44 (1.58)</td>
<td>n=89, 7.34 (1.59)</td>
<td>n=92, 7.72 (1.70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple is Likely to Argue</td>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>n=92, 5.49 (1.67)</td>
<td>n=91, 5.56 (1.83)</td>
<td>n=89, 5.75 (1.87)</td>
<td>n=93, 5.60 (1.71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Through the Internship</td>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>n=92, 5.85 (1.73)</td>
<td>n=90, 6.39 (1.87)</td>
<td>n=89, 6.08 (1.75)</td>
<td>n=93, 6.29 (1.85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Through Graduate School</td>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>n=92, 5.19 (1.76)</td>
<td>n=91, 5.77 (1.90)</td>
<td>n=89, 5.37 (1.82)</td>
<td>n=93, 5.49 (2.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple is Likely to Get Married</td>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>n=92, 5.32 (1.87)</td>
<td>n=91, 5.86 (2.05)</td>
<td>n=89, 5.29 (1.85)</td>
<td>n=93, 5.46 (2.02)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample Size, Mean (Standard Deviation)
Table 2: Regression: Same Race Couples compared to the reference category of Mixed Race Couples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Support from Friends</th>
<th>Support from Families</th>
<th>Agrees on Important Decisions</th>
<th>Shares Values and Beliefs</th>
<th>Emotionally Close</th>
<th>Committed to making the relationship last</th>
<th>Couple is not Likely to Argue</th>
<th>Likely to stay together through the internship</th>
<th>Likely to stay together through graduate school</th>
<th>Likely to Get Married</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.5824*** (0.1296)</td>
<td>7.7459*** (0.1348)</td>
<td>5.9670*** (0.1417)</td>
<td>6.7857*** (0.1196)</td>
<td>7.7459*** (0.1151)</td>
<td>7.3259*** (0.1198)</td>
<td>5.6758*** (0.1311)</td>
<td>6.1868*** (0.1341)</td>
<td>5.4341*** (0.1405)</td>
<td>5.3791*** (0.1450)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1099 (0.1833)</td>
<td>0.1175 (0.1901)</td>
<td>0.07668 (0.2002)</td>
<td>0.0230 (0.1689)</td>
<td>0.1011 (0.1623)</td>
<td>0.1221 (0.1690)</td>
<td>-0.1512 (0.1852)</td>
<td>-0.0714 (0.1896)</td>
<td>0.04681 (0.1984)</td>
<td>0.2056 (0.2048)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0010</td>
<td>0.0011</td>
<td>0.0004</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.0011</td>
<td>0.0014</td>
<td>0.0018</td>
<td>0.0004</td>
<td>0.0002</td>
<td>0.0028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>365</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** p < 0.001
Table 3: Regression: White Same Race, Black Same Race compared to the reference category of Mixed Race Couples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1 Support from Friends</th>
<th>Model 2 Support from Families</th>
<th>Model 3 Agrees on Important Decisions</th>
<th>Model 4 Shares Values and Beliefs</th>
<th>Model 5 Emotionally Close</th>
<th>Model 6 Committed to making the relationship last</th>
<th>Model 7 Couple is not Likely to Argue</th>
<th>Model 8 Likely to stay together through the internship</th>
<th>Model 9 Likely to stay together through graduate school</th>
<th>Model 10 Likely to get Married</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>7.5824*** (0.1296)</td>
<td>7.7459*** (0.1346)</td>
<td>5.9670*** (0.1414)</td>
<td>6.7857*** (0.1196)</td>
<td>7.7459*** (0.1152)</td>
<td>7.3259*** (0.1200)</td>
<td>5.6758*** (0.1313)</td>
<td>6.1868*** (0.1335)</td>
<td>5.4341*** (0.1399)</td>
<td>5.3791*** (0.1445)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Same Race Couple</td>
<td>0.2527 (0.2245)</td>
<td>0.3091 (0.2327)</td>
<td>0.3077 (0.2449)</td>
<td>0.1374 (0.2072)</td>
<td>0.1772 (0.1991)</td>
<td>0.1136 (0.2067)</td>
<td>-0.1154 (0.2274)</td>
<td>0.2021 (0.2321)</td>
<td>0.3352 (0.2423)</td>
<td>0.4780+ (0.2503)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Same Race Couple</td>
<td>-0.0329 (0.2245)</td>
<td>-0.0719 (0.2318)</td>
<td>-0.1518 (0.2441)</td>
<td>-0.0901 (0.2064)</td>
<td>0.0259 (0.1984)</td>
<td>0.1306 (0.2067)</td>
<td>-0.1867 (0.2265)</td>
<td>-0.3389 (0.2304)</td>
<td>-0.2384 (0.2414)</td>
<td>-0.0639 (0.2494)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.0043</td>
<td>0.0066</td>
<td>0.0077</td>
<td>0.0026</td>
<td>0.0023</td>
<td>0.0015</td>
<td>0.0020</td>
<td>0.0116</td>
<td>0.0117</td>
<td>0.0124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>365</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ p < 0.1, *** p < 0.001
Table 4: Regression: Black Same Race, Black Male/White Female and White Male/Black Female Couples compared to the reference category of White Same Race Couple.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1 Support from Friends</th>
<th>Model 2 Support from Families</th>
<th>Model 3 Agrees on Important Decisions</th>
<th>Model 4 Shares Values and Beliefs</th>
<th>Model 5 Emotionally Close</th>
<th>Model 6 Committed to making the relationship last</th>
<th>Model 7 Couple is not Likely to Argue</th>
<th>Model 8 Likely to stay together through the internship</th>
<th>Model 9 Likely to stay together through graduate school</th>
<th>Model 10 Likely to get Married</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>7.8352*** (0.1834)</td>
<td>8.0549*** (0.1899)</td>
<td>6.2747*** (0.1996)</td>
<td>6.923*** (0.1692)</td>
<td>7.9231*** (0.1627)</td>
<td>7.4396*** (0.1695)</td>
<td>5.5604*** (0.1858)</td>
<td>6.3889*** (0.1899)</td>
<td>5.7692*** (0.1981)</td>
<td>5.8571*** (0.2046)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Same Race Couple</td>
<td>-0.2857 (0.2594)</td>
<td>-0.3810 (0.2678)</td>
<td>-0.4595 (0.2815)</td>
<td>-0.2274 (0.2386)</td>
<td>-0.1513 (0.2294)</td>
<td>0.01696 (0.2390)</td>
<td>-0.0713 (0.2621)</td>
<td>-0.5412* (0.2671)</td>
<td>-0.5736* (0.2783)</td>
<td>-0.5419+ (0.2885)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Male/White Female Couple</td>
<td>-0.1610 (0.2608)</td>
<td>-0.4257 (0.2700)</td>
<td>-0.5332+ (0.2839)</td>
<td>-0.2489 (0.2406)</td>
<td>-0.1590 (0.2313)</td>
<td>-0.1025 (0.2410)</td>
<td>0.1924 (0.2642)</td>
<td>-0.3102 (0.2694)</td>
<td>-0.3984 (0.2817)</td>
<td>-0.5650+ (0.2909)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Male/Black Female Couple</td>
<td>-0.3405 (0.2579)</td>
<td>-0.1962 (0.2678)</td>
<td>-0.0919 (0.2808)</td>
<td>-0.0306 (0.2379)</td>
<td>-0.1948 (0.2294)</td>
<td>-0.1243 (0.2390)</td>
<td>0.0417 (0.2614)</td>
<td>-0.0986 (0.2664)</td>
<td>-0.2746 (0.2786)</td>
<td>-0.3948 (0.2877)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.0057</td>
<td>0.0086</td>
<td>0.0143</td>
<td>0.0048</td>
<td>0.0023</td>
<td>0.0015</td>
<td>0.0029</td>
<td>0.0134</td>
<td>0.0122</td>
<td>0.0134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ p < 0.1, * p<0.05, *** p < 0.001
Table 5: Regression: White Same Race, Black Male/White Female and White Male/Black Female Couples compared to the reference category of Black Same Race Couple.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
<th>Model 6</th>
<th>Model 7</th>
<th>Model 8</th>
<th>Model 9</th>
<th>Model 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>Support from Friends</td>
<td>Support from Families</td>
<td>Agrees on Important Decisions</td>
<td>Shares Values and Beliefs</td>
<td>Emotionally Close</td>
<td>Committed to making the relationship last</td>
<td>Couple is not Likely to Argue</td>
<td>Likely to stay together through the internship</td>
<td>Likely to stay together through graduate school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5495*** (0.1834)</td>
<td>7.6739*** (0.1888)</td>
<td>5.8152*** (0.1985)</td>
<td>6.6957*** (0.1683)</td>
<td>7.7717*** (0.1618)</td>
<td>7.4565*** (0.1686)</td>
<td>5.4891*** (0.1848)</td>
<td>5.8478*** (0.1879)</td>
<td>5.1957*** (0.1969)</td>
<td>5.3152*** (0.2034)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Same Race Couple</td>
<td>0.2857 (0.2594)</td>
<td>0.3810 (0.2678)</td>
<td>0.4595 (0.2815)</td>
<td>0.2274 (0.2386)</td>
<td>0.1513 (0.2294)</td>
<td>-0.0169 (0.2390)</td>
<td>0.0713 (0.2621)</td>
<td>0.5411* (0.2671)</td>
<td>0.5736* (0.2793)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Male/White Female Couple</td>
<td>0.1247 (0.2608)</td>
<td>-0.0447 (0.2693)</td>
<td>-0.0736 (0.2831)</td>
<td>-0.0215 (0.2399)</td>
<td>-0.0077 (0.2307)</td>
<td>-0.1194 (0.2404)</td>
<td>0.2637 (0.2635)</td>
<td>0.2308 (0.2679)</td>
<td>0.1751 (0.2809)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Male/Black Female Couple</td>
<td>-0.0548 (0.2379)</td>
<td>0.1848 (0.2670)</td>
<td>0.3676 (0.2799)</td>
<td>0.1968 (0.2373)</td>
<td>-0.0435 (0.2288)</td>
<td>-0.1413 (0.2384)</td>
<td>0.1130 (0.2606)</td>
<td>0.4425+ (0.2649)</td>
<td>0.2989 (0.2778)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.0057</td>
<td>0.0086</td>
<td>0.0143</td>
<td>0.0048</td>
<td>0.0023</td>
<td>0.0015</td>
<td>0.0029</td>
<td>0.0134</td>
<td>0.0122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>365</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ p < 0.1, * p<0.05, *** p < 0.001
Table 6: Regression: White Same Race Couple/Black Same Race Couple as a dummy variable. Black Same Race Couple = 1. Data for both Interracial Couples were dropped.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1 Support from Friends</th>
<th>Model 2 Support from Families</th>
<th>Model 3 Agrees on Important Decisions</th>
<th>Model 4 Shares Values and Beliefs</th>
<th>Model 5 Emotionally Close</th>
<th>Model 6 Committed to Making Relationship Last</th>
<th>Model 7 Not likely to argue</th>
<th>Model 8 Last through the Internship</th>
<th>Model 9 Last through Graduate School</th>
<th>Model 10 Couple is likely to Get Married</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>7.8352*** (0.1883)</td>
<td>8.0549*** (0.1812)</td>
<td>6.2747*** (0.1977)</td>
<td>6.9230*** (0.1664)</td>
<td>7.9231*** (0.1536)</td>
<td>7.4396*** (0.1662)</td>
<td>5.5604*** (0.1836)</td>
<td>6.3889*** (0.1924)</td>
<td>5.7692*** (0.1935)</td>
<td>5.8571*** (0.2095)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Same Race Couple</td>
<td>-0.2857 (0.2664)</td>
<td>-0.3810 (0.2556)</td>
<td>-0.4595+ (0.2741)</td>
<td>-0.2274 (0.2347)</td>
<td>-0.1513 (0.2167)</td>
<td>-0.0169 (0.2345)</td>
<td>-0.0713 (0.2589)</td>
<td>-0.5411* (0.2669)</td>
<td>-0.5736* (0.2711)</td>
<td>-0.5419+ (0.2901)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.0064</td>
<td>0.0121</td>
<td>0.0153</td>
<td>0.0052</td>
<td>0.0027</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0004</td>
<td>0.0223</td>
<td>0.0241</td>
<td>0.0189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ p < 0.1, * p < 0.05, *** p < 0.001
Table 7: Regression: White Same Race Couple/Black Same Race Couple as a dummy variable. Black Same Race Couple = 1. Data for both Interracial Couples were dropped and data was dropped for the International Student Respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
<th>Model 6</th>
<th>Model 7</th>
<th>Model 8</th>
<th>Model 9</th>
<th>Model 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>7.9059*** (0.1775)</td>
<td>8.1176*** (0.1731)</td>
<td>6.3176*** (0.1977)</td>
<td>7.0235*** (0.1631)</td>
<td>8.0000*** (0.1552)</td>
<td>7.4706*** (0.1707)</td>
<td>5.5529*** (0.1914)</td>
<td>6.4167*** (0.1924)</td>
<td>5.7647*** (0.1935)</td>
<td>5.8824*** (0.2057)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Same Race Couple</td>
<td>-0.1294 (0.2510)</td>
<td>-0.2456 (0.2441)</td>
<td>-0.4339 (0.2787)</td>
<td>-0.1979 (0.2300)</td>
<td>-0.2093 (0.2189)</td>
<td>0.0876 (0.2406)</td>
<td>0.0413 (0.2699)</td>
<td>-0.4399 (0.2705)</td>
<td>-0.4508 (0.2728)</td>
<td>-0.5219+ (0.2955)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.0016</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.0141</td>
<td>0.0044</td>
<td>0.0054</td>
<td>0.0008</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.0155</td>
<td>0.0159</td>
<td>0.0181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ p < 0.1, *** p < 0.001
Appendix A: The Vignette for the Four Conditions

Please carefully read the following story and answer the questions that follow.

It was a Friday in September, [Darius/Andrew] had just finished up his first full week of classes as a junior in college. He was walking home, exchanging text messages with friends about weekend plans when he noticed a black and white dog making its way down the sidewalk. The dog stopped occasionally, sniffing around trees or bushes, but when it noticed [Darius/Andrew], its tail started to wag and it ran toward him.

“Hi…” [Darius/Andrew] read the dog’s tags, “Ranger. Where do you belong?” He thought the dog looked familiar as though he’d seen it in the neighborhood but could not yet place it. [Darius/Andrew] dialed the phone number on the dog’s tags.

“Hello?” A female voice answered the phone, as [Darius/Andrew] remembered where he had seen the dog before: it was usually with the cute girl who had just moved in down the street from him.

“Um, hi, I think I just found your dog.” [Darius/Andrew] stammered. [Darius/Andrew]’s idea of the identity of the dog’s owner was confirmed when she gave him her address. [Darius/Andrew] volunteered to drop the dog off on his way home.

Stopping next to a parked car, [Darius/Andrew] made a quick check of his [black cornrows/short light brown hair] in the rearview mirror before he walked Ranger up to the house. When he turned the corner onto their street, the girl was sitting on her front steps. He couldn’t
help but think she looked good even in yoga pants and a tank top with her [blonde hair/black braids] pulled into a ponytail.

“Ranger!” She called and the dog ran over to her.

[Darius/Andrew] followed. “I found him wandering around Whitman Ave.”

“Thank you so much for bringing him home. I just moved here from Georgia and he doesn’t know his way around yet. I was worried I’d never find him again.” She reached out her right hand, “I’m [Keandra/Emily], by the way.”

[Darius/Andrew] shook her hand, “[Darius/Andrew]. And, no problem.”

Several weeks had gone by, [Keandra/Emily] and [Darius/Andrew] saw each other occasionally around campus or in their neighborhood but they had not spoken much. One day as [Darius/Andrew] walked past [Keandra/Emily]’s house, she called out for him to wait.

“Hey, are you going to the Halloween party at the Brewery next Saturday?” [Keandra/Emily] asked.

“Uh, yeah, I think so.” He responded. She looked like she was waiting for him to say something else. “We could go together, if you want?”

[Keandra/Emily] laughed. “That’s not an invitation. But I’ll take it.” She thought for a moment, then said, “I was planning on going as Catwoman, you should be Batman.”

[“That’ll be something new, a black Batman.” Darius said, laughing.]

“That’s alright, the mask will cover this up.” [Keandra/Emily] joked, patting his neat cornrows. /“I don’t exactly look like Christian Bale.” Andrew said, referring to his physique.
“Yeah, he doesn’t have your green eyes, but this is about right.” [Keandra/Emily] smiled, ruffling his light brown hair. “Besides, I’m no [Halle Berry/Anne Hathaway] myself.” [Keandra/Emily] stated, “We’ll be great together, I’m sure.”

They spent so much time together over the next few months that when Christmas break came, [Keandra/Emily] and Ranger made the five hour road trip across the state with [Darius/Andrew] to meet his family. The following summer, [Darius/Andrew] flew back to Georgia with [Keandra/Emily] to meet her family.

Before the start of their senior year, they moved in together. As their one year anniversary came and went, they realized that Ranger’s health was deteriorating. They had to put him down around Thanksgiving.

In January, they began more seriously discussing what would happen after graduation. They were each applying for jobs and graduate schools near both of their families, but they had not made any solid plans.

“I have something I want to tell you.” [Keandra/Emily] told him, her [dark/blue] eyes sparkling with excitement.

“So do I, but you go first.” [Darius/Andrew] prompted.


“That’s great.” [Darius/Andrew] forced a smile and slipped the ring box back in his pocket underneath the table. “Congratulations.” His news would have to wait.
A few days later at home, [Keandra/Emily] inquired, “You seem disappointed about the internship. What’s going on?”

[Darius/Andrew] handed her a letter he had received in the mail a few weeks prior.


“Yeah, I thought that would work out well for us.” He reached into a desk drawer and pulled out the ring box. Turning to her, [Darius/Andrew] said, “I thought we’d plan a wedding while we were there.”

“Oh my gosh.” [Keandra/Emily] gasped, appearing to be at a loss for words.

[Keandra/Emily] seemed set on going to D.C., while [Darius/Andrew] couldn’t pass up going to grad school. They were great together, as [Keandra/Emily] predicted before their first date. But even with the engagement, a wedding wasn’t a definite thing. They needed to first make this long distance relationship work.
Appendix B:  
Survey 1: Following the Vignette

Please answer the following questions regarding the story you have just read.  

Dummy Questions:

1. What role did the dog, Ranger, play in the story? Choose all that apply.
   ____ A. Nothing, he was just a dog.
   ____ B. He served as excuse for the beginning of the main characters’ relationship.
   ____ C. Symbolized the best and worst times in the main characters’ relationship.

2. What did it mean for [Keandra/Emily] when the dog died? Choose all that apply.
   ____ A. The beginning of her adulthood: starting down the path to a career and being self-reliant.
   ____ B. The loss of a beloved pet.
   ____ C. Relationships can be temporary and still meaningful.

3. The author implies that [Darius/Andrew]: Choose ONE answer.
   ____ A. Has resigned himself to the fact that they will be apart for long amounts of time for the duration of her internship, because he understands that it is in both of their best interests to pursue their individual opportunities.
   ____ B. Is jealous of [Keandra/Emily]’s opportunity to move to a big city.
   ____ C. Wishes that [Keandra/Emily] would choose not to go to D.C., to the point that he will try to convince her to go with him to Georgia State University.
   ____ D. Is planning on buying [Keandra/Emily] a new puppy before she leaves.

4. What costumes were worn by the couple to the Halloween party? Choose ONE answer.
   ____ A. Pirates
   ____ B. Doctor and Nurse
   ____ C. Batman and Catwoman

5. Which state is [Keandra/Emily] from? Choose ONE answer.
   ____ A. Texas
   ____ B. Georgia
   ____ C. New Mexico

6. How likely is it that [Keandra/Emily]'s internship will advance her career?  
   Circle ONE answer between 1 (Not at all Likely) and 10 (Very Likely).

   1 --------- 2 --------- 3 --------- 4 --------- 5 --------- 6 --------- 7 --------- 8 --------- 9 --------- 10

40
7. To what extent do you agree with the following statement?

It is better for young people to wait until they complete their education to start a serious relationship. Circle ONE answer between 1 (Strongly Disagree) and 10 (Strongly Agree).

1 --------- 2 --------- 3 --------- 4 --------- 5 --------- 6 --------- 7 --------- 8 --------- 9 --------- 10

Questions of Interest:

Social support:

1. How likely is it that [Darius/Andrew] and [Keandra/Emily]’s friends approve of their relationship?

Circle ONE answer between 1 (Not at all Likely) and 10 (Very Likely).

1 --------- 2 --------- 3 --------- 4 --------- 5 --------- 6 --------- 7 --------- 8 --------- 9 --------- 10

2. How likely is it that [Darius/Andrew] and [Keandra/Emily]’s families approve of their relationship?

Circle ONE answer between 1 (Not at all Likely) and 10 (Very Likely).

1 --------- 2 --------- 3 --------- 4 --------- 5 --------- 6 --------- 7 --------- 8 --------- 9 --------- 10

Duration:

3. How likely is it that [Darius/Andrew] and [Keandra/Emily] will stay together for the duration of her year-long internship? Circle ONE answer between 1 (Not at all Likely) and 10 (Very Likely).

1 --------- 2 --------- 3 --------- 4 --------- 5 --------- 6 --------- 7 --------- 8 --------- 9 --------- 10

4. How likely is it that [Darius/Andrew] and [Keandra/Emily] will stay together while he finishes graduate school (four years or more)? Circle ONE answer between 1 (Not at all Likely) and 10 (Very Likely).

1 --------- 2 --------- 3 --------- 4 --------- 5 --------- 6 --------- 7 --------- 8 --------- 9 --------- 10

5. How likely is it that [Darius/Andrew] and [Keandra/Emily] will get married?

Circle ONE answer between 1 (Not at all Likely) and 10 (Very Likely).

1 --------- 2 --------- 3 --------- 4 --------- 5 --------- 6 --------- 7 --------- 8 --------- 9 --------- 10
Conflict:

6. How likely is it that [Darius/Andrew] and [Keandra/Emily] will agree about important decisions regarding their future together? Circle ONE answer between 1 (Not at all Likely) and 10 (Very Likely).

1 -------- 2 -------- 3 -------- 4 -------- 5 -------- 6 -------- 7 -------- 8 -------- 9 -------- 10

7. How likely is it that [Darius/Andrew] and [Keandra/Emily] will agree about values or beliefs? Circle ONE answer between 1 (Not at all Likely) and 10 (Very Likely).

1 -------- 2 -------- 3 -------- 4 -------- 5 -------- 6 -------- 7 -------- 8 -------- 9 -------- 10

8. How emotionally close are [Darius/Andrew] and [Keandra/Emily]? Circle ONE answer between 1 (Not at all Close) and 10 (Very Close).

1 -------- 2 -------- 3 -------- 4 -------- 5 -------- 6 -------- 7 -------- 8 -------- 9 -------- 10

9. How committed are [Darius/Andrew] and [Keandra/Emily] to making their relationship last? Circle ONE answer between 1 (Not at all Committed) and 10 (Very Committed).

1 -------- 2 -------- 3 -------- 4 -------- 5 -------- 6 -------- 7 -------- 8 -------- 9 -------- 10

10. How often are [Darius/Andrew] and [Keandra/Emily] likely to argue? Circle ONE answer between 1 (Not Often at all) and 10 (Very Often).

1 -------- 2 -------- 3 -------- 4 -------- 5 -------- 6 -------- 7 -------- 8 -------- 9 -------- 10

Demographic Questions
What is your age?
________ years

What is your gender? Please select one.
_____ male _____ female

What is your race/ethnicity? Please select one.
_____ African American/black
_____ Asian
_____ Hispanic/Latino
_____ Native American
_____ White
_____ Other, please specify: _____________________________

**What is your year in school?** *Please select one.*
_____ Freshman
_____ Sophomore
_____ Junior
_____ Senior

**What is your major?** ______________________________________

**Were you born in the United States?** *Please select one.*
_____ Yes
_____ No. Please answer the next two questions:

  **Where were you born?** ________________________________

  **How old were you when you came to the U.S.?** _______ years
Appendix C:
Survey 2: Social Distance and Prejudice

Please determine the extent to which you agree with the following statements. Please circle one answer per question.

Social Distance

Think about the various ethnic groups within the U.S. including Whites, African Americans, Asian Americans, Hispanics, Native Americans, and so on. To what extent do you agree with the following statement?

Individuals who belong to the same ethnic group tend to be fairly similar to one another.

1 - Strongly Agree
2 - Agree
3 - Neither Agree nor Disagree
4 - Disagree
5 - Strongly Disagree
6 - Don’t Know

Now think only about ethnic minority groups within the U.S. such as African Americans, Asian Americans, Hispanics, and Native Americans. To what extent do you agree with the following statement?

Ethnic minority groups in the U.S. are very distinct and very different from one another.

1 - Strongly Agree
2 - Agree
3 - Neither Agree nor Disagree
4 - Disagree
5 - Strongly Disagree
6 - Don’t Know

Think about Whites in the U.S. compared to ethnic minority groups. To what extent do you agree with the following statement?

Whites as a group are very distinct and different from ethnic minority groups.

1 - Strongly Agree
2 - Agree
3 - Neither Agree nor Disagree
4 - Disagree
5 - Strongly Disagree
6 - Don’t Know

**Individuals of different races have different values from each other.**

Strongly Disagree                      Strongly Agree
----------------------------------------
1----------------------------------------3----------------------------------------4------------------------5

**Individuals of different races are too incompatible to have successful romantic relationships.**

Strongly Disagree                      Strongly Agree
----------------------------------------
1----------------------------------------3----------------------------------------4------------------------5

**Individuals of different races often do not like each other.**

Strongly Disagree                      Strongly Agree
----------------------------------------
1----------------------------------------3----------------------------------------4------------------------5

**Prejudice**

I feel that I have been excluded from opportunities because they were unfairly given to a member of a minority.

Strongly Disagree                      Strongly Agree
----------------------------------------
1----------------------------------------3----------------------------------------4------------------------5

I’d like to get your feelings toward some groups in U.S. Please rate your general feelings toward these groups using a measurement tool called the feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 degrees and 100 degrees mean that you feel favorable and warm toward the group. Ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don’t feel favorable toward the group and that you don’t care too much for that group. You would rate the group at the 50 degree mark if you don’t feel particularly warm or cold toward the group. For each group listed below, please write a number that indicates your feelings about this group.
8. In general, how favorable (warm) or unfavorable (cold) do you feel about African Americans? Please specify a number between 0 (unfavorable/cold)-100 (favorable/warm).

___________________________

9. In general, how favorable (warm) or unfavorable (cold) do you feel about Asian Americans? Please specify a number between 0 (unfavorable/cold)-100 (favorable/warm).

___________________________

10. In general, how favorable (warm) or unfavorable (cold) do you feel about Hispanics? Please specify a number between 0 (unfavorable/cold)-100 (favorable/warm).

___________________________

11. In general, how favorable (warm) or unfavorable (cold) do you feel about Caucasian Americans? Please specify a number between 0 (unfavorable/cold)-100 (favorable/warm).

___________________________

12. In general, how intelligent or unintelligent are each of these groups? Please circle a number between 1 (Are Intelligent) and 7 (Are Unintelligent).

African Americans
13. In general, how much does each group prefer to be self-supporting or prefer to live off of welfare?

*Please circle a number between 1 (Prefers to be Self-Supporting) and 7 (Prefers to Live off of Welfare)*

African Americans

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Asian Americans

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Hispanics

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Caucasian Americans

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

14. In general, how easy or hard is each group to get along with?
Please circle a number between 1 (Are Easy to Get Along with) and 7 (Are Hard to Get Along with).

African Americans
1 -------------- 2 ---------------- 3 --------------- 4 ----------------- 5 -------------- 6 -------------- 7

Asian Americans
1 -------------- 2 ---------------- 3 --------------- 4 ----------------- 5 -------------- 6 -------------- 7

Hispanics
1 -------------- 2 ---------------- 3 --------------- 4 ----------------- 5 -------------- 6 -------------- 7

Caucasian Americans
1 -------------- 2 ---------------- 3 --------------- 4 ----------------- 5 -------------- 6 -------------- 7
Appendix D: the Process of Choosing Names

It has been found that when people read names without visual cues such as photographs, they make assumptions about the characteristics of the person, especially about gender and race (Bertrand and Mullainathan 2004, Carpusor and Loges 2006). These studies provide the necessary support for the manipulation being based primarily on the names of the characters while supplemented with racial cues regarding the appearance of the characters.

When searching for names that would elicit the correct racial associations, I used a few different online databases for baby names. From BabyNames.org (2012), I found lists of common African American baby boys’ and girls’ names. I took names from this list and used Parents.com (2012) to research their popularity ranking in 1992 and 1993, the years that the participants were born. This process helped me to determine what names were likely to be commonly known amongst the respondents’ peer groups. While I could find a few lists of common black names, there were no comparative lists of white names. Therefore, in order to check on my chosen names, I also used Google.com to run image searches of the first names. These results showed common associations with the names with both celebrities and the general population. Using this image search, I confirmed that these names would elicit the desired racial association.

The names for the pre-test were chosen in the same way. Because I wanted to include names that were common for both blacks and whites, some were found on the list of common African American names from BabyNames.org (2012), some were from lists found on BabyCenter.com (2012). All of the names on the pre-test were found to be commonly used names for babies born in 1992 and 1993 based on their popularity rankings on the Parents.com
(2012) baby names site. Names were considered popular if they ranked above 150, meaning that around 0.1% of the population of that sex had that name who were born in 1992 or 1993 (Parents.com 2012).