Boston College
Lynch School of Education

Department of Counseling, Developmental and Educational Psychology

Program in Counseling Psychology

THE INTRAPSYCHIC DYNAMICS OF RACIAL SELF-DESIGNATION, INTERNALIZED RACIAL IDENTITY, AND WELL-BEING IN PART-WHITE MULTIRACIAL ADULTS

Dissertation
by

EVA SIMONE WILSON

submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

August 2021

© Copyright 2021 Eva Simone Wilson

Abstract

The Intrapsychic Dynamics of Racial Self-Designation, Internalized Racial Identity, and Well-Being in Part-White Multiracial Adults

Eva Simone Wilson

Janet E. Helms, Chair

Part-White Multiracial adults undergo a unique racial identity development process within a racially stratified society. Theorists suggest that different ways of self-designating either improve or impede healthy psychological outcomes for Multiracial people, but virtually no theoretical rationale or empirical studies account for the internal mechanisms underlying self-designations and mental health outcomes. People of Color and White racial identity theories were used to investigate racial dynamics implicit in the identity development and self-designations of Multiracial individuals. The current study examined the relationships between racial self-designations, internalized racial identity, and well-being in part-White Multiracial adults.

Part-White (Asian/White or Black/White) Multiracial adults ($N = 169$) completed a measure of frequency of use of five multiracial self-designations, People of Color and White Racial Identity Attitudes Scales to assess their internal race-related processes (i.e., statuses), and the Brief Symptom Inventory 18 (Derogatis, 2001) and the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1979) to assess healthy and unhealthy psychological outcomes.

Multivariate Multiple Regression Analyses were conducted to examine the relationships among racial self-designation and well-being, racial self-designation and internalized racial identity, and internalized racial identity and well-being. Results specific to racial self-designations were (a) greater disorientation about racial dynamics

predicted more frequent identification as White and Multiracial, (b) withdrawal from Whiteness increased monoracial minority self-designation and decreased self-designation as Multiracial (c) more complex appraisals of Whiteness predicted more frequent use of most self-designation choices, and (d) an intellectualized view of Whiteness reduced use of the monoracial minority designations and increased identifying with no racial groups at all. Self-designation use was not related to psychological outcomes, but racial identity statuses were.

Overall, the results of the study supported examining racial self-designation, internalized racial identity and well-being in a single study. As expected, internalized racial identity was predictive of self-designations and well-being. This study provides initial support for adding conceptual and empirical complexity to discussions about the mental health and wellbeing of Multiracial people. Methodological limitations and implications for future theory, research, and practice are discussed.

Table of Contents

List of Tables *vi*

Acknowledgements *vii*

Chapter 1 *1*

Introduction **1**

Chapter 2 *6*

Review of Literature *6*

Racial Self-Designation **7**

Monoracial Self-Designation Theories 8

Integrated Self-Designation Theories 9

Fluid Self-Designation Theories 14

Typology Models and Measures 15

Internalized Racial Identity **18**

People of Color Racial Identity 19

White Racial Identity 21

Measurement of Internalized Racial Identity 22

Well-Being **23**

Multiracial vs. Monoracial Well-Being 23

Self-Designation and Well-Being 27

Internalized Racial Identity and Well-Being 32

Self-Designation, Internalized Racial Identity, and Well-Being 33

Statement of the Problem *35*

Racial Self-Designation **36**

Internalized Racial Identity **37**

Well-Being **38**

Current Study ***39***

Hypotheses **41**

Research Questions **44**

Chapter 3 ***45***

Method ***45***

Participants **45**

Measures **45**

Demographic Questionnaire 46

Measure of Multiracial Self-Designation (MMSD) 47

People of Color Racial Identity Attitudes Scale (PRIAS) (Helms, 1995) 48

Rosenberg's Self-Esteem Scale (RSES) (Rosenberg, 1979) 50

Brief Symptom Inventory 18 (BSI 18) (Derogatis, 2001) 52

White Racial Identity Attitudes Scale (WRIAS) (Helms & Carter, 1990) 54

Procedures **57**

Chapter 4 ***60***

Results ***60***

Preliminary Analyses **60**

Tests of Hypotheses and Research Questions **64**

Chapter 5 ***82***

Discussion *82*

Self-Designation and Well-Being **83**

Internalized Racial Identity and Well-Being **85**

Racial Self-Designation and Internalized Racial Identity **89**

Internalized White Racial Identity and Self-Designation **92**

Internalized White Racial Identity and Well-Being **95**

Summary **98**

Limitations *100*

Sample Considerations **100**

Measurement Considerations **102**

Research Design **106**

Statistical Considerations **107**

Implications for Future Theory and Research and Clinical Practice *108*

Implications for Multiracial Theory and Future Research **108**

Implications for Clinical Practice **112**

References *115*

Appendix A: Demographic Questionnaire *127*

Appendix B: Measure of Multiracial Self-Designation (MMSD) *128*

Appendix C: People of Color Racial Identity Attitudes Scale (PRIAS) *129*

Appendix D: Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSES) *132*

Appendix E: Brief Symptom Inventory 18 (BSI 18) ***133***

Appendix F: Modified White Racial Identity Attitudes Scale (WRIAS) ***134***

List of Tables

Table 1 Models of Integrated Multiracial Self-Designation Theories 13

Table 2 Summary of Participants' Self-Reported Demographic Characteristics 47

Table 3 Means, Standard Deviations, Ranges, and Cronbach Alpha Coefficients for Predictor and Outcome variables 59

Table 4 Pearson Correlations among Predictor and Criterion Variables 63

Table 5 Multivariate Multiple Regression with Racial Self-Designation Predicting Self-Esteem and Psychological Distress 65

Table 6 Multivariate Multiple Regression Analysis with People of Color Racial Identity Predicting Self-Esteem and Psychological Distress 69

Table 7 Multivariate Multiple Regression Analysis with Person of Color Racial Identity Predicting Self-Designation 73

Table 8 Multivariate Multiple Regression Analysis with White Racial Identity Predicting Self-Designation 78

Table 9 Multivariate Multiple Regression Analysis of White Racial Identity Predicting Self-Esteem and Psychological Distress 81

Acknowledgements

This dissertation would not have been possible without the support of my family, friends, mentors, and colleagues throughout my graduate training. First, I want to thank my parents for their endless love and support, for always encouraging my curiosity, for being my greatest cheerleaders, and for always believing I would reach this milestone.

Thank you to my advisor and dissertation chair, Dr. Janet Helms, without whom I would not be the scholar I am today. Dr. Helms furthered both my thinking and writing on this project from start to finish, and I could not have done this without her tireless work and support. To my dissertation readers, Drs. Elizabeth Sparks and Usha Tummala-Narra, thank you for your guidance and support throughout this process and during my time at BC.

I also must thank my mentor and dissertation reader, Dr. Natasha Torkelson, for her wisdom and guidance, for her endless encouragement in my journey as a Multiracial researcher, and for many years of collaboration and friendship.

Thank you to my training cohort at UPenn, Sam, Rosaline, and Eddie, for their comradery, love, and endless humor as we navigated a formidably challenging intern year and our dissertations. We made it! I would also like to thank my training director and supervisor, Dr. Michele Downie, for her compassion, thoughtfulness, and care during an unprecedented training year.

Finally, to my dissertation writing group, Nicole and Emma, this dissertation would not be possible without the hours of productivity, humor, commiserating, and fun

we shared over the past few years. Nicole, thank you especially for your support along the way.

Chapter 1

Introduction

People of mixed race are often faced with the challenge of developing a racial identity that brings them a sense of life satisfaction and well-being in a racially stratified society that views them as an anomaly. *Multiracial, Biracial,* or *Mixed Race* people, defined as individuals with one White parent and one parent of Color, were the focus of the present study. Although there are Multiracial individuals with parents from two different marginalized racial groups, they were not the focus of this study because the combination of one parent of Color and one White parent represents the largest subset of Multiracial combinations in the United States (U.S. Census Bureau, 2012). Further, racial groups of Color and the White racial group have greater social distance than any two racial groups of Color. *Social distance* refers to the longstanding racial hierarchy within the United States, wherein White supremacy placed the White racial group at the top of the hierarchy, with Black designated as the hierarchical opposite of White, and other racial groups of color somewhere in between (Rockquemore & Brunsma, 2004). Consequently, Person of Color/White Multiracials may experience greater identity challenges from society than Multiracial individuals from two people of Color backgrounds. In the United States, Multiracial people make up almost 3% of the total population (just over 9 million people) and the largest and fastest growing groups include those designating as White and Black (1.8 million) and as White and Asian (1.6 million) (U.S. Census Bureau, 2012, p. 4). Therefore, this study focused on these two large and rapidly growing groups.

Multiracial identity development has been an area of interest for the past few decades, with many theorists attempting to describe the identity development process of this population. Historically, the Multiracial population has been pathologized as dysfunctional due to their existence on the "margins" of society by virtue of their place at the margins of racial group boundaries (Stonequist, 1937). As psychologists came to have a greater understanding of race as a social construct following the repeal of anti-miscegenation laws nationwide, theory on Multiracial identity turned away from a sole focus on dysfunction and toward a more multifaceted view of Multiracial well-being. With this shift, theorists began to ask how Multiracial individuals identified and what the developmental process was that led them to an ultimate "resolved" identity (Poston, 1990). Because this shift moved away from pathologizing Multiracial people, theorists created models inclusive of multiple healthy ways of identifying and developed various identity choice typologies to capture empirically supported identity options (Brunsma, 2006; Rockquemore & Brunsma, 2004; Rockquemore, 1990; Renn, 2000; Root, 1990; 1999). Theorists also created stage models of identity development, based largely on the monoracial identity models that they criticized for not being accurate depictions of the Multiracial experience(s) (Poston, 1990).

Furthermore, in the Multiracial literature, there have been dual foci on either identity development *processes* or identity development *outcome(s)* (e.g., the outcome of a racial self-designation choice, often called a racial identity choice or label) of Multiracial individuals. Process-focused theory and research attends to the external, contextual influences that affect a person's internal processes (e.g., cognitions, feelings), but process-focused studies do not offer a deep understanding of the internal processes

themselves (AhnAllen, et al., 2006; Coleman & Carter, 2007; Collins, 2000; Jackson, 2012; Kelch-Oliver & Leslie, 2006; Khanna, 2004; Miville, et al., 2005; Torkelson et al., 2013, 2014). Some of the proposed contextual factors examined in the process studies include inherited influences (e.g., phenotype), traits (such as personality type), and social interactions in one's neighborhood, school, or work place (Root, 1999). Qualitative and quantitative examinations of how Multiracial individuals understand and experience the influence of these factors suggest that they are important aspects of Multiracial identity development. Nevertheless, the cognitive process by which such factors influence identity is still not understood.

In contrast, identity development outcome-focused theory and research examines the relationship between self-designation and an array of factors (e.g., self-esteem, anxiety, and social acceptance). Despite shifts in theoretical perspectives that have widened the range of "healthy" ways of identifying, the existing literature on Multiracial identity development suggests that how a person chooses to self-designate may be a critical determinant of whether the person is well-adjusted psychologically (Coleman & Carter, 2007; Poston, 1990; Root, 2003). Well-being has been associated with Multiracials' racial self-designation choice, with some choices consistently being associated with more positive psychological functioning than other choices (Coleman & Carter, 2007; Chong, 2013; Damann, 2008; Lusk et al., 2010; Rockquemore & Brunsma, 2002).

Multiracial researchers have contended that internal processes may be implicit in the ways in which part-White Multiracials self-designate or label themselves. Yet one's self-designation alone does not adequately reflect the process by which one develops a

positive sense of self amidst society's binary racial conflict(s). Indeed, the prominent multiracial researcher Maria P. Root stated, "to name oneself is to validate one's existence and declare visibility," [but] self-designation on its own tells us little about how an individual views race and understands themselves racially [sic] (Root, 1992, p. 7). Without greater knowledge of Multiracials' racial self-comprehension, we cannot fully understand the relationship between self-designation and well-being.

Racial Identity Theory (Helms, 1995) provides a means of understanding how Multiracials' understand themselves, that is, their racial self-comprehension. Racial Identity Theory holds that racial identity development is a process of racial self-actualization and results from individuals developing successively more complex strategies (called schemas) for coping with racial stimuli (Helms, 1990; 1995). Different racial identity schemas may allow for more or less successful coping with racial stimuli, and thus have been associated with varying levels of well-being (e.g., Alvarez & Helms, 2001). For Multiracial individuals, racial stimuli often include potentially distressing questions or challenges regarding their racial background and self-designation.

Although several studies have supported the premise that racial self-designation in Multiracial people is influenced by socioracial context(s), a postulate of Racial Identity Theory is that contextual racial information is filtered through an individual's racial identity schemas (Helms, 1995). One possible indicator of how a person understands oneself racially is therefore their self-designated racial label, which might not be the same as society's label for the person. Given that racial identity schemas represent internal processes that may underlie one's outward racial self-designation, racial identity may play a role in how one self-designates. To clarify the distinction between racial self-

designation (outward) and racial identity (internal), I will use the term *internalized racial identity* in this dissertation.

Aspects of well-being, such as self-esteem, life satisfaction, and symptoms of psychological distress have been associated with different ways of self-designating, as well as with internalized racial identity schemas (e.g., Lusk et al., 2010; Pyant & Yanico, 1991). Further, theory suggests that internalized racial identity may be a cognitive process through which Multiracial individuals come to self-designate. Existing Multiracial research, however, has not explored the relationship between racial identity schemas and racial self-designation nor their combined relation to well-being. To begin to explore this relationship, the current study focused on Multiracial people's internalized racial identity and how this relates to their choice of self-designation and psychological adjustment. Therefore, this study examined the potentially mediating role of internalized racial identity schemas in the relationship between racial self-designation and well-being in Multiracial adults.

Although Multiracial individuals are no longer universally perceived to be inherently pathological if they do not identify as monoracial, there is little empirical information regarding their well-being and self-identification. Without greater knowledge of how Multiracial identity processes and ways of self-designating relate to individuals' well-being, counseling psychologists remain ill-equipped to support their Multiracial clients through normative development as well as psychological difficulties. Counseling psychology emphasizes the role of environmental and situational influences on mental health, thus the influence of racial identity and self-designation on the well-being of Multiracial clients is essential knowledge for counseling psychologists. The present study

may contribute to clinicians' work with Multiracial clients by identifying potential risk and protective factors affecting their self-esteem and psychological adjustment. Further, this study may provide counseling psychologists with greater understanding of both the identity development processes and outcomes of Multiracial clients.

Chapter 2

Review of Literature

Over time, multiracial research and theory have shifted away from a requirement that Multiracial people adopt a monoracial racial designation to one that recognizes the possibility of an integrated Multiracial self-designation (Rockquemore & Brunsma, 2002). Theorists have suggested several potential pathways to the development of a healthy identity for Multiracial people, as well as various self-designation patterns or typologies purportedly used by Multiracial people (Jacobs, 1992; Kerwin & Ponterotto, 1995; Kich, 1992; Poston, 1990; Renn, 2008; Rockquemore, 1990). In much of the traditional literature, developmental pathways may lead to self-designation outcomes that are healthy or unhealthy according to the theorists' perspectives, but recent theorists contend that no self-designation choice is inherently unhealthy (Kerwin & Ponterotto, 1995; Kich, 1992; Poston, 1990; Renn, 2008; Root, 1990; 1999). Moreover, both traditional and recent theorists use the term "racial identity" as a synonym for racial self-designation without regard to the person's *internalized racial identity*, defined as race-related cognitions and schemas (Helms, 1995). Internalized racial identity may potentially mediate the relationship between self-designation and well-being.

To support the perspective that one should consider self-designation in combination with internalized racial identity to understand the well-being of Multiracial people, the following literature will be reviewed: Theory and research on (a) self-designation, (b) internalized racial identity, and (c) well-being of Multiracial adults. In actuality, most of the reviewed internalized racial identity research is based on monoracial adults because virtually no multiracial studies exist that focus on internalized racial identity and well-being of Multiracial people.

Racial Self-Designation

Racial self-designation does not occur spontaneously, but rather relates to the process of identity development. Just as many theorists in developmental and personality psychology have proposed theories of specific and general identity development (i.e., gender identity, political identity, etc.), scholars studying Multiracial people have developed identity development theories regarding racial identity. Theorists suggest that racial self-designation is the outward expression of one's internal identity development process and how an individual self-designates denotes the person's racial self-concept. Various qualitative studies have suggested that Multiracial individuals may change their self-designations situationally or over time (Miville et al., 2005; Sanchez at al., 2009; Smith, 2014). Implicitly or explicitly, theory on Multiracial self-designation addresses the question of how ways of self-designating relate to well-being. Although some researchers and theorists use various terms to refer to *an individual's self-labeling*, for the sake of clarity, the term *racial self-designation* will be used in the present study.

In responding to the question of the relationship between racial self-designation and well-being, the pendulum of Multiracial scholarship has swung in different

directions. On one side is an assumption that the only healthy identity for a Multiracial person of part-White heritage is a monoracial group-of-color identity. On the other side is a developmental perspective that assumes that the only healthy self-designation option is a "Biracial" or "Multiracial" identity. More recently, some scholars have acknowledged the multifaceted and various ways in which Multiracial individuals may self-designate (Brunsma, 2006; Rockquemore & Brunsma, 2004; Root, 1990; 1999). These shifts have coincided with societal changes, such as the Civil Rights Movement and racial pride movements of the mid-20th century, as well as the more recent Multiracial pride movement beginning in the 1980s. Although racial pride movements bolstered positive associations with minority racial status, they nevertheless reinforced monoracial identities as the norm. The Multiracial pride movement, in contrast, began to broaden society's understanding of race and introduced the concept of a distinct "multiracial" identity.

Monoracial Self-Designation Theories

One of the earliest scholars to address Multiracial identity was Stonequist (1937), who posited the Marginal Man [sic] theory to explain the presumed maladjustment of Multiracials. This theory argued that Multiracial people struggle psychologically due to their existence on the margins of racial groups and within a marginalizing society. Accordingly, Multiracials allegedly experienced isolation, stigmatization, and rejection due to their ambiguous racial identity. According to Stonequist, Multiracial individuals must select a single monoracial identity in order to resolve their marginal status and avoid threats to their psychological well-being.

Stonequist's stance aligned with predominant societal views of race at the time and with the "One Drop Rule", which assigned all part-Black individuals in the US to the

Black racial group both legally and socially. More broadly speaking, this concept is known as hypodescent, where society assigns a race to a Multiracial child that corresponds to the race of their "socially subordinated" parent (Harris, 1964, as cited in Peery & Bodenhausen, 2008, p. 973). This perspective, that Multiracial people's only healthy self-designation option is their racial group of Color (e.g., Black), remained the predominant view among scholars for decades.

Integrated Self-Designation Theories

Later in the 1990s, theorists developed stage models by which they proposed that Multiracial people's healthy racial identification occurs in response to a crisis in which they are forced to choose an identity. In contrast to Stonequist, however, these theorists posited a Multiracial or Biracial self-designation as the only option associated with psychological well-being. Four developmental models propose that healthy or unhealthy Multiracial identity develops by way of a stage-wise process (Jacobs, 1992; Kerwin & Ponterotto, 1995; Kich, 1992; Poston, 1990). These models are summarized in Table 1.

Poston's (1990) Model. Poston's (1990) model, based on research with Biracial youths, adolescents, and adults, proposed stages ranging from an inconsistent understanding of race (i.e., sometimes showing no awareness of race) to an understanding of racial reference groups (i.e., identifying with one parent's racial group) (Gibbs, 1987; Hall, 1980; Ponterotto, 1989; Sebring, 1985). Integrating and appreciating one's multiraciality is positive identity resolution in Poston's model. Poston's model also posits that positive identity resolution is preceded by a stage in which individuals struggle with feeling forced to choose a single Racial Group Orientation (RGO), which then results in feeling guilt for having rejected one parent's racial group.

Despite Poston's (1990) aim to provide a model of development for all Multiracial people, his model does not acknowledge the potential for multiple healthy resolutions to the identity development process. In addition, his model presumes that all Biracial individuals will at some point choose a single racial designation, and that this choice will result in guilt that must be resolved in order to progress developmentally. Further, Poston's model does not account for the salience of societal racism in the lives of People of Color, including those of mixed-race heritage.

Jacobs's (1992) Model. Similar to Poston (1990), Jacobs's (1992) stage model was based on the developmental issues of Biracial children. His three stages focused on Biracial children's increasing cognitive maturity as they evolved toward a Biracial self-concept. The final stage and fundamental task of Jacobs's model involves Biracial children exploring and coping with negative societal stereotypes and discrimination toward their racial group of Color, which might contribute to ambivalence about their identity (1992, p.198). Like Poston (1990), Jacobs argues that an integrated Biracial or Multiracial self-concept is the ultimate goal of identity development in Biracial individuals. Unlike other theorists, Jacobs acknowledges societal messages about racial hierarchies and the differential value associated with various racial groups to be a factor in Biracial children's process of developing a way of self-designating.

Kerwin and Ponterotto's (1995) Stage Model. Kerwin and Ponterotto's model also considers development of a Biracial identity the most beneficial option. In their model, they recognize that identity development is dependent on "numerous personal, societal, and environmental factors" and that the resolution of the identity development process is unique to each individual (p. 210). Unlike Poston and Jacobs, Kerwin and

Ponterotto describe a process that occurs from preschool through adulthood. It involves an individual's understanding of racial groups, phenotypic differences, and in-group and out-group dynamics. Further, as individuals reach young adulthood, immersion into one of their parents' racial groups may occur, unless the individual has a secure personal identity. Adulthood is the last stage of Kerwin and Ponterotto's model, and they argue that Biracial identity development is a lifelong process that requires continuing the continued integration of the facets of one's racial identity throughout adulthood. Because this is a stage model, successful resolution of earlier stages precede movement through later stages, but the ultimate goal of the theorists' model is a Multiracial identity.

Although Kerwin and Ponterotto's (1995) model traces potential challenges faced by Multiracial individuals across the lifespan, much of their model does not address how the particular racial backgrounds of Multiracial individuals, including differences in the relative marginality and power of their parents, may influence their developmental processes. Further, Kerwin and Ponterotto's model does not describe the characteristics of an integrated self-designation for various types of Multiracial people.

Kich's (1992) Model. Kich's (1992) stage model of Bicultural, Biracial Identity Development is based primarily on Kich's research with Biracial Asians. The model proposes that all Multiracial people progress through three stages in order to arrive at a state of "healthy self-acceptance" (p. 305). Of the stage models, Kich's is the only one to propose explicit differentiations between other's interpretations of the Multiracial person and the person's own lived experiences and internal sense of self. Kich suggests that all Multiracial people move from a "questionable, sometimes devalued sense of self to one where an interracial self-conception is highly valued and secure" (p. 305). During each

stage, Multiracial people experience being different based on their own observations, or from others pointing out characteristics which differ from some imagined norm. When a Multiracial person perceives this difference as negative, it begins the identity crisis fueled by a sense of not belonging. Kich's model also conceptualizes the beginning of development as the childhood struggle to find an in-group as they first acknowledge a Multiracial self-designation. In the final stage, which is part of an ongoing process throughout adulthood, the optimal goal is to create "congruent self-definitions" (p. 317).

Kich's (1992) model, while differing from many stage models due to the relatively few stages identified, shares similarities with other stage-based identity models. This model highlights the main struggles in developing a Biracial self-designation that have been identified by researchers: (a) feelings of being different, (b) struggles to be accepted, and (c) finally creating a self-defined identity and rejecting the definitions imposed by others. Although Kich's factors have been supported by research, their model may not generalize to Multiracials of all backgrounds, due to its reliance on Kich's work with a specific group (part-Asian) as its empirical foundation.

Summary

Taken together, the stage models of Multiracial and Biracial identity development essentially provide one perspective on how people of mixed-race heritage may come to a racial self-designation, as well as how appropriate designations contribute to their mental well-being. In the stage perspectives, all people with multiple racial backgrounds will ideally achieve a particular way of self-designating—Multiracial or Biracial. The stage theorists each postulate that the Multiracial or Biracial self-designation is an outward reflection of a healthy internal ability to integrate one's multiple heritages.

Table 1

Summary of Four Models of Integrated Multiracial Self-Designation Theories

	Models			
Life Stage	**Poston (1990)**	**Jacobs (1992)**	**Kich (1992)**	**Kerwin & Ponterotto (1995)**
	Biracial Identity Development Model	*Stages in the Development of Biracial Identity*	*Stages of Biracial, Bicultural Identity Development*	*Biracial Identity Development*
Childhood	**Personal Identity** Inconsistent understanding of race; no RGO	**Pre-Color Constancy** Play and Experimentation with color and recognition of difference in physical appearance	**Initial Awareness of Differentness and Dissonance** Experience being different as involving negative feelings	**Preschool** Racial awareness emerges in children
Late childhood	**Choice of Group Categorization** Pushed to choose an identity and RGO	**Post-Color Constancy** Biracial label and racial ambivalence	**Struggle for Acceptance** Seeking to belong in friendship groups highlights sense of being different	**Entry to School** Children have a differentiated sense of self and some notions about social groups and their characteristics
Adolescence	**Enmeshment/Denial** Feeling guilty about monoracial self-designation and having parent outside of their RGO	**Biracial Identity** Understanding that skin color indicates racial group membership. Achievement of un-ambivalent Biracial Identity	**Self-Acceptance and Assertion of an Interracial Identity** Create "congruent self-definitions" rather than be externally-defined through stereotypes	**Preadolescence** Gain awareness that their parents belong to distinct racial groups and spend this stage becoming more aware of physical appearance and group membership
Young Adulthood	**Appreciation** Growing to appreciate their multiple identities and broaden their RGO			**College/Young Adulthood** May reject one parent's racial group OR reject society's expectations and affirm a Biracial identity
Adulthood	**Integration (adulthood)** Recognitions of the value of all of their racial identities and integrating their identities			**Adulthood** Continued lifelong identity integration

Fluid Self-Designation Theories

As a rebuttal to theories promoting one healthy self-designation, other theorists have alternative models to offer more flexible identity options. Root's (1992) ecological transactional model argues that many factors are central to a Multiracial person's developmental process and therefore account for why no single designation is best. Root describes three types of factors: (a) inherited (e.g., phenotype and family characteristics, (b) traits (e.g., personality), and (c) social environments (e.g., friends, school and community). These various factors represent benefits, challenges, and sources of resilience for Multiracial people. Root describes the Multiracial identity developmental process as exhibiting multifinality; that is, there are many possible outcomes and no single destination is held as healthy, superior or most developed. Although this model of development does not promote a particular way of self-designating, it also does not explore the internal cognitive processes that help individuals self-designate but instead focuses on external influences.

In addition to her ecological metamodel, Root also developed a model of "Multiracial resolutions" intended to address tensions Multiracials experience as they attempt to define themselves with respect to their multiple racial heritages. Root (1990) proposed her model in response to existing minority racial identity models that suggest individuals experience a stage of rejecting White culture and immersing themselves in their minority culture. Root notes that for Multiracial individuals with White heritage, neither rejection of majority culture nor immersion in a minority culture may be possible (1990, p. 34). Instead, she argues that Biracial individuals face unique tensions as they

navigate the border space between and amongst their minority and majority racial groups and develop their racial identities.

Root's resolutions include (a) passive acceptance of the identity society assigns, usually via hypodescent; (b) identification with both racial groups; (c) active choice of identification with a single racial group; and (d) identification as a new racial group (e.g., Biracial) (Root, 1990; 1996). The resolutions acknowledge the many ways Multiracial individuals may respond to societal messages and demands regarding their self-designation, but still do not address the mental health consequences of their selection(s).

Typology Models and Measures

Two theorists developed models that describe patterns or styles of Multiracial self-designation. Renn's (2000, 2004) patterns built upon Root's (1990) resolutions. The five patterns include a Monoracial identity, in which an individual identifies as only one of their parents' racial groups, as well as Multiple Monoracial identities (e.g., White and Asian) that shift according to context. In addition, an individual may hold a Multiracial identity only (i.e., "Mixed" or "Biracial"). Finally, individuals may opt out of identification with U.S. racial categories using an Extra-Racial identity, or they may choose a situational identity characterized by moving among the other patterns depending on context (Renn, 2008). Renn's model aligns with Root's (1990) theoretical perspective in that there are multiple, fluid ways for Multiracial people to healthily self-designate.

Rockquemore and Brunsma's (2002a) research-based typology of self-designation is specific to the Black/White Multiracial population and is similar to Renn's patterns (2000; 2004; 2008). Rockquemore and Brunsma's (2002a, 2002b) model built upon earlier work by Rockquemore (1999). To assess individuals' type(s) of self-

designation(s) in her mixed-methods dissertation study ($N = 225$), Rockquemore developed a one-item self-designation that consisted of seven statements from which the person is asked to choose the option that, "best describes how you feel about your racial identity" (1999, pp. 57-59). An example of one such statement is, "I sometimes consider myself black [sic], sometimes my other race, and sometimes biracial depending on the circumstances" (p. 58). To create their self-designation typology, Rockquemore and Brunsma (2002b) collapsed Rockquemore's (1999) seven statements into four self-designation patterns. The four resulting patterns were (a) a single, monoracial identity, (b) a border identity (exclusively Biracial), (c) a protean (shifting) identity, and (d) a transcendent identity, which rejects race as a category (Rockquemore & Brunsma, 2002b, p.336).

Rockquemore and Brunsma (2002a) conducted a qualitative study of Black/White Biracial ($N = 259$) college students using the four-pattern typology. The authors differentiated individuals who self-designated as Biracial and were perceived as Biracial from those who self-designated as Biracial, but were perceived by others as Black. Rockquemore and Brunsma argue that this perception as something other than their chosen self-designation indicates a lack of societal and community acceptance of the individual's Biracial self-designation. The Rockquemore and Brunsma model, like Renn's (2004) model, is intended to stimulate flexibility and diversity when studying Multiracial individuals' self-designation choices.

Unlike stage theories, Rockquemore and Brunsma (2002a) do not prescribe a particular identity as ideal, but they do label Black/White people who self-designate with a border, protean, or transcendent identity as "honorary Whites." They presume that

protean-identified Multiracials are culturally White though not fully accepted into the White group due to appearance (2002a, p. 62). In line with "The One Drop Rule", Rockquemore and Brunsma assume that Black/White individuals are part of the Black racial group and as such present their model as a new way to understand Black identification. Their assumption perpetuates the "One Drop Rule" that categorizes Black/White Multiracials as Black, regardless of how they self-designate (p. 63). Rockquemore and Brunsma also explain that their finding that some Black/White Multiracials identify as White (whether or not this is accepted by others) may signify a society-level shift in the rules governing Whiteness and ideas about racial purity and mutually exclusive racial categories (2002, p. 61). Again, this model and the research through which it was developed places significant attention on contextual factors (e.g., self-designation validation by others) influencing self-designation but does not address one's internal racial self-concept as determining self-designation.

Besides Rockquemore (1990) and Renn's (2003) typologies, two other measures have been used to operationalize self-designation in previous research. The first is the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (Phinney, 1992) and the second is the Multiracial-Heritage Appreciation and Personal Affiliation scale (M-HAPAs, Choi-Misailidis, 2004). However, these measures do not actually measure *racial* self-designation. Instead, they measure individuals' levels of affiliation with and appreciation for multiple racial groups (not only the groups their parents belong to), and their identification with various ethnic groups.

Summary

Taken together, the fluid identity models reflect researchers' growing acknowledgement of the multifaceted, flexible ways that Multiracial individuals potentially self-designate (Renn, 2000, 2003, 2008; Rockquemore & Brunsma, 2002a, 2002b; Root, 1990, 1996. No one way of self-designating is held to be ideal, and much of the background research conducted to develop these models aimed to capture a more complex picture of all the ways Multiracial people self-designate. Thus, in one way these models stand in stark contrast to the prescriptive nature of earlier typologies (Stonequist, 1937) and stage models (Poston, 1990). Yet in another way, they are similar. None of these models has addressed how a person's own internalized racial dynamics are related to their preferred self-designation. Further, Renn (2000) and Rockquemore and Brunsma's (2002a) models provide mutually exclusive categories of self-designation, and thus do not allow Multiracial individuals to fully express the fluidity and variety of their racial self-designations.

Internalized Racial Identity

In contrast to Multiracial identity development and self-designation models, Racial Identity Theory (Helms, 1990; 1995) addresses the internal, ego-related development of a person's racial self-actualization (Thompson & Carter, 1997, p. xvi). For the purpose of clarity, given the use of similar terms in discussions about race, in the present study, the phrase "internalized racial identity" will be substituted for *racial identity*. Helms's People of Color Racial Identity Theory addresses people's unconscious "race-related cognitions, feelings and behaviors", rather than the process of choosing a way to self-label (Helms, 2003b, p. 46). According to Helms's theory, all people go

through an internalized racial identity development process described by what she calls "statuses". The content of the statuses depends on the racial group membership of the individual due to assumed differences in racial socialization experiences. Reactions to internal and environmental race-related stimuli trigger the development of more complex statuses and use of more complex cognitive schemas. As individuals develop more schemas, they engage in increasingly complex management of racial material, and a person can use any of the schemas that they have developed.

Historically, studies involving the measurement of internalized racial identity in part-White Multiracial individuals have used the People of Color Racial Identity Theory (Helms, 1990; 1995) based on the assumption that they are often considered by society to be People of Color, and thus may best relate to the People of Color Racial Identity Theory. However, this assumption ignores findings that some part-White Multiracials identify with the White racial group as well as the reality that, depending on phenotype, part-White Multiracial individuals may be perceived as White by others (regardless of their self-designation). Therefore, this study considers both People of Color and White racial identity theories.

People of Color Racial Identity

In Helms's (1995) model, the lifelong developmental task for People of Color is to undo and overcome internalized racism, whereas for White people, the task is to recognize racial privilege and abandon entitlement. Although earlier versions of the People of Color theory were specific to people of Black or African-American descent, she expanded the model to include all People of Color in the U.S., with the argument that the cognitive schemas are probably similar across racially marginalized groups.

Nevertheless, the content of different internalized racial identity statuses likely differs across groups, just as their specific experiences of racism vary. Moreover, it is not clear how the model pertains to part-White Multiracial people who may identify as a Person of Color, as White, or as both.

The People of Color theory and model describes five schemas. The model's five schemas are different from stages used in many identity models because they are all potentially present in any given individual but vary in dominance and availability depending on a person's environment, personality, and racial self-designation. Within this model, the statuses are split into those indicating internalized racism (Conformity, Dissonance, and Immersion/Emersion) and those reflecting the undoing of this internalized racism (Internalization and Integrated Awareness). The first of the internalized racism statuses is Conformity, which involves the idealization of the White group and standards, and acceptance of the racial status quo. The next is Dissonance, which is characterized by confusion regarding racism often resulting from experiences of discrimination that bring awareness to racism's effect on the person's life. Finally, the Immersion/Emersion status includes the idealization of and pride in one's own racial group and condemnation of everything White, as well as hypersensitivity to racism.

The statuses marking the undoing of internalized racism are (a) Internalization and (b) Integrative Awareness. When expressing Internalization, a person has a positive sense of self based on race, an awareness of racism, and the ability to respond objectively to White individuals. Integrative Awareness is the merging and integration of one's racial identity with other aspects of one's identity (Helms, 2003a; Helms, 2003b; Perry et al., 2009).

White Racial Identity

For part-White Multiracial people, the PRIAS may not fully capture their internalized racial identity schemas. Root (1990) argues that Multiracial people with White heritage may have difficulty rejecting the White racial group as part of the Immersion/Emersion status. Further, empirical findings show that some part-White Multiracial people identify as either only White or as both White and another race, bolstering the need to consider White racial identity schemas when discussing this group's internalized racial identity.

Helms's (1995) White Racial Identity Theory includes schemas that allow an individual to progressively process more complex racial information. The first of these is Contact, characterized by satisfaction with the racial status-quo and obliviousness to racism. Disintegration, the next schema, encompasses the feelings of disorientation and anxiety that is provoked when a White person is exposed to a racial moral dilemma and must choose between in-group loyalty and humanism. The third status, Reintegration, involves the idealization of the White racial group (in-group) and the denigration of other racial groups (out-groups). In this status, racial factors are often highly influential in decision-making. Pseudo-Independence is the next most complex status, and involves an intellectualized loyalty to the White racial group and "deceptive tolerance" of racial out-groups, such that individuals may make decisions ostensibly to help racial minority groups (p. 185). The Immersion/Emersion status is one in which White individuals search for a personal understanding of racism and seek to learn how racism benefits them as a member of the majority. Individuals in this status may also seek to redefine what Whiteness means to them and may engage in racial activism. The most complex status,

Autonomy, involves an informed, positive White racial group commitment and the use of personal, internal standards of self-definition. Individuals in this status avoid decisions that may force them to participate in oppression.

Measurement of Internalized Racial Identity

For Multiracial individuals of part-White heritage, measurement of internalized racial identity is a complicated task. Even though part-White Multiracial individuals self-designate in a multitude of ways involving the Person of Color and White aspects of themselves, research on their internalized racial identity has exclusively focused on them as People of Color and used the People of Color Racial Identity Attitude Scale (PRIAS) (Helms, 1995). The PRIAS measures an individual's endorsement of the various racial identity attitudes associated with the POC schemas. To measure White racial identity attitudes, Helms and Carter (1990) created the White Racial Identity Attitudes Scale (WRIAS). This inventory allows for the measurement of each White identity status as a subscale of the overall measure, and can ascertain how strongly an individual endorses the various racial identity attitudes relative to one another.

Various studies have investigated the relations of POC attitudes relative to various well-being outcomes, although not necessarily using Multiracial samples. Franks (2001) conducted the only study that explored the relationship between White individuals' internalized racial identity and well-being. In a sample of White social work students (N = 292), the relationship between White internalized racial identity and self-esteem was investigated using the WRIAS (Helms & Carter, 1990) and the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (1979). She found that the WRIAS statuses overall were predictive of self-esteem,

and that the Disintegration status (i.e., confusion and anxiety) was related to lower levels of self-esteem.

Well-Being

Subjective well-being, defined by Shin and Johnson (1978) as "a global assessment of a person's quality of life according to his [sic] own chosen criteria," has been identified by Multiracial theorists (Jacobs, 1992; Kerwin & Ponterotto, 1995; Kich 1992; Poston, 1990; Stonequist, 1937) as an important concept in racial identity development (p. 478). They have operationalized Multiracial well-being as self-esteem, life satisfaction, and depression. From this literature, for the present study, three themes are relevant. One theme is the relative well-being of Multiracials as compared to their monoracial peers. The second theme is the extent to which various types of self-designation are related differently to well-being. The third theme is whether internalized racial identity is related to well-being.

Multiracial vs. Monoracial Well-Being

The early deficit-focused (Stonequist, 1937) and developmental theorists (e.g., Poston, 1990) asserted that Multiracial individuals were inherently destined for poor psychological adjustment due to their marginalized position in society's racial landscape. In particular, developmental theorists argued that particular ways of self-designating are essential in order for Multiracials to have positive well-being. Research, however, has found mixed results on whether Multiracial samples typically exhibit poorer well-being than monoracial samples (Bracey et al., 2004; Campbell & Eggerling-Boeck, 2006; Field, 1996; Herman, 2004; Phillips, 2004; Shih & Sanchez, 2005; Smith, 2014).

Better Outcome Studies. Other researchers suggest that Multiracial individuals may have *better* psychological well-being than monoracial individuals (Phillips, 2004; Sanchez & Shih, 2004; Stephen & Stephen, 1989). Phillips (2004) examined the relationship between racial self-designation, self-esteem, and psychological distress in Black/White and Asian/White Multiracial adolescent girls. The study's results indicated that as a group, Multiracial adolescent girls had higher levels of positive self-esteem compared to monoracial adolescents. Sanchez and Shih (2004) found that in their sample of Multiracial (Asian/White, Black/White, Latinx/White) ($N = 62$), monoracial White ($N = 42$), and monoracial minority (Asian, Black, Latinx) ($N = 57$) adults, Multiracial participants reported higher self-esteem compared to both monoracial White and minority participants.

Poorer Outcome Studies. Multiple studies using the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (Add Health) found that Multiracial adolescents demonstrated *lower* well-being scores than monoracial adolescents. Milan and Keiley (2000) found that on a measure of self-worth administered to a sample of monoracial White ($N = 3{,}521$), Multiracial ($N = 272$), and monoracial minority ($N = 1{,}941$) adolescents, the Multiracial adolescents reported significantly lower self-worth scores than the monoracial minority and majority (White) adolescents. Schlabach (2013) looked at social well-being scores (depression, social acceptance) for White ($N = 6{,}153$), Black ($N = 2{,}088$), Native American ($N = 41$), Asian ($N = 462$), "Other" ($N = 39$), Black/White ($N = 90$), Native American/White ($N = 164$), Asian/White ($N = 67$), and "Other Multiracial" ($N = 136$) adolescents. She also found that the aggregated Multiracial group and monoracial minorities showed elevated depression scores compared to monoracial Whites.

Mixed Results. Other studies found mixed results or no significant differences overall between the aggregate Multiracial group and monoracials, though some studies did find differences in well-being for specific Multiracial subgroups. Herman (2004) conducted a study exploring self-esteem and ethnic identity in monoracial (Black, White, Asian, Hispanic; *N* = 6,743) and Multiracial (*N* = 1,496; Black-Asian (*N* = 30), Black-Hispanic (*N* = 52), Other-Asian (*N* = 27), Asian-Hispanic (*N* = 55), Other-Hispanic (*N* = 46), Other-Black (*N* = 91), Black-White (*N* = 160), White-Asian (*N* = 250), Other-White (*N* = 324), and White-Hispanic (*N* = 461)) adolescents. Overall, she found no significant differences in self-esteem between the Multiracial and monoracial categories, nor between the specific types of Multiracial groups.

Stephan and Stephan (1989) found mixed results in their study of self-esteem in Multiracial and monoracial college students in Hawaii and New Mexico using the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (1979). The Hawaiian sample included monoracial Asian (*N* = 100), Asian/White Multiracial (*N* = 57), and monoracial White (*N* = 34) college students. In their New Mexico sample, they surveyed monoracial Latinx (*N* = 54), Latinx/White Multiracial (*N* =123), and monoracial White adults (*N* = 129). They also reported that the aggregate Multiracial group had higher self-esteem than monoracial Asian participants, and lower self-esteem than White participants, though these results were not significant. In contrast, in the New Mexico sample, they found that Multiracial participants reported higher self-esteem than both monoracial Latinx (minority) and White peers.

Campbell and Eggerling-Boeck (2006) also used the Add Health dataset to compare Multiracial (Black-White (*N* = 142), American Indian/White (*N* = 262),

Asian/White (N = 125), Black/American Indian (N = 106), Other Multiracial (N = 168) adolescents to their monoracial White peers on measures of depression, suicidality, and a variety of social connectedness measures. Although no other groups differed significantly on depression scores, the Native American/White subset of the Multiracial group reported poorer depression scores than their White peers (a finding replicated by Schlabach, 2013). However, the Native American/White group's depression scores were not significantly different from the monoracial Native American group's scores.

Campbell and Eggerling-Boek's findings suggest that overall, Multiracial adolescents as an aggregate did not differ significantly from their monoracial White peers on measures of well-being and adjustment. Similarly, in her study comparing college-aged Japanese/White participants (N = 53) with monoracial Japanese college students (N = 52), Mass (1992) found no significant difference in reported self-esteem between the two groups. In a study of Black/White Biracial (N = 31), Black (N = 31) and White (N = 31) youths, Field (1996) also found no difference in self-esteem scores between the White, Black, and Multiracial groups.

Bracey et al. (2004) used the Add Health dataset to examine ethnic identity exploration and self-esteem for a sample of Black (N = 331), White (N = 982), Asian (N = 626), Latinx (N = 1,162), Asian/White (N = 37), Black/White (N = 26), Latinx/White (N = 95), Asian/Black (N = 3), Asian/Latinx (N = 6), and Black/Latinx (N = 14) adolescents. Results suggested that Multiracial adolescents reported significantly higher levels of self-esteem than Asian adolescents, but significantly lower levels of self-esteem than Black adolescents (2004).

Summary

Researchers comparing Multiracial samples to monoracial samples on measures of well-being have reported that Multiracial groups sometimes experience better outcomes, poorer outcomes, and mixed results depending on the comparison group(s). These varied findings align with theory (Renn, 2000, 2003, 2008; Root, 2003) suggesting there are multiple possibly healthy ways to self-designate and that Multiracial individuals are no more or less psychologically well-adapted than their monoracial peers.

Self-Designation and Well-Being

With some of the Multiracial models relating particular types of self-designation to more positive psychological outcomes than others, several scholars have investigated the relationships between different self-designation choices (e.g., "Biracial" or "singularly [sic] Black") and measures of psychological distress and/or adjustment (Coleman & Carter, 2007; Chong, 2013; Damann, 2007; Field, 1996; Lusk et al., 2010; Phillips, 2004). Several studies have operationalized well-being as some combination of self-esteem, depression and anxiety symptoms, and life satisfaction. Racial self-designation has been operationalized using Rockquemore and Brunsma's (2002a) typology, the M-HAPAs (Choi-Misailidis, 2004), and various one-item measures created by researchers.

Studies Using Rockquemore and Brunsma's (2002a) Typology. Some racial self-designation research focuses on how self-designation choice, measured by Rockquemore and Brunsma's (2002a) typology, relates to levels of anxiety, depression, and stress. Coleman and Carter (2007) used Rockquemore's Racial Identity Typology (1999) to measure racial self-designation in their study of the relationship between racial self-designation choice, anxiety, and depression in a sample of Black/White adults (N =

61). Their results indicated that individuals who self-designated as Biracial and felt that others validated their designation, had significantly lower levels of depression and anxiety than those with other racial identifications. Further, individuals with protean identities (i.e., racial-group switching, e.g., "sometimes I identify as Black, and sometimes as Asian") or transcendent identities (lacking a racial reference group) reported the highest anxiety and depression scores.

Binning et al. (2009) explored Multiracial self-designation and positive or negative psychological outcomes in a sample of Multiracial adolescents from a variety of backgrounds ($N = 182$). The authors investigated self-designation by coding participants' responses on the Rockquemore and Brunsma typology (2002) according to whether participants identified with (a) their high-status racial group (i.e., White or Asian), (b) their low-status racial group (i.e., Black or Latinx), or (c) multiple racial groups. On measures of affect and perceived stress, adolescents who identified with multiple racial groups reported more positive affect and lower stress than those who identified with a single racial group (whether high or low-status). Further, Binning et al. did not find significant differences between well-being scores of adolescents who identified with a single high-status group compared to adolescents who identified with a single low-status racial group.

Finally, Lusk et al. (2010) also used Rockquemore and Brunsma's (2002) typology to examine the relationship between racial self-designation, ethnic identity, self-esteem, and depression for a sample of Black/White Biracial adults ($N = 74$). Participants with border (biracial) or protean (shifting; sometimes biracial) identities had higher levels of self-esteem and lower depression scores than those who self-designated with a single

monoracial or transcendent (no race) identity. Though Lusk et al.'s findings contradict Coleman and Carter's findings that a protean identity is negatively associated with well-being, taken together, these studies support developmental theorists' (Jacobs, 1992; Kerwin & Ponterotto, 1995; Kich, 1992; Poston, 1990) suggestions that an integrated, Multiracial identity does not impair psychological adjustment and may even promote positive well-being in Multiracial individuals.

Studies Using the M-HAPAS (Choi-Misailidis, 2004). In a quantitative study, Damann (2007) examined the relationship between racial self-designation, psychosocial adjustment, self-esteem, and life satisfaction for a sample of diverse Multiracial adults (*N* = 268). The author measured self-designation by using an open-ended self-report question and the M-HAPAs (Choi-Misailidis, 2004). Because participants self-designated in 40 different ways (e.g., "Native American/Hispanic" and "Amerasian") the author coded open-ended self-designation into three categories: (a) two or more racial groups (*N* = 142), (b) only one racial group (*N* = 75), and (c) simply multiracial/mixed (*N* = 51). Results demonstrated that a lack of racial-group identification (i.e., Marginal Identity) was negatively associated with self-esteem, life satisfaction, and social functioning, and positively associated with depression. Conversely, combining all racial backgrounds into one's identity (i.e., Integrated-Combinatory) showed the opposite pattern.

Similarly, Chong's (2013) quantitative study used the M-HAPAs (Choi-Misailidis, 2004) to examine the relationship between racial self-designation, family factors, and psychological adjustment in Asian/White Multiracial adults and found that participants with an integrated, Multiracial identity reported less distress and more positive overall well-being than those who identified as a single race or with no racial

group. Both studies provide empirical support for theories advocating an integrated identity (Jacobs, 1992; Kerwin & Ponterotto, 1995; Kich, 1992; Poston, 1990).

Studies Using Researcher-Created Measures. Some studies measured self-designation using author-created self-report measures to explore their measures' relationships to measures of well-being. Field (1996) conducted a study comparing groups of Black/White Biracial youths on measures of self-worth, self-concept, behavioral adjustment, and reference group orientation. Self-designation was measured by asking participants to select either a White, Black, or Biracial reference group. Although the three groups did not differ significantly on global self-worth, she found that the Biracial youths in the sample who identified with the White racial group had more negative self-concepts.

Several studies operationalized well-being as some combination of self-esteem, depression and anxiety symptoms, and life satisfaction. In a quantitative study, Phillips (2004) examined the relationship between racial self-designation (measured as choice of ethnic group membership), self-esteem, and psychological distress in Black/White and Asian/White Multiracial adolescent girls. The study's results indicated that the Multiracial youths had positive self-esteem and average levels of psychological distress compared to monoracial adolescents. Yet, Asian/White Biracial and Black/White Biracial girls who self-designated as White reported the lowest self-esteem and highest psychological distress (measured as depression and substance abuse) compared to Multiracials who self-designated differently.

In another study that examined how type of Multiraciality was related to well-being, Suzuki-Crumly and Hyers (2004) examined the relationships between racial self-

designation, self-esteem, life satisfaction, and depression in Asian-White ($N = 42$) and Black-White Multiracial ($N = 24$) adults. They measured self-designation by using a single-item measure, created for the study, which asked participants to select one of four "ethnic group orientations." The four options were their minority background (e.g., Asian, Black), their majority background (e.g., "Caucasian"), both groups, or neither of the groups. The authors found that for both groups, participants who identified with both of their racial groups reported the highest self-esteem, but those who self-designated as their minority racial group (e.g., Asian, Black) were more satisfied with their lives. Interestingly, there were no differences found between the depression scores of any of the groups, whether individuals identified with two racial groups, a single racial group, or no racial group.

Summary

Findings on the relationships between self-designation and well-being generally indicate that Multiracial individuals who self-designated as only White or did not identify with any racial group reported the poorest well-being on a multitude of measures when compared with those who self-designated as Multiracial or chose an identity label that integrated multiple racial groups. Studies also support the idea that a monoracial minority (e.g., Black, Asian) self-designation results in positive well-being. However, the relationships revealed in these studies—whether positive or negative—do not speak to the mechanisms by which self-designation influences well-being. One possible mechanism through which racial self-designation affects well-being is internalized racial identity.

Internalized Racial Identity and Well-Being

Internalized racial identity among Multiracial individuals has been sparsely explored to date, and remains a considerable gap in the literature. The only two studies that have explored internalized racial identity in Multiracial people are those conducted by Torkelson (2016) and Fatimilehin (1999). Both studies used the People of Color Racial Identity Attitudes Scale, reflecting the historical bias and societal tendency to categorize part-minority individuals as People of Color. I was unable to find evidence of the use of the WRIAS (Helms & Carter, 1990) with Multiracial, part-White samples.

In a descriptive study of Black/White ($N = 70$) and Asian/White adults ($N = 102$), Torkelson (2016) examined internalized racial identity schemas within a contextual model of Multiracial identity development and well-being. Torkelson's model included social context, racial identity, and well-being in order to capture the complexity of identity development in Multiracial adults. She used the PRIAS (Helms, 1995) to measure internalized racial identity along with a life satisfaction scale, a resilience measure, and a symptom inventory to measure well-being. Torkelson found that when individuals used racially reactive schemas (e.g., Dissonance), they reported greater psychological distress than those using more proactive statuses (e.g., Internalization). Specifically, Dissonance and Immersion were positively related to symptoms of psychological distress, such as depression and anxiety. Conversely, the Internalization status was positively related to resilience.

In a study of British Black/White Biracial youths ($N = 23$), Fatimilehin (1999) used Parham and Helms's (1996) Black Racial Identity Attitudes Sale (BRIAS) in conjunction with measures of racial socialization and self-esteem. Further supporting

Torkelson's (2016) finding, Fatimilehin also found that Internalization was positively associated with well-being, in this case measured as self-esteem. Encounter and Immersion statuses, however, correlated with measures indicating a struggle with one's identity.

Taken together, these two studies support racial identity theory and suggest that for Multiracial people, more complex racial identity schemas may be positively related to psychological well-being. Despite the lack of substantial research on the use of the PRIAS (Helms, 1996) with Multiracial populations, these studies support the relevance of minority-status racial identity theory for Multiracial individuals. However, there seem to be no studies of White identity as it pertains to Multiracial adults.

Internalized Racial Identity and Well-Being in Monoracial Populations. Although few studies have explored Helms's (1996) theories with Multiracial samples, considerable research has explored racial identity with monoracial groups. Research has examined the relationship between internalized racial identity schemas and various outcome variables such as self-esteem, psychological adjustment, and symptoms of distress (anxiety, depression, anger) in monoracial samples of Black/African Americans or Asian Americans. Overall, these studies support Helms's (1990) argument that statuses reflecting one's internalization of racism will be related to poorer psychological well-being, whereas statuses reflecting one's undoing of internalized racism will be associated with greater well-being.

Self-Designation, Internalized Racial Identity, and Well-Being

Only one extant study was found that considered both racial self-designation and internalized racial identity in relation to self-esteem. Speight et al. (1996) qualitatively

and quantitatively explored the relationships between racial self-designation, racial identity attitudes, and self-esteem in a sample of Black college students ($N = 97$) and Black ($N = 135$) adults recruited from a local church congregation. This study used the RIAS (Parham & Helms, 1981) to measure the four racial identity attitude statuses in Cross's theory of racial identity (1971), namely Pre-encounter (analogous to Conformity), Encounter (Dissonance), Immersion/Emersion, and Internalization. To assess self-esteem, the authors used the Unconditional Self Regard Scale (USRS; Betz et al., 1991), and they used a checklist of self-designation options to measure racial self-designation. In addition, participants were asked to explain their self-designation preference using an open-ended response that was analyzed using content analysis.

Speight et al. (1996) found that there were significant relationships between both racial self-designation and racial identity attitudes, as well as between racial identity attitudes and self-esteem. Self-esteem was positively related to Immersion and Internalization attitudes and negatively related to Pre-encounter attitudes. However, no relationship was found between self-esteem and racial self-designation. Higher Pre-encounter attitudes were associated with self-designation as *American*, *Other*, or *Black;* higher Immersion attitudes were associated with self-designating as *African American*. Particular patterns were observed for each of the self-designation options. Individuals with higher levels of Immersion and lower levels of Pre-encounter preferred *African American*. Participants with moderate Immersion and higher Pre-encounter preferred *Black*. Those with lower Immersion scores and higher Pre-encounter scores preferred *Other.* Individuals with higher Pre-encounter and moderate Immersion scores preferred *American*.

The patterns found in this study are consistent with racial identity theory, in that individuals with positive feelings about Blackness (i.e., Immersion attitudes) preferred self-designations that highlighted their racial and cultural heritage. Further supporting this, in responses to the open-ended question, individuals who self-designated as *African American, Afro-American*, and *Black* listed "reflecting their heritage" and "a sense of pride" as some of the reasons for these preferences. These findings suggest that self-designations that emphasize one's racial background are associated with more complex internalized racial identity statuses.

Speight et al.'s (1996) work is seemingly the first to address all three constructs in a single study, but the absence of a significant relationship between self-esteem and self-designation precluded the authors from further exploring the interaction between all of the constructs together. Thus, it remains unknown what role internalized racial identity might play in the relationship between racial self-designation and self-esteem.

Statement of the Problem

Research and theory on Multiracial individuals have historically focused on the psychological maladjustment of this group, based on socially held beliefs about the marginal space these individuals occupy in the socioracial landscape (Stonequist, 1937). As this population has grown, however, research has begun to examine specific factors that later theorists suggest may influence the psychological well-being of this group (Helms, 1995; Jacobs, 1992; Kerwin & Ponterotto, 1995; Kich, 1992; Poston, 1990; Renn, 2008; Rockquemore & Brunsma 20002a, 2002b; Root, 1990). Relevant factors include racial self-designations and internalized racial identity schemas.

In the context of Multiracial individuals' lives, psychological well-being is not an outcome of their mixed-race heritage, but rather results from how they internalize their interactions with various contextual factors based on their mixed-race ancestry or appearance. Internalization of the messages attributable to such factors may influence or be influenced by their self-concept, as well as their racial identification. Very little research has been conducted on Multiracial people's perceptions of themselves as related to racial identity. Therefore, the relationships between internalized racial identity, racial self-designation, and well-being among Multiracial adults remain unexplored.

Racial Self-Designation

Research on the racial self-designation of Multiracial individuals has yielded mixed results, but some patterns have emerged. First, studies support theoretical indications (Jacobs, 1992; Kerwin & Ponterotto, 1995; Kich, 1992; Poston, 1990) that an integrated, "Multiracial" self-designation enables positive psychological adjustment, as measured by self-esteem, life satisfaction, and low-levels of depression (Binning et al., 2009; Chong, 2013; Coleman & Carter, 2007; Damann, 2008; Lusk et al., 2010; Suzuki-Crumly & Hyers, 2004). Further, there is some evidence to support theoretical claims (Stonequist, 1937) that a monoracial minority (e.g., Black) self-designation promotes self-esteem (Suzuki-Crumly & Hyers, 2004). Such findings align with later theorists (Renn, 2000, 2003, 2008; Root, 2003) who claim that there are many ways that Multiracial people can identify that are healthy, and that well-being may be more influenced by contextual factors than by Multiracial status alone. For example, the severely oppressed condition of Native Americans in the United States may account for negative outcomes in part-Native Multiracial people.

Second, supporting the integrated theoretical perspective, there is evidence that having no racial self-designation (Damann, 2008; Coleman & Carter, 2007) or a White self-designation (Field, 1996; Phillips, 2004) leads to maladjustment in the form of low self-esteem and life satisfaction, poor self-concept, and high levels of depression. Taken together, research provides support for both integrative self-designation theories (Jacobs, 1992; Kerwin & Ponterotto, 1995; Kich, 1992; Poston, 1990) and fluid (or multiple) self-designation theories (Renn, 2008; Rockquemore & Brunsma, 2002a, 2002b; Root, 1990) and suggests that integrated Multiracial or monoracial minority self-designations support healthy psychological adjustment in Multiracial individuals.

However, despite their focus on the complexity of self-designation, most theorists still propose that Multiracials should choose one exclusive category. But if it is true that self-designation varies with context as some theorize, then perhaps Multiracials endorse multiple designations rather than only one. Therefore, racial self-designation was operationalized in this study using a measure developed by the author, adapted from Rockquemore and Brunsma's Biracial Self-Identification Measure (BSIM; 2002) and Renn's (2002) Patterns of Multiracial Identity. The adapted measure asked participants to rate the frequency with which they use each of five self-designation patterns statements identified in Renn (2002) and Rockquemore and Brunsma's (2002a) models. The patterns are represented by statements, adapted from the aforementioned models, that are phrased to reflect participants' White/Person of Color backgrounds.

Internalized Racial Identity

Research on the influence of internalized racial identity on the well-being of Multiracial individuals has also garnered mixed results. In both Multiracial and

monoracial populations, studies have supported Helms's (1995) theoretical claims that more complex racial identity schemas support positive psychological adjustment. For People of Color, research has shown that schemas indicating internalized racism and high racial reactivity (Conformity, Dissonance, and Immersion) are associated with lower self-esteem and higher levels of depression, anxiety and perceived stress (Alvarez & Helms, 2001; Fatimilehin, 1999; Iwamoto & Liu, 2010; Neville et al., 1997; Parham & Helms, 1985; Pierre et al., 2006; Piyant & Yanico, 1991; Torkelson, 2016).

Similarly, among White adults, findings suggest that the Disintegration status is associated with lower self-esteem (Franks, 2001). Research with racially diverse samples has also consistently found positive associations between the Internalization status and self-esteem (Alvarez & Helms, 2001; Fatimilehin, 1999; Iwamoto & Liu, 2010; Neville et al., 1997; Parham & Helms, 1985; Pierre et al., 2006; Piyant & Yanico, 1991; Speight et al., 1996; Torkelson, 2016). In the current study, internalized racial identity was operationalized using the White Racial Identity Attitudes Scale (WRIAS, Helms & Carter, 1990) and the People of Color Racial Identity Attitudes Scale (PRIAS, Helms, 1995).

Well-Being

Although comparison studies have shown mixed results regarding the relative well-being of Multiracial individuals as compared to monoracial people, the mixed results regarding self-esteem may be explained by researchers' lack of focus on the interactions between racial self-designation and internalized racial identity. Further, researchers have not explicitly investigated whether the relationship(s) between Multiracial people's self-designation and well-being is influenced by their internalized

racial identity schemas. The only study that explored internalized racial identity status, racial self-designation, and well-being in monoracial Black adults found that more complex statuses were associated with self-designation choices that highlighted Black and African heritage (Speight et al., 1996).

For Multiracial individuals, Speight et al.'s findings (1996) would suggest that more complex racial identity statuses might be associated with an integrated self-designation or a self-designation that acknowledges multiple racial groups. However, Speight et al. found no significant relationships between self-designation and well-being. Thus, to better understand the dynamics between and among these important influences on the well-being of Multiracial adults, there remains a need for research that considers all of these variables together. Therefore, the current study attempted to discern the influence of internalized racial identity on the relationship between racial self-designation and well-being of Multiracial adults. In the current study, well-being was operationalized using the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (1979) and the Brief Symptom Inventory 18 (BSI-18, Derogatis, 2001).

Current Study

Internalized racial identity schemas are cognitive patterns and processes that enable an individual to understand and manage racial information (Helms, 1995). For Multiracial individuals, commonly encountered racial information may include messages questioning or challenging their racial reference group, or encouraging a specific way of self-designating (Rockquemore & Brunsma, 2002a, 2002b). Schemas might account for why they do or do not internalize self-damaging or self-enhancing messages. Therefore, racial identity schemas might be mediating factors in the relationships between racial

self-designation (an outward label of internal racial self-concept) and aspects of well-being such as self-esteem and psychological distress. Currently, the role of internalized racial identity in the relationship between racial self-designation and well-being is unknown. Understanding the role of internalized racial identity may explain the relationship between self-designation and well-being and enable clinicians to better address the needs of this population.

The current study examined the role of internalized racial identity on the relationship between Multiracial adults' racial self-designation and well-being. Extant research suggests that self-designation as monoracial White or designating no racial group has a negative effect on psychological adjustment. Thus, it was expected that these self-designation choices would be negatively associated with self-esteem, and positively associated with symptoms of distress. Previous findings also suggested that integrative (combining all racial groups), Multiracial, and monoracial minority self-designations promote positive well-being in Multiracial individuals. It was anticipated that these self-designations would be positively associated with self-esteem, and negatively associated with distress.

Research also suggested that Multiracial people may identify in multiple ways simultaneously (Miville et al., 2005). Therefore, for the current study, I have developed a novel method of measuring self-designation to capture more fully the diversity of self-designation choices participants may use. This measure is a 5-item questionnaire asking participants to rate their usage frequency for various statements describing ways of self-designating, as an alternative to forcing participants to choose a single self-designation option.

Some studies have indicated that internalized racial identity statuses indicative of internalized racism and emotional reactivity (e.g., Conformity, Dissonance, Disintegration) are associated with lower self-esteem and higher levels of depression. Therefore, I expected that these statuses would be negatively associated with self-esteem and positively associated with psychological distress scores. In addition, more complex statuses (e.g., Internalization) have been found to be associated with positive psychological adjustment and low levels of depression. Thus, it seemed possible that complex statuses would be positively associated with self-esteem and negatively associated with psychological distress.

Finally, in the single study exploring both internalized racial identity and self-designation, results suggested that more complex racial identity statuses might be associated with integrated, Multiracial self-designations that acknowledge a Multiracial person's multiple racial backgrounds (Speight et al., 1996). Based on these aggregate findings, it was expected that less complex, reactive racial identity statuses would be positively correlated with monoracial White self-designations or no racial group designations. Further, it was expected that more complex racial identity statuses would be associated with integrated Multiracial or monoracial minority self-designations.

Hypotheses

In view of the existing theory and empirical research on the relationships between internalized racial identity, racial self-designation, and well-being, the following hypotheses were tested:

Hypothesis 1. Racial self-designation will be associated with well-being. There are five patterns of racial self-designation: (a) Monoracial minority self-designation, (b)

Monoracial White self-designation, (c) Two or More Monoracial self-designation, (d) Multiracial self-designation, and (e) Extra-racial self-designation, which involves deconstructing race or opting out of identification with U.S. racial categories. Participants' frequency of usage of each of the self-designation patterns was measured. *Hypothesis 1a.* Specifically, higher frequencies of Multiracial self-designation (d), Two or More Monoracial self-designation (c), and Monoracial minority self-designation (a) will be related to higher levels of self-esteem and lower psychological distress scores. *Hypothesis 1b.* Higher frequencies of Monoracial White self-designation (b) and Extra-racial self-designation (e) will be related to lower levels of self-esteem and higher psychological distress scores.

This hypothesis suggests that stronger endorsements of self-designation choices that acknowledge Multiracial individual's racial backgrounds, including their minority racial group background, will facilitate positive psychological well-being. Conversely, self-designation choices that do not reflect one's racial heritage or only reflect one's majority group heritage (i.e., White) will be facilitative of negative psychological adjustment. This hypothesis reflects theory that suggests that healthy self-designation options involve acknowledgement and integration of Multiracial individuals' multiple racial heritages (Jacobs, 1992; Kerwin & Ponterotto, 1995; Kich, 1992; Poston, 1990). In addition, it reflects theory that fluid (or multiple) self-designation options (Renn, 2008; Rockquemore & Brunsma, 2002a, 2002b; Root, 1990) and monoracial minority self-designation choices (Stonequist, 1937) can support healthy psychological adjustment.

Hypothesis 2: Internalized racial identity statuses (PRIAS) will be associated with well-being. There are less complex statuses (Conformity, Dissonance, Immersion/Emersion) and more cognitively complex statuses (Internalization).

Hypothesis 2a. Specifically, it is hypothesized that higher levels of less-complex statuses will be related to lower levels of self-esteem and positively related to psychological distress.

Hypothesis 2b. Higher levels of complex statuses will be related to higher levels of self-esteem and lower levels of psychological distress.

This hypothesis reflects research that indicates that less complex internalized racial identity statuses are linked to lower self-esteem and higher levels of distress and depression using both the PRIAS (Helms, 1995) and WRIAS (Helms & Carter, 1990) measures. Research has also consistently found a positive relationship between the Internalization status and self-esteem (e.g., Pierre et al., 2006).

Hypothesis 3: Frequency of racial self-designations will be associated with internalized racial identity. This hypothesis reflects findings from Speight et al. (1996) showing relationships between internalized racial identity and racial self-designation for Black adults. Theory and research do not support a directional hypothesis for this relationship.

Hypothesis 4: Internalized racial identity will mediate the relationships between usage frequency of types of racial self-designations and well-being. This hypothesis reflects theory suggesting that internalized racial identity statuses reflect different strategies for processing racial information (Helms, 1995). Further, theory asserts that choice of Multiracial self-designation is an outward marker of Multiracial people's understanding of their racial identity and self-concept. Theory also suggests that both of these constructs

are related to well-being. Taken together, theory may suggest that internalized racial identity status represents the internal processes underlying racial self-designation choice.

Research Questions

Due to a lack of previous research using the WRIAS (Helms & Carter, 1990) with Multiracial individuals, directional hypotheses cannot be proposed regarding White racial identity schemas. However, previously summarized theory and research suggest several research questions.

Research Question 1. What are the relationships between internalized White racial identity schemas and racial self-designation? One study found a relationship between racial identity schemas and racial self-designation options in a sample of Black adults (Speight et al., 1996). However, I could not locate any research that examined White people's self-designation and internalized White identity. Therefore, no directional hypothesis s was proposed for this study.

Research Question 2. What are the relationships between internalized White racial identity schemas and well-being? A single study (Franks, 2001) with White adults found that the WRIAS statuses overall were predictive of self-esteem, and that the Disintegration status (i.e., confusion and anxiety) was related to lower levels of self-esteem. However, since no extant research existed using the WRIAS with Multiracial adults, no directional hypothesis was proposed.

Research Question 3. What are the relationships between internalized White racial identity schemas, racial self-designation, and well-being? Due to a lack of research on the effects of internalized White identity on Multiracial individuals' identity development, it

was not plausible to hypothesize the role of White racial identity schemas in the relationships between racial self-designation and well-being.

Chapter 3

Method

Participants

Participants (N = 169) were adults with one White parent and one parent belonging to either the Black/African-American (N = 80) or Asian/Pacific Islander (N = 89) racial groups. Participants' gender identities included female (N = 124), male (N = 36), non-binary (N = 7) and 2 people who identified as "other" who self-described as "on the female side of gender neutral" and "female and non-binary". The sample was predominantly self-identified female (73.4%), middle class (48.5%) and highly educated, with 32.5% holding an advanced degree (MA, PhD, JD, etc.) and 98.8% having at least a high school education. In addition, the sample included individuals predominantly from the East Coast (25.4%), West Coast (34.3%), and Midwest (13.6%) and South (20.7%) regions of the United States. Participants were given the opportunity to enter a raffle for one of two $25 Amazon gift cards.

Measures

Measures used in the current study included (a) a Demographic Questionnaire, (b) a Multiracial Self-Designation Measure created for this study, (c) the People of Color Racial Identity Attitudes Scale (PRIAS; Helms, 1995), (d) the White Racial Identity Attitudes Scale (WRIAS – short form; Helms & Weber, in progress), (e) Rosenberg's

Self-Esteem Scale (1979), and (f) the Brief Symptom Inventory 18 (BSI-18; Derogatis, 2001). (Table 3)

Demographic Questionnaire

The demographic questionnaire was designed for this study to gather information about participants' demographics, describe the sample, and identify participants that met inclusion criteria (Table 2). Participants were asked to report their racial background, the racial backgrounds of their parents, their socioeconomic status, age, gender (multiple choice and write-in if "other" was selected), highest degree completed, birth place, and current city and state of residence. (Appendix A).

Table 2

Summary of Participants' Self-Reported Demographic Characteristics (N = 169)

Category	Frequency	%
Parents' Race		
Asian/White	89	52.7
Black/White	80	47.3
Age		
18-25	41	24.3
26-35	66	39.1
36-45	30	17.8
46-55	13	7.7
56-71	4	2.4
Gender Identity		
Female	124	73.4
Male	36	21.3
Non-Binary	7	4.1
Other	2	1.2
Socioeconomic Status		
Lower Class	5	3
Lower Middle Class	30	17.8
Middle Class	82	48.5
Upper Middle Class	48	28.4
Upper Class	4	2.4
Education		
Some High School	1	0.6
High School Graduate	1	0.6
Some College	36	21.3
Associate's Degree	5	3
Bachelor's Degree	48	28.4
Some Graduate School	23	13.6
Advanced Degree	55	32.5
Hometown Region		
East Coast	41	24.3
Midwest	37	21.9
South	29	17.2
Southwest	3	1.8
West Coast	49	29

Measure of Multiracial Self-Designation (MMSD)

I created this 5-item measure to capture the complexity of racial self-designations of Multiracial participants by considering that they might not choose only one category

based on previous research suggesting individuals' self-designation choice is not fixed and is often influenced by context. Items therefore used a frequency scale response format. Participants were asked to indicate how often they use each of five self-designation options to racially identify. Response options were: 1 (*Never*), 2 (*Rarely*), 3 (*Occasionally*), 4 (*Often*), and 5 (*Always*). The five self-designation statements illustrate the five patterns of Multiracial identification used in Renn's (2000, 2003, 2008) qualitative studies with Multiracial college students. The statements include: (a) I identify as my racial group of Color; (b) I identify as White, (c) I identify as White and my racial group of color, (d) I identify as Multiracial or Biracial, (e) I do not identify with a racial group/I do not believe in racial categories.

Nearly identical patterns have been found in other empirical studies (Kilson, 2001; Rockquemore & Brunsma, 2002; Wallace, 2001) and are supported by theory (Renn, 2000). Further, multiple studies have shown evidence that Multiracial individuals may hold multiple self-designations simultaneously (Miville et al., 2005; Renn, 2003). Therefore, this adapted instrument measures frequency of use of each self-designation pattern, rather than mutually exclusive choices. Scores indicate participants' frequency of use of each self-designation, with higher scores indicating a higher frequency of using that way of self-designating. (Appendix B).

People of Color Racial Identity Attitudes Scale (PRIAS) (Helms, 1995)

The PRIAS is a 50-item self-report measure with four subscales designed to measure the racial identity statuses of the People of Color Racial Identity Theory (Helms, 1995). The scale uses Likert-style items ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (strongly Agree). The four subscales include (a) Conformity (12 items) (e.g., "In general, I believe

that Whites are superior to other racial groups"), (b) Dissonance (14 items) (e.g., "I feel anxious about some of the things that I feel about people of my race"), (c), Immersion (14 items) (e.g., "I limit myself to activities involving people of my own race"), and (d) Internalization (10 items) (e.g., "People, regardless of their race, have strengths and limitations") (Helms, 2005). Raw scores from each scale are summed to produce a total subscale score. Higher scores indicate higher levels of that status. In the current study, the PRIAS measured participants' race-related cognitive processing schemas and level of racial identity development.

Several studies have demonstrated moderate to high internal consistency with racially diverse samples for the PRIAS using Cronbach alpha coefficients. Studies have used samples of Asian Americans, Southeast Asian Americans, Native Americas, Black Americans, and Black Brazilians. Alpha coefficients have ranged from .61 to .79 for Conformity, .62 to .84 for Dissonance, .72 to .83 for Immersion/Emersion, and .67 to .82 for Internalization. Coefficients of .61 and .73 were found in two studies that did not collapse the Integrative Awareness subscale into the Internalization subscale) (Bianchi et al., 2002; Bryant, 1998; Helms & Alvarez 2001; Helms & Carter, 1990; Kohatsu, 1993, as cited in Chen et al., 2006; Perry, et al., 2009).

PRIAS scores have also been found to have high internal consistency in studies with Multiracial samples. In a mixed-methods study of factors thought to influence Multiracial identity development, Torkelson et al. (2013) found Cronbach alpha coefficients of .70 (Conformity), .84 (Dissonance), .82 (Immersion/Emersion) and .66 (Internalization). Further, Torkelson (2016) found coefficients of .74 (Conformity), .83

(Dissonance), .86 (Immersion), and .72 (Internalization) in her study developing a contextual model of Multiracial identity development.

In the present study, Cronbach alpha coefficients were calculated for the total sample as well as for each of the two racial groups included in the study separately (Asian/White and Black/White). In the total sample, Cronbach alphas were: Conformity (.69), Dissonance (.77), Immersion/Emersion (.87), and Internalization (.74). For Asian/White participants, alpha coefficients were: Conformity (.66), Dissonance (.78), Immersion/Emersion (.88), and Internalization (.69). For Black/White participants, alphas were: Conformity (.72), Dissonance (.76), Immersion/Emersion (.84), and Internalization (.78). These findings support the internal consistency of participants' scores on the measure with a multiracial sample.

As for the validity evidence supporting use of the PRIAS, two studies of Asian American racial identity and well-being (Helms & Alvarez, 2001; Iwamoto & Liu, 2010) found that racial identity schemas significantly predicted collective self-esteem and psychological well-being. Additionally, Bianchi et al. (2002) found that racial identity significantly predicted collective and individual self-esteem in a sample of Black Brazilian men. Torkelson (2016) found that the Dissonance and Immersion statuses were positively related to psychological distress. These findings provide support for using the PRIAS to predict psychological well-being and self-esteem with the present Multiracial samples. (Appendix C).

Rosenberg's Self-Esteem Scale (RSES) (Rosenberg, 1979)

This scale is composed of 10 Likert-type items with endpoints of (1) strongly disagree to (4) strongly agree. Items (e.g., "On the whole, I am satisfied with myself") are

scored so that higher scores indicate greater levels of self-esteem on items 1, 2, 4, 6, and 7, while items 3, 5, 8, 9, and 10 are reverse scored. In the current study, the RSES was used as a measure of well-being. (Appendix D).

In a study examining ethnic identity and self-esteem in both monoracial and Multiracial adolescents, Cronbach alphas for the Multiracial samples ranged from .58 to .87 (Bracey et al., 2004). In their study, Suzuki-Crumly and Hyers (2004) reported Cronbach alpha coefficients of .86 (Black/White) and .92 (Asian/White) for scores of Multiracial adults. In Franco and O'Brien's (2008) study of racial invalidation in Multiracial adults, they found a Cronbach alpha reliability estimate of .91. Finally, Choi-Misailidis found a Cronbach alpha of .89 in a sample of Multiracial Hawaiian adults. Damann (2007) found a Cronbach alpha coefficient of .91 in her study of Multiracial self-designation, self-esteem and psychological functioning, providing support for the internal-consistency reliability for scores of these Multiracial samples. Moreover, the PRIAS has been used with diverse populations, including Mexican, Black, and White adolescents. In these samples, high Cronbach alpha coefficients (.79 to .85) were reported. For the present study, the Cronbach alpha coefficient was .91, demonstrating further support for the use of this measure with the present Multiracial sample.

Donellan et al. (2015) reviewed strong validity evidence for the RSES in a study (Zeigler-Hill, 2010) of predominantly White and Black undergraduates ($N = 1422$), which found correlation coefficients ranging from .71 - .90 between scores on the RSES and scores on the State Self-Esteem Scale (Heatherton & Polivy, 1991, as cited in Donellan et al., 2015, p.134) and the Self-Liking and Self-Competence scales (Tafarodi & Swann, 2001, as cited in Donellan et al., 2015, p.134). Damann (2007) found that no

racial group self-designation was negatively association with self-esteem, life satisfaction, and social functioning, and positively associated with depression. Conversely, a self-designation that combined all racial backgrounds had positive associations with self-esteem and negative associations with depression. Lusk et al. (2010) used the RSES to study self-designation and self-esteem in Black/White Multiracial adults, and found that individuals with border (biracial) or protean (shifting; sometimes biracial) self-designation had higher levels of self-esteem than those who self-designated as monoracial or with no racial group. Evidence therefore supports the use of this measure for assessing self-esteem in Multiracial samples.

Brief Symptom Inventory 18 (BSI 18) (Derogatis, 2001)

The BSI 18 is an 18-item self-report measure of Somatization, Depression, and Anxiety and is a shortened version of the Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI; Derogatis, & Spencer, 1993). Each question asks participants to rate how much a variety of symptoms have distressed them during the past week with answers formatted on 5-point scales ranging from 0 (*not at all*) to 4 (*extremely*). In the current study, the BSI 18 was used as a measure of psychological well-being. The BSI 18 provides a Global Severity Index (GSI) score, which assesses the person's overall psychological distress level. A raw GSI score is calculated by summing all items, with a possible score range of 0-71, and scores on the three symptom categories (Somatization, Depression, Anxiety), with a range of 0-24 each, can also be reported (Derogatis, 2001).

Derogatis and Savitz (2000) reported acceptable internal consistency for the GSI (Cronbach alpha = .89). Additionally, Chong (2013) used the BSI 18 to study the racial identity and psychological adjustment of Multiracial adults, and reported an overall

Cronbach alpha coefficient of .91 and inter-item correlations ranging from .33 to .69. Also, Sparrold (2003) used the original BSI for her study of the relationship between ethnic identity and psychological adjustment for a sample of Multiracial college students ($N = 60$) and comparison groups of White ($N = 60$) and racial minority ($N = 41$) college students. The author reported high Cronbach alpha coefficients for the Global Symptom Inventory (GSI) for monoracial participants (.96) and multiracial participants (.96). For the present study, the Cronbach alpha coefficient for the GSI was .93. These results provide some evidence for the reliability of the BSI 18 as a measure of psychological well-being for Multiracial populations.

In addition, as validity evidence, multiple studies have reported no significant differences in scores between individuals from a variety of racial groups and immigrant statuses on the original BSI (Acosta et al., 1994; Aroian et al., 1995), suggesting its appropriateness for diverse populations. Derogatis (2001) also reported initial evidence for convergent validity between the BSI 18 and the Symptom Checklist-90-Revised (SL-90 R; Derogatis & Lazarus, 1994) and Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (Butcher et al., 1989; MMPI) scores with correlations between .40 and .72.

Previous studies of psychological distress in Multiracial adults provide some validity evidence for the use of the BSI-18. Coleman and Carter (2007) explored racial self-designation choice, anxiety, and depression in a sample of Black/White adults. They found that individuals who self-designated as Biracial had significantly lower levels of depression and anxiety than those with other racial identifications. Lusk et al. (2010) found that Black/White Multiracial adults with border (biracial) or protean (shifting; sometimes biracial) self-designation had higher levels of self-esteem and lower

depression scores than those who self-designated with a single monoracial or transcendent (no race) identity. Chong's (2013) used the BSI-18 to study Asian/White Multiracial adults' self-designation and well-being and found that participants with an integrated, Multiracial self-designation reported less distress and more positive overall well-being than those who identified as monoracial or with no racial group. Torkelson (2016) found that in a Multiracial sample (Asian/White, Black White), the PRIAS racial identity statuses were predictive of psychological distress, with racial reactive schemas (i.e., Dissonance, Immersion/Emersion) being positively related to distress as measured by the BSI-18. Therefore, there is initial evidence supporting the use of the BSI-18 to examine psychological distress with Multiracial samples. (Appendix E).

White Racial Identity Attitudes Scale (WRIAS) (Helms & Carter, 1990)

The WRIAS (Helm & Carter, 1990) is a 60-item measure with Likert-style responses ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). For the present study, an abbreviated 36-item version of the WRIAS was used. This abbreviated version was developed using structural equation modeling (Helms & Weber, in progress). The measure assesses White racial identity schemas and was used in the present study to explore the racial self-conceptions of part-White Multiracials. The abbreviated WRIAS has six subscales, with subscales comprised of 5 to 7 items each, and subscale scores are summed to indicate participants' level of endorsement of each racial identity schema.

The six subscales are (a) Contact (5 items) (e.g., "I hardly ever think about what race I am."), (b) Disintegration (6 items) (e.g., "I just refuse to participate in discussions about race."), (c) Reintegration (7 items) (e.g., "Society may have been unfair to Blacks, but it has been just as unfair to Whites."), (d) Pseudoindependence (5 items) (e.g., " I feel

as comfortable around Blacks as I do around Whites."), (e) Immersion/Emersion (7 items) (e.g., "I am making a special effort to understand the significance of being White."), and (f) Autonomy (6 items) (e.g., " I involve myself in causes regardless of the race of the people involved in them.").

For the present study, two versions of the abbreviated WRIAS were used, one which referred to "Black people" and the Black racial group (i.e., the original WRIAS wording) and one which referred to "Asian people" or the Asian racial group. For example, the original wording: "I believe that Blacks would not be different from Whites if they had been given the same opportunities" was modified in the Asian version to read: " I believe that Asians would not be different from Whites if they had been given the same opportunities."

Participants were administered one of the versions based on their racial backgrounds. That is, Asian/White participants were administered the version referring to the Asian racial group and Black/White participants were administered the version referring to the Black racial group.

The original WRIAS subscales have demonstrated a range of Cronbach alpha coefficients in previous studies using White samples. Ranges for each status, across several studies using several types of monoracial White samples are as follows: .42-.53 (Contact), .65-.80 (Disintegration), .65-.80 (Reintegration), .57-.75 (Pseudoindependence), and .53-.72 (Autonomy) (Burkard, et al., 2003; Carter, 1987; Franks, 2001; Helms & Carter, 1990; King et al., 2015; Pope-Davis & Ottavi, 1994). In these studies, the version of the WRIAS used did not yet contain an Immersion/Emersion subscale. To date, I have not found any studies that used the WRIAS (Helms & Carter,

1990) with a Multiracial sample. Existing reliability estimates provide moderate support for the use of this measure with White samples, and may indicate support for its use with part-White Multiracials.

In the current study, Cronbach alpha coefficients for the abbreviated WRIAS were: Contact (.59), Disintegration (.61), Reintegration (.75), Pseudo-Independence (.33), Immersion/Emersion (.81), and Autonomy (.32). Reliability analyses were also conducted with participants grouped by racial background (i.e., Asian/White, Black/White). For Asian/White participants, alpha coefficients were: Contact (.63), Disintegration (.59), Reintegration (.69), Pseudo-Independence (.23), Immersion/Emersion (.83), and Autonomy (.53). For Black/White participants, alpha coefficients were: Contact, (.57), Disintegration (.63), Reintegration (.66), Pseudo-Independence (.42), Immersion/Emersion (.75), and Autonomy (-.07). Despite multiple subscales showing extremely low alpha coefficient values, all of the WRIAS subscales were used for analyses because the inclusion of this measure in the study is experimental in nature.

In the only study found exploring White racial identity and self-esteem, Franks (2001) found that for White social work students, the WRIAS statuses overall were predictive of self-esteem, and the Disintegration status (i.e., confusion and anxiety) was related to lower levels of self-esteem. This provides some initial support for the use of the WRIAS to assess the relationship between internalized racial identity and self-esteem. (Appendix F)

Procedures

Prior to sample recruitment, the Boston College Institutional Review Board approved the study. Participants with one White parent and one Black or Asian parent were recruited via an online survey. The research survey link and study description were distributed via email to leaders of undergraduate and graduate student organizations focused on racial, ethnic, or cultural identities, as well as to regional and national multiracial professional groups (e.g., Mixed at Cornell, National Association of Student Personnel Administrators - Transracial Adoptee and Multiracial Knowledge Community, etc.). It was also shared via the social media platforms “Facebook”, “Twitter”, and “Instagram”.

After accessing the link to the Qualtrics survey hosting site, participants were first shown the consent document explaining the purpose, risks, and benefits of the study, as well as their rights as study participants. In addition, the consent document informed participants that they could opt to be entered into a raffle to win one of two $25.00 Amazon gift cards. After consenting to take part in the study, participants were asked to complete the demographic questionnaire and the measures: the People of Color Racial Identity Attitudes Scale, the White Racial Identity Attitudes Scale, the Measure of Multiracial Self-Designation, the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale, and the Brief Symptom Inventory - 18.

Participants who chose to be entered into the raffle for the $25.00 Amazon gift cards indicated their interest by clicking “Yes” at the survey’s end. This directed them to another survey where they were instructed to provide their email address. Email addresses collected through the second survey were stored in a secure database separate

from the database containing participants' responses to the survey, thus maintaining the anonymity of the participants. The database with participants' email addresses was deleted after the raffle was conducted and the winners were sent their $25 gift cards via the Amazon.com website.

The original sample ($N = 259$) consisted of respondents who completed the informed consent and some of the measures, but 78 (30%) respondents were eliminated because they had not completed a sufficient number of measures. This reduced sample ($N = 181$) was then examined to determine if participants met the inclusion criteria for the study, resulting in 9 (4.9%) respondents being eliminated due to reporting a monoracial identity (e.g., both parents belonged to the Asian racial group) or racial backgrounds that are not included in this study (e.g., Hispanic of Color). The final sample ($N = 172$) represented 66% of the survey respondents.

Table 3

Means, Standard Deviations, Ranges, and Cronbach Alpha Coefficients for Predictor and Outcome variables (N= 168)

Variable	Mean	SD	Obtained Range	Possible Range	α
Measure of Multiracial Self-Designation					
Monoracial Minority	3.76	1.09	1.0-5.0	1.0-5.0	.
Monoracial White	2.07	1.15	1.0-5.0	1.0-5.0	.
Two or More Races	3.5	1.35	1.0-5.0	1.0-5.0	.
Multiracial	4.4	0.90	1.0-5.0	1.0-5.0	.
Extra-Racial	1.4	0.78	1.0-5.0	1.0-5.0	.
People of Color Racial Identity Attitudes Scale					
Conformity	22.92	5.32	12.00-40.00	12.00-60.00	0.69
Dissonance	39.44	7.93	18.00-64.00	14.00-70.00	0.77
Immersion/Emersion	41.30	8.48	19.00-64.00	14.00-70.00	0.87
Internalization	43.10	4.16	28.00-50.00	10.00-50.00	0.74
White Racial Identity Attitudes Scale					
Contact	16.12	3.21	9.00-23.00	5.00-25.00	0.59
Disintegration	12.13	3.42	6.00-22.00	6.00-30.00	0.61
Reintegration	9.83	2.95	7.00-21.00	7.00-35.00	0.75
Pseudo-Independence	18.92	2.53	12.00-25.00	5.00-25.00	0.33
Immersion/Emersion	23.05	5.20	7.00-33.00	7.00-35.00	0.81
Autonomy	23.22	2.92	15.00-30.00	6.00-30.00	0.32
Brief Symptom Inventory 18	15.73	12.51	0.00-72.00	0.00-72.00	0.93
Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale	29.89	5.93	13.00-40.00	10.00-40.00	0.91

Chapter 4

Results

Preliminary Analyses

In the present study, predictor variables were participants' racial self-designation patterns and internalized racial identity statuses (i.e., PRIAS: Conformity, Dissonance, Immersion/Emersion, Internalization; WRIAS: Contact, Disintegration, Reintegration, Pseudo-Independence, Autonomy). Outcome variables were participants' psychological well-being scores (i.e., Self-Esteem and Psychological Distress). The data were analyzed for missing values and outliers, and preliminary analyses were conducted to test for violations of the multivariate assumptions (linearity, normality, and homoscedasticity) prior to testing the hypotheses.

Missing Values

Missing values analyses were conducted to examine missing data in the sample. Three cases (cases 41, 138, 168) were found with significant missing values for the PRIAS items, a central measure in the study, resulting in these cases being removed from the sample. Six cases had 1 missing value each on the PRIAS, and these values were replaced with the rounded case mean for that subscale (that is, the participant's mean rounded to the next whole number for the PRIAS subscale which contained the missing value). Three cases had missing values for the BSI-18, two of which (case 41 and 138) were cases missing significant amounts of data for the PRIAS items, and so were eliminated. For the third case (case 60), rounded subscale means (e.g., Depression

subscale, Anxiety subscale) were used to replace missing values. After eliminating cases with too much missing data, the final sample size was $N = 169$.

Normality

The assumption of normality holds that variables are normally distributed without significant skewness and kurtosis. Histograms were examined to analyze the normality of the variables. Multiple variables, including the Self-Designation variables, Psychological Distress, and the Racial Identity variables were not normally distributed. However, this is to be expected due to the nature of these variables. Because the current sample is not a psychiatric sample, normally distributed psychological distress scores are not expected.

Linearity

The assumption of linearity holds that there is a "straight-line relationship between two variables" (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2019, p.72). Correlation matrices were created for pairs of independent and dependent variables and linearity was assessed by examining bivariate scatterplots for pairs of variables that had insignificant correlations. The Self-Designation variables showed insignificant correlations with the Well-Being variables, and when linearity was examined, they were found not to be linearly related. Although this violates the linearity assumption, transformation of these variables was not done because it would have rendered interpretation impossible.

Homoscedasticity

The assumption of homoscedasticity is that "variability in scores for one continuous variable is roughly the same at all values of another continuous variable" Tabachnick & Fidell, 2019, p.73). Bivariate scatterplots of pairs of variables were screened for heteroscedasticity (violation of homoscedasticity). For the variables that

violated the linearity assumption, heteroscedasticity was found. Again, because transformation of these variables would have severely impaired interpretation of results, no variables were transformed to improve homoscedasticity.

Additional Preliminary Analyses

Prior to conducting the main analyses of this study, an ANOVA was conducted to examine whether the outcome variables differed across groups when the data were sorted by racial background (i.e., Asian/White, Black/White). Results indicated no significant difference in Well-Being scores (on either the Self-Esteem measure or the Psychological Distress measure) between groups.

Table 4

Pearson Correlations among the Predictor and Criterion Variables (N = 169)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
1. Psychological Distress	--	-.053	.168*	.418**	.309**	-.200**	.160*	.255**	-.023	.031	.120	.160*	.073	.002	-.044	.003	.053
2. Self-Esteem		--	.120	.028	.107	-.068	.058	.034	.043	-.008	.029	-.045	-.018	-.078	-.061	-.032	-.083
3. Conformity			--	.357**	-.263**	-.124	.242**	.408**	.467**	.251**	.029	-.236**	-.204**	.097	.085	-.075	.099
4. Dissonance				--	.261**	-.302**	.265**	.440**	.075	.051	.316**	.020	-.056	.204**	.146	.078	.042
5. PRIAS Immersion/Emersion					--	-.273**	.043	-.079	-.220**	-.284**	.339**	.292**	.356**	-.107	.007	-.124	-.176*
6. Internalization						--	.170*	-.226**	-.046	.430**	.044	.283**	-.088	.088	.112	.232**	.136
7. Contact							--	.255**	.129	.413**	.503**	.319**	-.171*	.130	.324**	.146	-.036
8. Disintegration								--	.416**	.152*	.139	-.214**	-.201**	.173*	.140	.077	.038
9. Reintegration									--	.053	.020	-.314**	-.077	.185*	.067	-.038	.064
10. Pseudo-Independence										--	.041	.157*	-.249**	.070	.047	.049	.148
11. WRIAS Immersion/Emersion											--	.479**	-.003	.295**	.380**	.253**	-.064
12. Autonomy												--	.137	.035	.240**	.168*	-.149
13. Monoracial minority													--	.090	-.044	-.183*	-.354**
14. Monoracial White														--	.452**	.224**	.006
15. Two or More Races															--	.414**	-.175*
16. Multiracial																--	.089
17. Extra-Racial																	--

* = significant at the .05 level. ** = significant at the .01 level.

Tests of Hypotheses and Research Questions

To test Hypotheses 1a-3, multivariate multiple regression analyses (MMRAs) were conducted. MMRA is a stepdown analysis such that if the overall model(s) is significant, each subsequent significant step (i.e., model) in the analysis may be interpreted. Wilk's lambda criterion was used to determine the significance of successive steps and one minus lambda equals the percent of variance explained by a model.

Hypothesis 1. Integrative (Multiracial, Two or More Races) and Monoracial Minority Self-Designation patterns will be positively related to Well-Being (i.e., higher self-esteem and lower levels of distress), while Monoracial White and Extra-racial Self-Designation patterns will be negatively related to Well-Being (i.e., lower self-esteem and higher psychological distress).

For Hypothesis 1, predictor variables were the five Self-Designation variables and criterion variables were the Well-Being variables (Self-Esteem and Psychological Distress) (Table 5). Each score on the Self-Designation variables indicates the frequency with which participants use a particular pattern of self-designating (e.g., "I identify as White"). The Well-Being variables measured participants' levels of Self-Esteem and levels of Psychological Distress, with high scores indicating higher self-esteem and more symptoms of distress, respectively. The omnibus model of Self-Designation predicting Self-Esteem and Psychological Distress accounted for 3% of the variance, but it was not significant, $\lambda = .970$, $F (10, 320) = .49$, $p = .898$. Therefore, it was not interpreted further. Because Hypothesis 1, the first step in a mediation analysis, was not supported, mediation analyses (i.e., Hypothesis 4) were not conducted because mediation analyses require a relationship(s) between predictors and criteria.

Table 5

Multivariate Multiple Regression with Racial Self-Designation Predicting Self-Esteem and Psychological Distress (N = 167)

Predictor	Outcome	R2	F	B	T	Sig
Monoracial Minority		.011	.855			.427
	Self-Esteem	.008	.432	-.309	-.658	.512
	Psychological Distress	.003	1.355	.924	1.164	.246
Monoracial White		.100	.117			.889
	Self-Esteem	.000	.228	-.222	-.477	.634
	Psychological Distress	.001	.013	.091	.116	.908
Two or More Races		.400	.337[b]			.714
	Self-Esteem	.001	.450	-.289	-.671	.503
	Psychological Distress	.003	.200	-.325	-.447	.655
Multiracial		.001	.061[b]			.941
	Self-Esteem	.001	.004	.036	.061	.951
	Psychological Distress	.000	.116	.336	.34	.734
Extra-Racial		.015	1.179[b]			.310
	Self-Esteem	.005	1.712	-.875	-1.308	.193
	Psychological Distress	.011	.761	.984	.872	.384

* = significant at the .05 level. ** = significant at the .01 level. *** = significant at the .001 level.

Hypothesis 2. Less complex racial identity statuses (Conformity, Dissonance, Immersion/Emersion) will be negatively related to Self-Esteem and positively related to Psychological Distress, while more complex statuses (Internalization) will be positively related to Self-Esteem and negatively related to Psychological Distress.

For Hypothesis 2, predictor variables were the PRIAS Racial Identity variables (Conformity, Dissonance, Immersion/Emersion, Internalization), and the Well-Being criterion variables were the same as for Hypothesis 1(i.e., Psychological Distress and Self-Esteem). Each score on the PRIAS subscales indicates participants' level of endorsement for that racial identity status, with high scores indicating stronger endorsement of the status. For the Conformity subscale, high scores indicate stronger conformance to White standards; for the Dissonance subscale, high scores indicate greater confusion; for the Immersion/Emersion subscale, high scores indicate greater withdrawal into one's racial group of Color; for the Internalization subscale, high scores indicate greater integration of positive identification with one's racial group of Color.

The overall model using the four racial identity statuses to predict the two outcomes was significant using the Wilk's Lambda criterion, (λ = .728, F (8, 163) = 7.01, p < .001), which allowed subsequent steps to be interpreted. The omnibus test accounted for 27.2% of the variance between predictors and criteria.

Step 2. Tests of Individual Racial Identity Models

In the next step, each racial identity status was used to predict self-esteem and psychological distress.

Conformity

The Conformity model accounted for a significant amount of variance, 4.9%, when it was used to predict the outcomes (λ = .951, F (2, 163) = 4.16, $p \leq .017$). In the model, Conformity was significantly related to self-esteem (F (1, 163) = 4.88, p = .029), but not to psychological distress (F (1, 163) = 2.51, p = .115). Therefore, the regression coefficient for self-esteem and Conformity was examined to determine directionality of the relationship. As shown in Table 6, Conformity was positively related to self-esteem (ß = .221), which indicates that when the participants used the White self-defining status, their self-esteem was high.

Dissonance

The Dissonance model was significant (λ = .922, F (2, 163) = 6.92, p = .001), and accounted for about 7.8% of the variance. Dissonance was significantly predictive of psychological distress (F (1, 163) = 13.55, p <.001), but not self-esteem (F (1, 183) = 1.13, p = .289). The direction of the significant relationship was that higher levels of Dissonance or confusion were associated with higher levels of distress (ß = .376).

Immersion-Emersion

The model using Immersion/Emersion to predict the two outcome variables accounted for about 9.1% of the variance between itself and the outcome variables, which was significant, λ = .909, F (2, 163) = 8.18, p <.001. Immersion-Emersion significantly predicted both self-esteem (F (1, 163) = 4.01, p = .047) and psychological distress (F (1, 163) = 10.60, p = .001. The nature of the relationships was that Immersion-Emersion was positively related to self-esteem (ß = .124) and distress (ß = .305). Thus, the more

rebellious against racial norms the person was the better the person felt about oneself, but also the more distressed the person felt.

Internalization

The Internalization model, which predicted 0.1% of the model variance was not significant, $\lambda = .999$, F (2, 163) = .103, $p = .902$. Therefore, it was not further interpreted.

Summary

In sum, Dissonance and Immersion/Emersion were positively related to psychological distress and Conformity and Immersion/Emersion were positively related to self-esteem. Hypothesis 2 was partially supported. Thus, when participants endorsed higher levels of confusion about racial issues (Dissonance) and higher levels of withdrawal into their racial group of Color and rejection of Whiteness (Immersion/Emersion), they reported higher levels of psychological distress. Further, when participants endorsed higher levels of acceptance of the racial status quo and White standards (Conformity) and higher levels of withdrawal into their racial group of Color (Immersion/Emersion), they also reported higher self-esteem.

Table 6

Multivariate Multiple Regression Analysis with People of Color Racial Identity Predicting Self-Esteem and Psychological Distress (N = 169)

Predictor	Outcome	R^2	F	B	T	Sig
Conformity		.049	4.159			.017*
	Self-Esteem	.029	4.875	.221	2.208	.029*
	Psychological Distress	.015	2.507	.239	1.583	.115
Dissonance		.078	6.922			.001***
	Self-Esteem	.007	1.132	-.072	-1.064	.289
	Psychological Distress	.076	13.549	.376	3.681	<.001***
PRIAS Immersion/Emersion		.091	8.176			<.001***
	Self-Esteem	.024	4.007	.124	2.002	.047*
	Psychological Distress	.061	10.595	.305	3.255	.001***
Internalization		.001	.103			.902
	Self-Esteem	<.001	.080	-.033	-.283	.778
	Psychological Distress	.001	.101	-.057	-.319	.750

* = significant at the .05 level. ** = significant at the .01 level. *** = significant at the .001 level.

Hypothesis 3. Internalized Racial Identity Statuses will predict Racial Self-Designations.

For Hypothesis 3, PRIAS Racial Identity subscales (Conformity, Dissonance, Immersion/Emersion, Internalization) were the predictor variables while the five Self-Designation variables were the criterion variables (Table 7). Each score on the PRIAS subscales indicates participants' level of endorsement for that racial identity status, with high scores indicating stronger endorsement of the status. For the Conformity subscale,

high scores indicate stronger conformance to White standards; for the Dissonance subscale, high scores indicate greater confusion; for the Immersion/Emersion subscale, high scores indicate greater withdrawal into one's racial group of Color; for the Internalization subscale, high scores indicate greater integration of positive identification with one's racial group of Color. For the self-designation variables, high scores indicate higher frequency of using that pattern of self-designating. For example, more frequently self-designating as "Black and White", "Multiracial", or more frequently indicating that "I do not identify with a racial group or do not believe in racial categories."

The overall model using the four racial identity statuses to predict the five self-designation outcomes was significant using the Wilk's Lambda criterion, (λ = .658, F (20, 524.98) = 3.53, p <.001), which allowed subsequent steps to be interpreted. The omnibus test accounted for 34.2% of the variance between predictors and criteria.

Step 2. Tests of Individual Racial Identity Models

In the next step, each racial identity status was used to predict self-esteem and psychological distress.

Conformity

The Conformity model, which predicted 5.2% of the variance, was not significant, λ = .948, F (5, 158) = 1.718, p = .134. Therefore, it was not further interpreted.

Dissonance

The Dissonance model was significant, λ = .879, F (5, 158) = 4.35, p < .001, and predicted 12.1% of the variance between itself and the outcome variables. Dissonance was significantly predictive of both Monoracial White self-designation (F (1, 158) = 11.77, p <.001, and Multiracial self-designation, F (1, 158) = 9.07, p = .003. The

direction of the relationships was that Dissonance was positively related to Monoracial White (ß = .044) and Multiracial (ß = .03) self-designations, meaning increased confusion was related to more frequent use of Monoracial White and Multiracial self-designations.

Immersion/Emersion

The model using Immersion/Emersion to predict the four outcome variables was significant, λ = .839, F (5, 158) = 6.06, p < .001, with 16.1% of variance accounted for. Immersion/Emersion was positively related to Monoracial Minority self-designation (ß = .047, F (1, 158) =18.80, p < .001), and negatively related to Multiracial self-designation (ß = -.019, F (1, 158) = 4.17, p = .043). Therefore, increased withdrawal into the racial group of Color and rejection of Whiteness was related to more frequent use of a Monoracial Minority (i.e., Asian or Black) self-designation and less frequent use of a Multiracial self-designation.

Internalization

The Internalization model was significantly predictive of the outcome variables, λ = .923, F (5, 158) = 2.63, p = .026, with 7.7% of the variance in the outcome variables accounted for. Internalization significantly predicted variance in both Two or More Races self-designation (F (1, 158) = 4.48, p = .036) and Multiracial self-designation (F (1, 158) = 8.72, p = .004). The direction of these relationships was such that higher levels of Internalization were related to more frequent use of Two or More Races (ß = .057) and Multiracial (ß = .051) self-designations. Thus, the greater a person's integration of positive racial group of Color (i.e., Asian or Black) identification and realistic appreciation of Whiteness, the more frequently they self-designated as "Asian and White" or "Black and White", and as "Multiracial."

Summary

Considering these results, Hypothesis 3 was partially supported because three of the four racial identity statuses (Dissonance, Immersion/Emersion, and Internalization) were significantly related to four of the five self-designation patterns (Monoracial White, Monoracial Minority, Two or More Races, and Multiracial). Specifically, when participants reported higher levels of confusion about race (Dissonance), they also reported more frequent use of Monoracial White and Multiracial self-designations. When participants reported more withdrawal into their racial group of Color and rejection of White culture (Immersion/Emersion), they also reported more frequent use of a Monoracial minority self-designation and less frequent use of a Multiracial self-designation. Finally, when participants endorsed higher levels of integrating positive racial group (i.e., Asian or Black) identification and the capacity to realistically appreciate positive aspects of Whiteness (Internalization), they also reported more frequent use of Two or More Races and Multiracial self-designation.

Table 7

Multivariate Multiple Regression Analysis with Person of Color Racial Identity Predicting Self-Designation (N = 167)

Predictor	Outcome	R2	F	B	T	Sig.
Conformity		.052	1.717			.134
	Monoracial Minority	.003	.522	-.013	-.722	.471
	Monoracial White	.001	.174	-.008	-.418	.677
	Two or More Races	.002	.308	.013	.555	.580
	Multiracial	.028	4.589	-.031	-2.142	.034*
	Extra-Racial	.001	.149	.005	.386	.700
Dissonance		.121	4.348			.001***
	Monoracial Minority	.017	2.743	-.019	-1.656	.100
	Monoracial White	.068	11.769	.044	3.431	.001***
	Two or More Races	.023	3.815	.030	1.953	.053
	Multiracial	.053	9.071	.030	3.012	.003**
	Extra-Racial	.009	1.43	.011	1.196	.233
PRIAS Immersion/Emersion		.161	6.057			<.001***
	Monoracial Minority	.104	18.804	.047	4.336	<.001***
	Monoracial White	.018	2.991	-.02	-1.729	.086
	Two or More Races	.000	.070	.004	.264	.792
	Multiracial	.025	4.167	-.019	-2.041	.043*
	Extra-Racial	.021	3.441	-.015	-1.855	.065
Internalization		.077	2.625			.026*
	Monoracial Minority	.001	.206	-.009	-.454	.650
	Monoracial White	.016	2.574	.036	1.604	.111
	Two or More Races	.027	4.475	.057	2.115	.036*
	Multiracial	.051	8.715	.051	2.952	.004**
	Extra-Racial	.015	2.386	.024	1.545	.124

* = significant at the .05 level. ** = significant at the .01 level. *** = significant at the .001 level.

Hypothesis 4. Internalized Racial Identity Statuses will mediate the relationship between Racial Self-Designation and Self-Esteem and Psychological Distress.

Because Hypothesis 1, the first step in a mediation analysis, was not supported, mediation analyses (i.e., Hypothesis 4) were not conducted because mediation analyses require a relationship(s) between predictors (i.e., Self-Designation) and criteria (i.e., Self-Esteem and Psychological Distress).

Research Question 1. What are the relationships between internalized White racial identity schemas and racial self-designation?

For this research question, Multivariate Multiple Regression analyses were used to investigate the relationships between White racial identity schemas and racial self-designation. In these analyses, WRIAS subscale scores (Contact, Disintegration, Reintegration, Pseudo-Independence, Immersion/Emersion, Autonomy) were the predictor variables, while racial self-designation variables (Monoracial Minority, Monoracial White, Two or More Races, Multiracial, Extra-Racial) were the criterion variables (Table 8).

The overall omnibus model was significant, $\lambda = .599$, $F\ (30, 622) = 2.83$, $p < .001$, with 40% of the variance between predictors and criteria. Therefore, subsequent steps of the analysis could be interpreted.

Step 2. Tests of Individual Racial Identity Models

In the next step, each racial identity status was used to predict the five self-designation patterns.

Contact

The Contact model, which predicted 5.7% of the variance, was not significant, λ = .943, F (5, 155) = 1.86, p = .105. Therefore, it was not interpreted further.

Disintegration

The Disintegration model accounted for 1.8% of the variance and was not significant, λ = .982, F (5, 155) = .578, p = .717. Thus, no further interpretation was possible.

Reintegration

The model using Reintegration to predict self-designation accounted for 2.5% of the variance, which was not significant, λ = .975, F (5, 155) = .783, p = .564. Therefore, it was not interpreted further.

Pseudo-Independence

The Pseudo-Independence model accounted for 8.2% of the variance and was significant, λ = .918, F (5, 155) = 2.78, p = .020. Pseudo-Independence was significantly predictive of both Monoracial Minority self-designation, λ = .957, F (1, 155) = 7.11, p = .008, and Extra-Racial self-designation, λ = .961, F (1, 155) = 6.38, p = .012. The direction of these relationships was that Pseudo-Independence was negatively related to Monoracial Minority self-designation (ß = -.096) and positively related to Extra-Racial self-designation (ß = .067). That is, higher levels of an intellectualized view of race and one's own Whiteness were related to less frequent use of a Monoracial Minority (i.e., Asian or Black) self-designation and more frequent use of indicating that one does not identify with or believe in racial categories (Extra-Racial self-designation).

Immersion/Emersion

The model using Immersion/Emersion to predict self-designation was significant, $\lambda = .899$, F (5, 155) = 3.50, $p = .005$, with 10.1% of the variance accounted for. Immersion/Emersion significantly predicted Monoracial White ($\lambda = .918$, F (1, 155) = 14.26, $p < .001$), Two or More Races ($\lambda = .962$, F (1, 155) = 6.21, $p = .014$, and Multiracial ($\lambda = .970$, F (1, 155) = 4.96, $p = .027$) self-designations. Immersion/Emersion was positively related to all three self-designations (Monoracial White, ß = .080; Two or More Races, ß =.061; Multiracial, ß = .039), thus higher levels of active exploration of racism and realistic appraisal of White culture were related to more frequent self-designation as "White", "Asian and White" or "Black and White", and "Multiracial".

Autonomy

The Autonomy model was significant, $\lambda = .926$, F (1, 155) = 2.47, $p = .035$, with 7.4% of the variance accounted for. Autonomy significantly predicted Monoracial Minority self-designation ($\lambda = .962$, F (1, 155) = 6.30, $p = .013$), with the direction of the relationship being positive (ß = .091). Therefore, higher levels of a personal definition of Whiteness and active engagement in antiracism was related to more frequent Monoracial Minority self-designation (i.e., "I identify as Asian" or "I identify as Black").

Summary

These results provide some insight into the relationships between White racial identity status and racial self-designation for part-White Multiracial adults. When participants reported higher levels of intellectualized views of race and their own Whiteness (Pseudo-Independence), they also reported lower frequency of using a Monoracial minority (i.e., Asian or Black) self-designation, and more frequent use of an

Extra-Racial self-designation (not using or not believing in racial categories to self-designate). Further, when participants reported higher levels of active exploration of racism and realistic appraisal of White culture (Immersion/Emersion), they also reported higher frequency of Monoracial White self-designation, Two or More Races self-designation, and Multiracial self-designation. When participants reported higher levels of a personal definition of Whiteness and active engagement in antiracism (Autonomy), they also reported higher frequency of Monoracial minority self-designation (e.g., identifying as Asian or Black).

Table 8

Multivariate Multiple Regression Analysis with White Racial Identity Predicting Self-Designation (N = 166)

Predictor	Outcome	R2	F	B	T	Sig
Contact		.057	1.856			.105
	Monoracial Minority	.013	2.037	-.048	-1.427	.155
	Monoracial White	.004	.718	-.030	-.848	.398
	Two or More Races	.024	3.948	.081	1.987	.049*
	Multiracial	<.001	.020	.004	.142	.888
	Extra-Racial	.004	.703	-.021	-.838	.403
Disintegration		.018	.578			.717
	Monoracial Minority	.009	1.426	-.033	-1.194	.234
	Monoracial White	.002	.375	.017	.613	.541
	Two or More Races	.005	.769	.029	.877	.382
	Multiracial	.004	.701	.020	.837	.404
	Extra-Racial	.001	.088	-.006	-.297	.767
Reintegration		.025	.783			.564
	Monoracial Minority	.004	.718	.027	.847	.398
	Monoracial White	.015	2.495	.051	1.579	.116
	Two or More Races	.002	.330	.022	.575	.566
	Multiracial	.003	.439	-.018	-.662	.509
	Extra-Racial	<.001	.045	.005	0.212	.832
Pseudo-Independence		.082	2.781			.02*
	Monoracial Minority	.043	7.105	-.096	-2.666	.008**
	Monoracial White	.007	1.145	.040	1.070	.286
	Two or More Races	.004	.573	-.033	-.757	.450
	Multiracial	.001	.111	.010	.333	.740
	Extra-Racial	.039	6.383	.067	2.526	.012*
WRIAS Immersion/Emersion		.101	3.495			.005**
	Monoracial Minority	.001	.141	-.008	-.375	.708
	Monoracial White	.082	14.256	.080	3.776	<.001***
	Two or More Races	.038	6.208	.061	2.492	.014*
	Multiracial	.030	4.964	.039	2.228	.027*
	Extra-Racial	.003	.494	.010	.703	.483
Autonomy		.074	2.466			.035*
	Monoracial Minority	.038	6.300	.091	2.510	.013*
	Monoracial White	.004	.703	-.031	-.838	.403
	Two or More Races	.007	1.171	.047	1.082	.281
	Multiracial	.001	.197	.014	.444	.658
	Extra-Racial	.022	3.547	-.050	-1.883	.061

* = significant at the .05 level. ** = significant at the .01 level. *** = significant at the .001 level.

Research Question 2. What are the relationships between internalized White racial identity schemas and well-being?

For this question, Multivariate Multiple Regression Analysis (MMRA) was used to investigate the relationships. White racial identity subscale scores (Contact, Disintegration, Reintegration, Pseudo-Independence, Immersion/Emersion, Autonomy) were the predictor variables and Self-Esteem and Psychological Distress were the criterion variables (Table 9). MMRA found that the overall model was significant λ = .863, F (12, 320) = 2.04, p = .021, with 13.7% of the variance accounted for, therefore subsequent steps could be interpreted.

Step 2. Tests of Individual Racial Identity Models.

In the next step, each racial identity status was used to predict self-esteem and psychological distress.

Contact

The Contact model predicted 0.9% of the variance, which was not significant (λ = .991, F (2, 160) = .706, p = .495. Therefore, this step was not interpreted further.

Disintegration

The Disintegration model was significant (λ = .908, F (2, 160) = 8.07, p < .001, with 9.2% of the variance accounted for. Specifically, Disintegration was significantly related to psychological distress (λ = .909, F (1, 160) = 16.21, p < .001) and the direction of the relationship was positive (ß = 1.02). Thus, higher levels of disorientation and confusion about race were related to higher levels of psychological distress.

Reintegration

The model in which Reintegration predicted the outcome variables was not significant, $\lambda = .991$, F (2, 160) = .722, $p = .487$, and accounted for 0.9% of the variance. Because this model was not significant, it was not interpreted further.

Pseudo-Independence

The Pseudo-Independence model, accounting for 0.7% of the variance was not significant, $\lambda = .993$, F (2, 160) = .563, $p = .570$. Therefore, there was no further interpretation of this model

Immersion/Emersion

The model in which Immersion/Emersion predicted Self-Esteem and Psychological Distress was not significant, $\lambda = .996$, F (2, 160) = .292, $p = .747$. This model accounted for 0.4% of the variance and because it was not significant, it was not interpreted further.

Autonomy

The Autonomy model was not significant, $\lambda = .965$, F (2, 160) = .2.892, $p = .058$, and accounted for 3.5% of the variance. Because this model was not significant, it could not be interpreted further.

Summary

These results provide some initial information about the relationships between White racial identity schemas and well-being in part-White Multiracial adults. Specifically, Disintegration was the only White racial identity status significantly related to the outcome variables, with a positive relationship to Psychological Distress. Thus,

when Multiracial part-White adults reported increased disorientation and confusion, they also reported higher levels of psychological distress such as anxiety, depression, and somatization.

Table 9

Multivariate Multiple Regression Analysis of White Racial Identity Predicting Self-Esteem and Psychological Distress (N = 168)

Predictor	Outcome	R2	F	B	T	Sig
Contact		.009	.706			.495
	Self-Esteem	.004	.600	.149	.774	.440
	Psychological Distress	.005	.732	.262	.856	.393
Disintegration		.092	8.072			<.001***
	Self-Esteem	<.001	.006	-.013	-.080	.936
	Psychological Distress	.091	16.213	1.015	4.027	<.001***
Reintegration		.009	.722			.487
	Self-Esteem	<.001	.020	.025	.140	.889
	Psychological Distress	.009	1.45	-.346	-1.204	.230
Pseudo-Independence		.007	.563			.570
	Self-Esteem	.001	.111	-.069	-.333	.740
	Psychological Distress	.006	.977	-.327	-.988	.324
WRIAS Immersion/Emersion		.004	.292			.747
	Self-Esteem	<.001	.068	.031	.261	.794
	Psychological Distress	.003	.541	-.137	-.736	.463
Autonomy		.035	2.892			.058
	Self-Esteem	.004	.568	-.155	-.754	.452
	Psychological Distress	.033	5.451	.764	2.335	.021*

* = significant at the .05 level. ** = significant at the .01 level. *** = significant at the .001 level.

Chapter 5

Discussion

With the surge of research and theory focused on the Multiracial population over the past few decades, there has been much exploration of Multiracial people's sense of self and identity, as well as the processes through which they come to understand themselves as racial beings. Research on Multiracial self-designation, identity development, and well-being has been conducted, but previous studies have neglected to examine intersections of these three constructs. Scholars have largely focused on the processes of identity development as well as the outcomes of the labels by which individuals self-designate, but the majority of extant research only addresses either the external factors that may influence self-designation and racial identity or the relationship between self-designation and well-being with no consideration of internalized racial identity. No studies could be located that explored the effects of the internal processes of racial identity development on the self-designation and well-being of Multiracial individuals.

Previous theorists had proposed different solutions to the question of how "psychologically healthy" multiracial people do or should identify. In the current study, the relationships between internalized racial identity, racial self-designation, and well-being were examined to begin providing insight into the internal processes and dynamics underlying Multiracial identity development. Responses from a sample of Asian/White and Black/White Multiracial adults were analyzed to (a) examine whether frequencies of usage of particular types of possible self-designations were related to well-being (i.e.,

self-esteem and psychological distress) and (b) whether people of color and White internalized racial identity statuses were related to well-being and racial self-designations. Results of tests of relevant hypotheses, limitations of the current study, and implications for research and practice are discussed subsequently.

Self-Designation and Well-Being

Previous theories have posited that integrative, multiple, or racial minority self-designations support healthy psychological adjustment and functioning (Jacobs, 1992; Kerwin & Ponterotto, 1995; Kich, 1992; Poston, 1990; Renn, 2008; Rockquemore & Brunsma, 2002a, 2002b; Root, 1990; Stonequist, 1937). Qualitative and quantitative studies have supported theoretical assertions with findings that suggest that integrated "Multiracial" self-designations and monoracial minority self-designations promote self-esteem and lower levels of depression (Binning et al., 2009; Chong, 2013; Coleman & Carter, 2007; Damann, 2008; Lusk et al., 2010; Suzuki-Crumly & Hyers, 2004). Moreover, some theorists hold that having no racial self-designation or a White self-designation leads to low self-esteem and higher levels of psychological distress, and is supported by existing research (Damann, 2008; Coleman & Carter, 2007; Field, 1996; Phillips, 2004).

Most of the relevant literature defined Multiraciality by means of presumed mutually exclusive categories or labels. In the current study, self-designation was operationalized as the frequency with which an individual used each of various patterns of self-designating, including (a) Monoracial Minority (i.e., Asian or Black), Monoracial White, (b) Two or More Races (i.e., Asian and White, or Black and White), (c) Multiracial, and (d) Extra-Racial (i.e., opting out of using racial categories). Well-being

was operationalized as positive self-esteem and low levels of psychological distress (i.e., aggregated symptoms of depression, anxiety and somatization).

Hypothesis 1 tested whether frequencies of usage of self-designations of any type were related to wellbeing. The results summarized in Table 5 revealed no significant relationships between self-designation levels and self-esteem and distress, meaning that how participants labeled themselves was not significantly related to how they felt about themselves. The finding of a lack of significant relationships between self-labeling and wellbeing is not supported by the multitude of theories and studies that suggest that one type of self-labeling is better than another.

Nevertheless, despite much of the existing research supporting theoretical claims that particular self-designations are related to better or poorer psychological adjustment, the only other study that examined self-designation and well-being and also included internalized racial identity as did the present study also found no significant relationships between self-designation and well-being (Speight et al., 1996). By providing a response option for each self-designation type in the current study, rather than categorizing participants into groups based on self-designation, potentially significant relationships between self-designation choice and well-being may have been obscured. Yet it is also possible that participants in forced-choice studies are reacting to being forced to choose. Further, Speight et al. (1996) suggested that self-designation, because it is a conscious choice, may be too far removed from self-esteem in an individual's self-concept for the two variables to be significantly related.

Because the current study focused on both Asian/White and Black/White individuals, it is possible that differences in experiences of discrimination across and

between these groups may help to explain the lack of a relationship between racial self-designation and well-being in this sample. While both Asian and Black people in the U.S. experience hostile messaging and race related violence, the stereotypes applied to these two groups currently differ significantly, and may therefore differentially influence their racial self-designations and well-being. For example, at one time (enslaved) Black people were considered "the model minority," now it is Asian people who bear that stereotype (Takaki, 2000)

Further, generational differences (i.e., birth cohort) among the sample may have resulted in significant variation in how racial self-designation related to their well-being. For individuals of earlier generations, negative racial stereotypes and discrimination may have been more prevalent in the media they consumed and even enshrined explicitly in the law. This exposure to racist stereotypes could have led to lower well-being and also to differences in the process of developing a racial self-designation. Individuals from younger generations have had more exposure to Multiracial people in media, and though it is an under-researched area, much of the literature on this population was written in the last 30 years. These differences in representation and in the public discourse on Multiraciality likely influenced the identity development and self-designation experiences of the current sample.

Internalized Racial Identity and Well-Being

With the exception of Torkelson (2016) and Fatimilehin (1999), no other study had investigated internalized identity as an aspect of Multiracial people's mental health. In the present study, Helms's (1990) Racial Identity Theory (RIT) was used to fill this gap in the Multiracial literature. Her theory posits that more complex racial identity

statuses in which individuals undo internalized racism and come to have healthy, positive views of themselves as people of Color are related to healthier psychological adjustment and more positive well-being. In contrast, less complex statuses, characterized by internalized racism and acceptance of White standards, are theorized to be related to poorer self-esteem and more challenges with psychological adjustment. In the current study, internalized racial identity was operationalized as Helms' (1995) People of Color Racial Identity Attitudes Scale. Well-being was again operationalized as self-esteem and psychological distress, as previously described.

Less Complex Statuses

The less complex statuses were found to be significantly related to self-esteem and distress (i.e., well-being), but the more complex status, Internalization, was not (Table 6).

Conformity. The denial of the personal relevance of racial dynamics and acceptance of the racial status quo (Conformity) was positively related to self-esteem. The finding that Conformity, the acceptance of White standards and denial of the personal impact of racism, was related to higher self-esteem contradicts RIT and previous research (Helms, 1990; Pierre & Mahalik, 2005). However, the finding may point to the protective nature of obliviousness to racism. When a Multiracial racial individual does not acknowledge or recognize the personal impact of systemic and interpersonal racism, the person may be able to maintain a more positive sense of self-esteem because they are not acknowledging and therefore not internalizing racist messages. Further, as part-White individuals, the participants in the current study may have had some personal investment in the racial status quo depending on their own proximity to Whiteness either in

phenotype, family dynamics, or cultural norms. Given the immense trauma related to experiences of racism in the United States (Jernigan et al., 2015), using a racial identity schema that denies this reality may shield part-White Multiracial individuals from fully experiencing that trauma.

Dissonance. Confusion and disorientation about race (Dissonance) was positively related to one aspect of wellbeing, psychological distress. Dissonance was related to higher levels of psychological distress, consistent with RIT and previous research findings (Helms, 1990; Torkelson, 2016). Because many part-White Multiracial individuals face considerable commentary and questioning from others about their racial backgrounds, appearance, and racial affiliations, these frequent encounters which make race salient may lead to the disorientation and distress characteristic of Dissonance. For part-White Multiracials, consciousness of the realities of racism in U.S. society was related to more symptoms of depression, anxiety, and somatization, which aligns with findings on the impact of racism on people of Color (Jernigan et al., 2015).

Immersion. Finally, withdrawal into one's racial group of Color (i.e., Asian or Black racial groups) and rejection of White culture was related to both higher self-esteem and more psychological distress. This finding partially supports previous research, and its seemingly contradictory relationships to both self-esteem and psychological distress may be explained by the dual aspects of this status. First, withdrawal into one's racial group of Color, which is theoretically associated with greater racial pride and has been supported in previous research on Multiracial adults (Torkelson, 2016), may be said to logically relate to higher self-esteem. However, since another component of this status is rejection of Whiteness, part-White individuals may also experience greater psychological distress

due to feelings of separateness and distance from their White family. Indeed, the Immersion/Emersion status may signify an ongoing experiential instance of the "forced choice" phenomenon, which previous research has found to be associated with lower self-esteem, negative affect, and heightened anxiety (Coleman & Carter, 2007; Townsend et al., 2009; Kelch-Oliver & Leslie, 2006; Torkelson et al., 2013, 2014). The contradictory findings about self-esteem and distress highlight the unique experiences of part-White Multiracials, who may experience racial identity statuses differently from those of their monoracial minority or Multiracial minority peers who exclusively view the White racial group as an out group.

Summary. Together the findings regarding the less complex statuses partially support the premise that less complex statuses would be predictive of wellbeing, and are somewhat consistent with previous findings. Namely, less complex statuses were related to well-being, but in some unpredicted ways. Conformity and Immersion/Emersion statuses seemed to bolster the self-esteem of part-White Multiracials, contradicting theory and previous research. Dissonance and Immersion/Emersion were associated with greater psychological distress, as theory would suggest. In particular, the Immersion/Emersion status relationships to well-being perhaps provided some insight into the unique ways that part-White Multiracials navigate their racial self-concept and how their majority-minority racial self-conceptions may contribute to seemingly contradictory well-being outcomes.

Further, participants' social support systems (or lack thereof) and resilience could have influenced their levels of distress and self-esteem. These factors were not measured in the current study, but previous research suggests that family and social support have a significant impact on how Multiracial people internalize their experiences with racism

and microaggressions. Further, social and family support influence how Multiracial people process the messaging that they receive about race and racial identity and can help or hinder their efforts to develop a positive self-concept.

Racial Self-Designation and Internalized Racial Identity

Multiracial theorists have contended that internal, cognitive processes underly the racial self-designation choices of Multiracial individuals, yet studies have not adequately explored the relationships between these two phenomena. Although models of Multiracial identity development have been posited, these models address stages of self-designation rather than developmental processes related to self-concept (Jacobs, 1992; Kerwin & Ponterotto, 1995; Kich, 1992; Poston, 1990; Renn, 2000; Rockquemore, 1990). Helms's (1990) Racial Identity Theory, however, describes the internal, ongoing developmental process of coming to understand oneself as a racial being and in relation to racism in society. Because only a single extant study (Speight et al., 1996) on the relationships between racial self-designation and internalized racial identity was located and it was not focused on the population of interest in the present study, a directional hypothesis was not proposed. Instead, Hypothesis 3 posited that internalized racial identity would be related to racial self-designation. That is, Multiracial individuals' internal racial struggles or resolutions might influence what labels they use.

The findings summarized in Table 7 provide partial, but substantial, support for Hypothesis 3, with three of the four PRIAS racial identity statuses being significantly related to four of the five self-designation patterns. Namely, the Dissonance, Immersion/Emersion, and Internalization statuses were predictive of all of the self-designation patterns with the exception of the Extra-Racial self-designation.

Dissonance. Confusion about issues of race (Dissonance) was related to more frequently self-designating as White and as Multiracial. The heightened distress associated with this status may result in part-White Multiracials choosing to self-designate as part of the privileged White racial group as a protective or defensive choice. Conversely, the Dissonance status may connote one's awareness of racial dynamics in society. Thus, self-designating as Multiracial – an acknowledgement of one's multiple racial group backgrounds – may reflect the heightened awareness of racial conflicts that accompanies this status. Further, because a Multiracial self-designation integrates all of an individual's backgrounds, this self-designation may promote a sense of pride in one's racial backgrounds which could be protective against the distress related to the Dissonance status. Once again, these findings may be an instance of a single racial identity status operating in two distinct ways, perhaps for different sub-populations.

Immersion. Withdrawal from the White racial group and emersion in one's racial group of Color was associated with more frequent self-designation as monoracially Asian or Black and less frequent self-designation as Multiracial. This finding seems to be in line with theory and previous findings (Speight et al., 1996) that immersion in one's racial group of Color is associated with racial pride, which in turn encourages self-designations that acknowledge one's racial group of Color. Further, for part-White Multiracials, this status' characteristic of withdrawal from all things White logically leads away from self-designations that implicitly acknowledge one's White racial heritage, such as a Multiracial self-designation, leaving a monoracial minority self-designation as the most fitting option.

Internalization. Participants high in the Internalization status showed more frequent use of designating as Multiracial and as both of their racial groups, that is, Asian and White or Black and White. This means that the integration of positive Asian or Black identification with realistic appreciation of the valuable aspects of Whiteness was associated with more frequently acknowledging these two parts of oneself. RIT theory suggests that, compared to other statuses, Internalization may provide the healthiest, most balanced perspective on the racial dynamics of both one's group of Color and Whites. Therefore, individuals' frequent use of a Multiracial or Two or More Races self-designation might possibly have occurred because they did not perceive or had resolved for themselves conflicts between their racial-group backgrounds.

Summary. In sum, the findings with regard to whether people of color's racial identity statuses are differentially related to a variety of self-labels proposed in the literature partially support Hypothesis 3; but did not follow patterns based on the differential complexity of the racial identity statuses as previous research would suggest. Part-White Multiracials, who experienced the disorientation and confusion that comes with new awareness of racism opted to acknowledge their mixed-race heritage (Multiracial) or to identify with their most privileged racial group, both of which may be protective in different ways. The Immersion/Emersion status was related to self-designation in theoretically predictable ways, with part-White Multiracials' self-designation frequency of usage mirroring the emersion in their racial group of Color and rejection of the White racial group by opting for a self-designation as Asian or Black rather than integrating their racial groups through a Multiracial self-designation.

The most complex status, Internalization, was related to self-designation choices that integrated their racial groups which supports theory suggesting that an integrated self-designation is the ultimate outcome of racial identity development. Because Internalization is the most complex racial identity status, it can be understood to be the most developed, and thus represents someone further along their developmental journey. These findings provide new insights into the connections and interplay between the internalized racial identity and self-designation choices of part-White Multiracials and suggest that they are more complicated and multifaceted than previous literature on monoracial populations would suggest.

Internalized White Racial Identity and Self-Designation

Interestingly, no studies were found concerning how or whether part-White Multiracial people grapple with the issue accepting or not accepting the White aspect of their racial background. The majority of Multiracial theorists and research implicitly or explicitly suggest that a White racial self-designation is not a healthy choice for part-White Multiracials based on assumptions that this self-designation will be rejected by society (e.g., Stonequist, 1937; Poston, 1990; Rockquemore & Brunsma, 2002a; Damann, 2008; Coleman & Carter, 2007; Field, 1996; Phillips, 2004).

With little previous research for guiding inquiries into this question concerning Whiteness, Research Question 1 was developed by extending the literature on POC racial identity and self-designation and asking whether there might be relationships between the internalized White racial identity of part-White Multiracials and their self-designation patterns (Speight et al., 1996). Internalized White racial identity was operationalized as Helms and Weber's (in progress) modified White Racial Identity Attitudes Scale, and

self-designation was operationalized using the previously used measure, which as before was created for this study that assessed the frequency with which each self-designation was used. Similarly, racial identity statuses were conceptualized as more complex and less complex in a manner consistent with White racial identity theory.

Complex Statuses and Self-Designation

Based on the findings presented in Table 8, the more complex White racial identity statuses (Pseudo-Independence, Immersion/Emersion, and Autonomy) were found to be significantly related to self-designation. These findings are further discussed below.

Pseudo-Independence. The intellectualized acceptance of one's Whiteness was related to less frequently self-designating as Asian or Black (monoracial minority) and more frequently opting out of using racial categories to self-designate (i.e., extra-racial). Because the Pseudo-Independence status is also characterized by performative tolerance of non-White racial groups, it is possible that part-White Multiracials who use this status to understand racial information may not feel positively connected to their racial group of Color. Further, because this status is characterized by an intellectualized perspective on race rather than a personal, emotional one, rather than choosing a self-designation that integrates their racial backgrounds, individuals in this status more frequently chose to forego racial categories all together. This refusal to choose may relate to the concept that part-White Multiracials' existence challenges the racial status quo which holds that racial groups are mutually exclusive, and opting out of racial categories may be a method of coping with this experience.

Immersion. When part-White Multiracials search for a personal definition of Whiteness and seek to understand racism as it relates to their Whiteness, they more frequently self-designate as White, White and Asian or White and Black, and as Multiracial. This finding may reflect that individuals using the Immersion/Emersion schema have a realistic but healthy view of Whiteness and are able to accept the White part of their identity, despite the fact that Whiteness is privileged over their other racial group in society's racial hierarchy. By having to search for a personal definition and understanding of Whiteness and racism, part-White Multiracial individuals may be able to integrate their White identity into other aspects of their self-concept in a positive way. Further, though the boundaries of Whiteness are heavily policed in society, by seeking a personal definition of Whiteness, this status may have allowed the part-White Multiracials in the present study to more frequently use a White self-designation because they were in the process of defining Whiteness for themselves.

Autonomy. Finally, when part-White Multiracials in this study used personal standards to define a positive White identity and were actively engaged in antiracism, they also more frequently self-designated as a monoracial minority. Because this status involves not only having an internal definition of Whiteness, but also active engagement with antiracism, it may be supportive of self-designating as Asian or Black while also having a healthy view of one's White heritage without feeling like a member of the White racial group.

Less Complex Statuses

The less complex White racial identity statuses (Contact, Disintegration, and Reintegration), characterized by an unhealthy White identity and obliviousness to racial

dynamics, were not significantly related to self-designations. In this sample, visual inspection suggests that mean scores and score ranges for the less complex statuses were lower than for the more complex statuses discussed above (Table3). Because part-White Multiracials are not often viewed or accepted as White by society, and therefore are not afforded the chance to be oblivious to race, it makes sense that they would have lower scores for these schemas. Further, because of the lack of awareness and examination of race characteristic of these statuses, it could be expected that individuals with higher endorsement of these statuses may not spend time contemplating their own race and thus their racial identity status may not be very related to how they self-designate.

Summary. Taken together, these findings provide initial insight into the relationships between part-White Multiracials' internalized White racial identity and their patterns of self-designating. Although no literature was found relating to these relationships, the findings obtained in the present study suggest a complex developmental process through which part-White Multiracials come to understand their own Whiteness and the ways in which this understanding possibly influences their choices of how to present themselves to the world through racial labels.

Internalized White Racial Identity and Well-Being

One rationale for selecting part-White Multiracial people as the focus of the present study was that the White and Asian or Black parts of themselves might be in conflict given that conflictual racial dynamics occur in society. Some theorists contend that being Multiracial or using the wrong self-designation (e.g., accepting others' definitions rather than one's own self-definition) is related to poor mental health outcomes (Jacobs, 1992; Kerwin & Ponterotto, 1995; Kich, 1992; Poston, 1990;

Rockquemore & Brunsma, 2002a; Stonequist, 1937) The sole study on the racial identity and well-being of White adults suggested the Disintegration status of the White racial identity model was related to lower self-esteem in White individuals (Franks, 2001). The research question concerning well-being in the present study was informed by Multiracial theory, the aforementioned study, and research on POC racial identity and well-being. The question asked what, if any, relationships existed between internalized White racial identity and well-being in part-White Multiracial adults.

As summarized in Table 9, the Disintegration status was the only White racial identity status significantly predictive of psychological distress, while none of the statuses were related to self-esteem. Specifically, Disintegration was related to higher levels of distress. This is theoretically consistent with the findings of Franks (2001), as lower self-esteem is conceptually consistent with higher levels of distress. In White racial identity theory, Disintegration is characterized by anxiety and confusion associated with the moral dilemmas of being privileged because one is White.

When part-White Multiracials in the present study were experiencing Disintegration, they reported higher levels of psychological distress. For a part-White person, moral dilemmas may be experienced differently than they are for monoracial White individuals. For example, a part-White Multiracial person may not only feel distressed by the racial moral dilemma, but may also struggle with the question of where their in-group loyalty should lie in such a scenario. For monoracial White people, Helms theorizes that the choice posed to White people in a situation that provokes Disintegration is between in-group (White) loyalty and humanism. For part-White Multiracial people, this may present as an instance of forced choice in which they feel they must identify a

single racial group to be loyal to, rather than including all of their racial background groups.

Furthermore, given the firm boundaries around Whiteness in society, it is possible that part-White Multiracials have received many messages about not actually being part of the White racial group, so such a dilemma may be compounded by feelings of exclusion from the White racial group. Further, often dependent on their phenotype, part-White Multiracials may have felt excluded from their racial group of Color, so a racial moral dilemma may force them to acknowledge their relationships to both racial groups and, depending on their feelings of acceptance and affiliation with each group, their distress may be due to considerably complicated questions of loyalty.

Additionally, this moral dilemma may represent an internal conflict between the parts of one's self for part-White Multiracials, and threaten their sense of an integrated, cohesive sense of self. Not only do part-White Multiracial people have to consider group loyalty when faced with this dilemma, but this moral dilemma may evoke questions of their own identity and racial self-designation. Interestingly, both racial identity models propose that people's internal conflicts around moral dilemmas occurs in response to external racial dynamics, but perhaps for Multiracials, the conflict is elicited by internal moral dilemmas.

Although only one White racial identity status was found to be related to the well-being constructs, this finding provides some initial insight into the ways that part-White Multiracial people's internalized White racial identity may impact their psychological adjustment.

Summary. Together, these findings on the relationships between internalized White racial identity, self-designation, and well-being represent the first study of the internalized White racial identity of part-White Multiracials, and establish a basis for future research to expand upon. These findings indicate that internalized White racial identity might be involved in the identity development of part-White Multiracial people, and that their White racial identity development may have an impact on both their well-being and their racial self-designation. These insights support integrative and fluid Multiracial identity theorists' (Renn, 2000, 2003, 2008; Rockquemore & Brunsma, 2002a, 2002b; Root, 1990, 1996) assertions that Multiracial self-designation is multifaceted and flexible and that self-designation is part of an ongoing identity development process.

Summary

The findings of the current begin to paint a picture of the dynamics between part-White Multiracials' internalized POC and White racial identity and the linkages between their internalized racial identity statuses and racial self-designation and well-being. First, while racial self-designation was not found to be related to self-esteem or psychological distress, racial self-designation patterns were predicted by both POC and White internalized racial identity statuses. Thus, internalized racial identity may be the intrapsychic processes that theorists have suggested are underlying Multiracial people's patterns and choices of self-designation. Part-White Multiracials' use of different self-designation patterns varied in relation to both their White and POC racial identity statuses, indicating that these two racial identity models were useful in capturing some of

the part-White Multiracial experience, as well as discovering that their internal sense of self as a racial being influences their outward racial self-designation.

Moreover, part-White Multiracial people seem to "break the mold" when it comes to the ways their racial identity relates to their well-being, as the current findings consistently differed from patterns found in the previous literature. Namely, less complex POC racial identity statuses did not uniformly predict poorer well-being outcomes, but rather showed mixed relationships with self-esteem and distress. These findings may reflect the influence of part-White Multiracials' relationships to their Whiteness, which may sometimes act as a buffer to the negative psychological effects usually associated with less complex racial identity statuses. Importantly, these findings highlight that White racial identity may be salient for part-White Multiracial adults, which is a question that has seemingly never before been explored empirically. This finding supports calls from multiracial scholars to avoid automatically categorizing part-White Multiracials as POC in research and in practice and indicates that understanding how individuals' self-designate and what their racial backgrounds mean to them are important.

The present study illustrated the unique interplay of part-White Multiracial people's POC and White racial identities in both their ways of presenting themselves to the world and their own internal well-being. Taken together, the findings obtained in the present study provide a basis for further exploration of the complex dynamics involved in part-White Multiracials' development of a self-concept as it relates to race, which in turn may impact their psychological adjustment.

Limitations

In this study, there were a number of methodological and logistical limitations that should be considered when interpreting these results.

Sample Considerations

First, this study focused on only the two largest subgroups of the Multiracial population, Asian-Whites and Black-Whites. Though this study focused on individuals with one White parent, the racial background of participants was restricted to those with one Black or one Asian parent, rather than including all racial groups of color. Therefore, these results may not be generalizable beyond the Black/White and Asian/White multiracial populations. Additionally, it was not possible to conduct targeted recruitment of part-White Multiracial individuals who identified as White. Race and culturally based organizations and professional associations were some of the places where the study was advertised, but no organizations were located that were specifically composed of part-White Multiracials who identified as White. Therefore, this study may not have captured the full diversity of self-designations present in the part-White Multiracial population and may have an overrepresentation of those who self-designate in ways other than monoracial White.

Further, some participants described having more than two racial group affiliations, but met inclusion criteria by providing a single racial designation for each of their parents, which was then used to categorize participants and screen them for inclusion. This means that some of the nuance of participants' manner of perceiving their racial backgrounds was obscured the analyses. Further, this implies that the participants in this study may not classify themselves in the same ways as they classify their

biological parents, which again highlights the complexities of Multiracial self-designation and presents measurement challenges for this study and future research. This points to the need for development of measures that allow for more detailed and descriptive reporting of self-designation, and for mixed-methods studies to more thoroughly and accurately examine racial self-designation in the Multiracial population. However, this characteristic of the sample reflects the reality of mixed racial heritage in the U.S., which is that even individuals who are ostensibly "monoracial" may have some multiracial heritage that is not reflected in their self-designation or the self-designations of their parents and grandparents.

Second, recruitment for this study began during the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic in March 2020, which caused a marked drop in response rate and resulted in ongoing recruitment efforts through February 2021. The extension of the recruitment period meant that some responses were collected during and after the widespread police violence against Black civilians and corresponding Black Lives Matter protests in the summer of 2020. These highly publicized, racially salient events may have impacted the racial identity schemas of study participants (Helms, 1990). Experiences of traumatic racist events have been shown to impact internalized racial identity development, specifically, such events may trigger development of more complex schemas (Helms et al., 2012). Perhaps future researchers should include a racial climate measure so that they can explore the effects of context on the types of constructs investigated in the present study.

Third, it is possible that the COVID-19 pandemic had an impact on the overall well-being scores of the study's sample. Because pre and post-tests were not conducted to

assess for participants' baseline well-being prior to the pandemic, it is unknown how the pandemic might have affected the sense of well-being of the sample and, therefore, their well-being scores. Some research has demonstrated that the COVID-19 pandemic had an overall negative impact on people's mental health, with higher rates of depression, anxiety, post-traumatic stress disorder, stress and distress being reported (Xiong et al., 2020). It might be useful to compare the present sample's mean wellbeing scores to some samples' scores obtained in studies pre-COVID-19, even if the samples are not Multiracial.

Measurement Considerations

In most respects it was necessary to invent measures or modify measures so that I could address questions that had not previously been addressed in the manner that I thought was most appropriate. The self-designation measure and the WRIAS were each modified in some way that might have affected the results of the study.

Racial Self-Designation. The measure created for this study to assess racial self-designation was not piloted and may have been an insufficient method of measuring this construct. A frequency scale was used to allow participants to indicate their use of each of the five self-designation patterns; yet the phrasing of the frequency scale may have been confusing for participants. Specifically, the extra-racial self-designation, which was represented by the phrase, "I do not identify with a racial group/I do not believe in racial categories" may have made selecting a frequency response difficult because of the grammatical messiness in the combination of the prompt and the response options. For example, one response option to this question could be read as "I rarely [sic] do not identify with a racial group/do not believe in racial categories". A more coherent way to

understand this response option would be “I rarely opt out of identifying with a racial group.” However, the wording in the measure did not present this more cogent phrasing to participants thus they may have found responding to this prompt confusing.

Other researchers might complain that I did not assign participants to only one racial self-designation and, therefore, the results of the present study might not be directly comparable to previous theory and literature. Nevertheless, misuse of mutually exclusive categories was a rationale for developing a measure that permitted more flexible self-designations. An advantage of the measurement approach used in the present study is that researchers could actually determine whether or which designations a person used most often if that knowledge was important for some reason.

Alternative ways of measuring self-designation might be to use a rank-order response format, which would not require participants to make forced-choice decisions, but would enable researchers to use participants’ highest ranked selection in analyses. Nevertheless, rank-order scales create statistical problems associated with ipsative scales, including challenges with multivariate analyses due to the inherent interrelatedness of ipsative scale items. This should be explored in further research on racial self-designation, and it would be important to see if the relationships between self-designation and well-being were more robust when using a rank-order format. Further, the addition of a ‘Person of Color’ option might be an improvement on the racial self-designation measure, as this has become a more common way of self-designating among some part-White Multiracial adults. Future research should include this self-designation option, as it may help to better encompass the complexity and variety of self-designations among part-White Multiracials.

Finally, this study did not measure ethnic identity or the phenotype of participants. Both of these factors have been found to be related to experiences of discrimination and levels of privilege and oppression relative to other ethnic groups and people with different phenotypes. Both the phenotype and ethnic identities of participants could have influenced their experiences with racism and discrimination, which likely influenced their well-being as well as their self-perceptions and racial self-concept. For example, individuals with skin colors and features that are considered less Eurocentric would likely experience discrimination more similar to monoracial individuals of their racial group of Color. These individuals may also experience a greater sense of acceptance from their racial group of Color than individuals who appear more phenotypically White. Although this is only one example, and a myriad of factors could influence how others' reactions to one's phenotype affect the person's experiences of discrimination and group acceptance/rejection, it is important to note that phenotype is a significant factor in the Multiracial literature precisely because it may be a major influence on one's interpersonal experiences (Torkelson et al., 2013).

Ethnic group membership may also play a significant role in how one is treated by society; different ethnic groups (Japanese, Haitian, African American, Thai, etc.) have relative privilege compared to each other, in part because of their proximity to Whiteness, but also because of their unique histories in the United States. For example, the legacy of Japanese internment in the United States, or the impact of Jim Crow laws on Black Americans, both influence the current sociopolitical and racial dynamics influencing these ethnic groups. Omitting measures of phenotype and ethnic identity from this study made it impossible to explore the influence these factors may have had on the

relationships studied. On the other hand, the more one disaggregates the sample by demographic variables, the less likely it is that quantitative issues can be studied because of the unpredictable number of such characteristics that might exist in any Multiracial sample.

WRIAS. The WRIAS was modified in two ways in the current study. First, a shortened form of the WRIAS developed by Helms and Weber (in progress) was used for this study to lessen the cognitive burden on participants. The shortened version contained 36 items while the original WRIAS contained 60 items. Because the other measures in the study totaled 92 items, I decided to reduce the number of WRIAS items included in the study so that the survey was not overly long. Second, the phrasing of the WRIAS was changed slightly to reflect the racial backgrounds of the sample, producing two versions of the measure: the Asian as out-group version and the Black as out-group version. Participants were assigned to the version of the measure which referred to their racial group of Color (Asian or Black) as an out-group, a change from the original WRIAS phrasing which refers to only Black people as an out-group.

The original modified WRIAS (Helms & Weber, in progress) demonstrated similar Cronbach alpha coefficients to those found in the present study. By comparison, the respective coefficients that Helms and Weber found relative to those found in the current study were as follows: .49 vs .59 (Contact), .61 vs .61 (Disintegration), .84 vs .75 (Reintegration), .36 vs .33 (Pseudo-Independence), .84 vs .81 (Immersion/Emersion) and .40 vs .32 (Autonomy). When reliability analyses were conducted for Asian/White and Black/White participants separately, it was notable that the coefficients for the two groups differed, sometimes significantly, for each status. For Asian/White participants,

alpha coefficients were: .63 (Contact), 59 (Disintegration), .69 (Reintegration), .23 (Pseudo-Independence), .83 (Immersion/Emersion), and .53 (Autonomy). Black/White participants' coefficients were: .57 (Contact), .63 (Disintegration), .66 (Reintegration), .42 (Pseudo-Independence), .75 (Immersion/Emersion), and -.07 (Autonomy). These values indicate that the shortened versions of the WRIAS did not work very well with respect to reliability, although the modifications that I made for the current study did not significantly impact the reliability of the short-form measure for the sample as a whole. Nevertheless, for some statuses, Autonomy in particular, the modified WRIAS was significantly less reliable for one group than the other. This indicates that future research should seek to develop improved measures of White racial identity for part-White Multiracial people.

Research Design

Additionally, the length of the study survey may have contributed to the significant amount of missing data, in particular for the WRIAS measure, which was presented at the end of the study. Participants were asked to respond to 128 questions in total, including the demographics questionnaire, with most of the questions focusing on issues of race. This number of items and survey length may have been overwhelming or tiring, and perhaps explains the large percentage of the original sample (30%) that did not complete all of the items. It is also plausible that explicit focus on race was anxiety-provoking for potential participants, particularly if they were unaccustomed to talking about racial issues. Thus, there is a possibility that the less complex White racial identity statuses were not adequately represented in the study.

In addition, due to an oversight in the construction of the survey, which was designed to show Asian/White participants one version of the WRIAS and Black/White individuals another, two participants were shown both versions and one participant was shown neither. The participants who completed both versions of the WRIAS were included in the Black/White group to balance the numbers in the sample, and their Black as out-group WRIAS scores were used in the analyses. Some scholars may reasonably criticize this choice as erasing the Asian identities of these participants. In response, I would again suggest that more thorough, inclusive measures of racial background be included in future studies.

Alternatively, another option for this study would have been to modify the shortened WRIAS measure to include the phrase "Asian or Black" to describe the out-group of reference, rather than creating two separate versions which referred to only Asian or only Black out-groups. However, the responses of these two participants on the different versions were compared and showed considerable differences on some items, indicating that separate versions were useful. While comparisons between Asian/White and Black/White scores on the WRIAS were not conducted in the current study, the relationships between racial background and WRIAS scores in part-White Multiracials should be explored in future research.

Statistical Considerations

Multiple variables in the present study violated the normality assumption underlying the analyses used and statistical inference becomes less robust the further the variable distributions deviate from normality (Tabachnik & Fidell, 2019). The Measure of Multiracial Self-Designation, developed for this study, was one of the variables that

deviated from normality. However, several of these variables were not expected to be normally distributed and transformation of these variables was not reasonable because it would have significantly impeded interpretation of results. With these violations in mind, the results were interpreted cautiously and generalization of these findings may be limited.

Implications for Future Theory and Research and Clinical Practice

Implications for Multiracial Theory and Future Research

The current study is the first to examine racial self-designation, internalized racial identity and well-being in part-White Multiracial adults and provides a basis for future theory and research. This study included the development of a novel measure of racial self-designation for Multiracial people that allows individuals to report all of the self-designations they utilize, rather than imposing a forced choice scenario. Further, this was the first study to examine the internalized White racial identity of part-White Multiracials and thus the first instance of using the WRIAS with a Multiracial sample. These novel aspects of the study lend themselves to numerous possible future research directions, which are discussed below.

Future research should continue to examine the full spectrum of racial self-designation patterns used by Multiracial people. Although theory asserts that Multiracial self-designation is fluid and develops over time and qualitative studies have captured some of this fluidity, previous quantitative studies have yet to meaningfully measure racial self-designation. It is recommended that future researchers build upon the novel racial self-designation measure developed for this study and seek to develop more accurate ways to measure the full complexity of self-designation in Multiracial samples.

Internalized Racial Identity

White Racial Identity. Additionally, the internalized White racial identity of part-White Multiracials must be further explored. This was the first instance of examining the White racial identity schemas as used by part-White Multiracials. Yet previous studies have shown that some part-White Multiracials affiliate and self-designate strongly with the White racial group (Rockquemore & Arend, 2002). Further, across the spectrum of racial group affiliations and self-designation choices, it is possible that part-White Multiracials may have been raised in closer proximity to White culture than minority-minority Multiracials, due to their possible relationships with their White parent and their White relatives. Therefore, their experiences with Whiteness and their sense of their own Whiteness may be important aspects of part-White Multiracials' identity development that must be more deeply understood.

People of Color Racial Identity. The people of Color racial identity of part-White Multiracials should also be explored more thoroughly in future research. Although only some of the White racial identity statuses were significantly related to the other variables in the current study, all of the POC racial identity statuses were related to either well-being or racial self-designation. This points to the importance of part-White Multiracials' self-concepts as people of Color, and further bolsters Multiracial theory and previous research that has emphasized this point. Due to the hierarchy of racial oppression in the U.S., an important aspect of part-White Multiracials' identity development is recognition of the relative privilege and oppression associated with their racial groups (Jacobs, 1992).

To further understand how this process is experienced by part-White Multiracials, their self-concept as people of Color must be more deeply understood. For example, Black/White Multiracials may be exposed to more explicitly denigrating messages about Black people than Asian/White Multiracials, who may instead be exposed to microaggressions (frequent, subtle racist messages) that are deceptively positive on the surface, such as the "Model Minority Myth" or the view that Asian women are sexually attractive. Though Asian microaggressions and stereotypes do convey denigrating messages and have a significant negative impact on people of Asian descent (Sue et al., 2016), they vary considerably in their content and are one way that Asian oppression differs from Black oppression in the U.S. (Sue et al., 2016).

For Black/White Multiracials, messages about colorism may ostensibly convey positive evaluations of individuals with racially ambiguous features, but these messages reinforce racial hierarchies within and beyond the Black community and in fact persist in communicating that Blackness is bad. Further, other racial microaggressions targeting Black people, such as the assumption of criminality or ascriptions of low intelligence, are explicitly negative and likely impact the racial self-concept of Black/White Multiracials in significant ways. Therefore, further research expanding on the work of scholars such as Torkelson (2016) should be conducted to examine how context and messaging may impact the POC racial identity status, and the racial self-designation, of part-White Multiracials.

Summary. Further study of internalized POC and White racial identity will help create a fuller picture of part-White Multiracial internalized racial identity as a whole.

Ideally, further study will lead to the development of a model that accurately captures the internal racial identity processes of this population.

Internalized Racial Identity, Self-Designation and Well-Being

Additional research on internalized racial identity and racial self-designation in relation to other aspects of well-being would also help to expand the knowledge base of how these constructs impact the psychological adjustment of this population. The earliest research on Multiracial people was preoccupied with their maladjustment, and greater understanding of what aspects of identity and self-designation may promote or decrease distress in this population would be beneficial to the mental health field as well as for educators and parents.

Exploring a Variety of Racial Backgrounds. This study focused on two combinations of mixed-race heritage, and future research should expand upon this study to include other part-White Multiracial combinations. Although no significant differences were found between the two groups included in this study on either of the outcome variables, further study of the differences between part-White Multiracial groups in terms of their POC and White internalized racial identity and racial self-designation choices would further elucidate the relationships between these constructs.

The Need for Qualitative Research. Finally, expanding this research to include qualitative data would allow the relationships observed in the current study to be more deeply understood and highlight nuances that may be lost in strictly quantitative methods. To reiterate earlier statements, though the current study attempted to better capture the racial backgrounds and racial self-designations of the sample the current measures fell

short. Qualitative methods are needed to fully examine these complicated, fluid, and dynamic relationships.

Implications for Clinical Practice

The findings from the current study have many implications for clinical work with part-White (Asian/Black) Multiracial clients. First, the novel method of measuring racial self-designation in this study provided quantitative support for earlier qualitative research delineating various patterns of self-designation Multiracial people use. By allowing participants to indicate how often they use five different ways of self-designating, the fluidity and multidimensionality of their Multiracial self-designation was captured more accurately than is possible with a forced choice measure. Participants in this study showed a range of self-designation patterns, supporting fluid identity theorists and qualitative findings about the multiple, changing racial labels used by Multiracials (Renn, 2000, 2004; Rockquemore & Brunsma, 2002; Root, 1990).

These findings on multiple, shifting racial self-designations suggest that in clinical practice, it is important that clinicians ask their Multiracial clients about how they self-designate in an open-ended manner, rather than providing clients with yet another forced choice dilemma. Further, therapists should not assume that part-White Multiracials will identify as a Person of Color nor that they will identify as White, which might be experienced by the client as erasure of their White heritage or their Person of Color heritage. A client's racial self-designation should be incorporated into the therapist's case conceptualization, particularly as it pertains to culture and experiences of oppression and privilege, and should inform culturally relevant treatment planning. In addition to allowing clients to report multiple racial self-designations, clinicians should provide

space for clients to explore their self-designation choices and what they mean to the client.

Furthermore, therapists should not only attend to client's self-designation but to their internalized racial identity and how clients understand race and racism in relation to their own lives. The current study found significant relationships between racial identity statuses and well-being; thus, the internalized racial identity of a part-White Multiracial individual is an important consideration in therapy. Given the current racial climate in the United Stated as news coverage of police killings of Black people and anti-Asian hate crimes proliferates, clinicians should seek to understand their part-White Multiracial clients' most salient racial identity statuses, as this will allow them to more effectively support that client in the face of racial traumas.

In addition, by seeking to understand client's racial identity statuses, clinicians can more successfully provide empathic care and appreciate the client's world view. Clinicians should be aware that part-White Multiracial clients who express a lack awareness about race and racism may have more positive self-esteem, but a significant racial event could instigate the development of disorientation and confusion about race and lead to emotional distress. Indeed, part-White Multiracial clients who are experiencing confusion and disorientation about race may be at risk for increased symptoms of anxiety, depression, and somatization. Additionally, clients who espouse being strongly affiliated with their racial group of Color and actively avoid or reject Whiteness may also be at risk for increased distress, though their affiliation and pride in their minority racial group may be a protective factor that improves self-esteem.

In summary, mental health therapists and counselors should be cognizant and welcoming of the complexities of part-White Multiracial self-designation and should consider the implications that clients' internalized racial identity schemas may have for their well-being and mental health.

References

Alvarez, A. N., & Helms, J. E. (2001). Racial identity and reflected appraisals as influences on Asian Americans' racial adjustment. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 7*, 217-231. doi: http://dx.doi.org.proxy.bc.edu/10.1037/1099-9809.7.3.217

Betz, N. E., Serling, D., & Wohlgemuth, E. (1991). A new measure of self-esteem based on the concept of unconditional self-regard: Preliminary manual. The Ohio State University.

Bianchi, F. T., Zea, M. C., Belgrave, F. Z., & Echeverry, J. J. (2002). Racial identity and self-esteem among Black Brazilian men: Race matters in Brazil too! *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 8*, 157-169. doi: http://dx.doi.org.proxy.bc.edu/10.1037/1099-9809.8.2.157

Binning, K. R., Unzueta, M. M., Huo, Y. J., & Molina, L. E. (2009). The interpretation of Multiracial status and its relation to social engagement and psychological well-being. *Journal of Social Issues, 65*, 35-49. doi: http://dx.doi.org.proxy.bc.edu/10.1111/j.1540-4560.2008.01586.x

Bracey, J. R., Bamaca, M. Y., & Umana-Taylor, A. J. (2004). Examining ethnic identity and self-esteem among biracial and monoracial adolescents. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 33*, 123-132.

Brunsma, D. L., Delgado, D., & Rockquemore, K. A. (2013). Liminality in the multiracial experience: Towards a concept of identity matrix. *Identities, 20*, 481. doi: http://dx.doi.org.proxy.bc.edu/10.1080/1070289X.2013.827576

Donellan, M. B., Trzeniewski, K.H., & Robins, R. W. (2015). Measures of Self-Esteem. In G. Boyle, D. Saklofske, G. Matthews (Eds.). *Measures of Personality and Social Psychological Constructs.* Elsevier Science & Technology. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-386915-9.00006-1

Campbell, M. E., & Eggerling-Boeck, J. (2006). "What about the children?" The psychological and social well-being of multiracial adolescents. *The Sociological Quarterly*, *47*, 147-173.

Chen, G. A., LePhuoc, P., Guzmán, M. R., Rude, S. S., & Dodd, B. G. (2006). Exploring Asian American racial identity. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 12*, 461-476. doi: http://dx.doi.org.proxy.bc.edu/10.1037/1099-9809.12.3.461

Choi-Misailidis, S. (2004). *Multiracial-heritage awareness and personal affiliation: Development and validation of a new measure to assess identity in people of mixed race descent.* [Doctoral dissertation]. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering*. (620616975; 2004-99002-280).

Chong, V. (2013). *Racial identity, family, and psychological adjustment in Asian-white biracial young adults. Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering*. (1411060536; 2013-99180-045).

Coleman, V. H., & Carter, M. M. (2007). Biracial self-identification: Impact on trait anxiety, social anxiety, and depression. *Identity: An International Journal of Theory and Research, 7*, 103-114. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15283480701326018

Collins, J. F. (2000). Biracial Japanese American identity: An evolving process. *Cultural*

Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 6, 115-133. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1099-9809.6.2.115

Damann, K. M. (2008). *Relation of Multiracial identity statuses to psychosocial functioning and life satisfaction. Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering*. (621714518; 2008-99020-311).

Derogatis, L. R. (2001). *Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI)-18: Administration, scoring and procedures manual*. NCS Pearson.

Fatimilehin, I. A. (1999). Of jewel heritage: Racial socialization and racial identity attitudes amongst adolescents of mixed African-Caribbean/White parentage. *Journal of Adolescence, 22*, 303-318. doi: http://dx.doi.org.proxy.bc.edu/10.1006/jado.1999.0223

Field, L. D. (1996). Piecing together the puzzle: Self-concept and group identity in Biracial Black/White youth. In M. P. P. Root (Ed), *The Multiracial experience: Racial borders as the new frontier* (pp. 211-226). Sage Publications, Inc.

Franks, C. L. (2001). On becoming White: The relationship between White racial identity development and self-esteem. [Doctoral dissertation]. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *62*, 773. (UMI No. 3005716).

Frazier, P. A., Tix, A. P., & Barron, K. E. (2004). Testing moderator and mediator effects in counseling psychology research. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *51*, 115.

Hall, C. C. I. (1992). Please choose one: Ethnic identity choices for Biracial individuals. In M. P. P. Root (Ed), *Racially mixed people in America* (pp. 250-264). Sage Publications, Inc.

Helms, J.E. (1990). *Black and White racial identity: Theory, research and practice.*

Greenwood Press.

Helms, J. E. (1995). *An update of Helms' White and people of Color racial identity models*. Sage Publications, Inc.

Helms, J.E. (2003a). Racial identity and racial socialization as aspects of adolescents' identity development. In R. Lerner, F. Jacobs, & D. Wertlief (Eds.) *Handbook of Applied Developmental Science: Promoting Positive Child, Adolescent, and Family Development Through Research, Policies, and Programs, 1.* (pp. 143-163). Sage Publications.

Helms, J. E. (2003b). Racial identity in the social environment. In P. B. Pederson & J. C. Carey (Eds), *Multicultural counseling in schools: A practical handbook (2nd ed.)* (pp. 44-58). Allyn & Bacon.

Helms, J. E. (2005). *The people of Color (POC) Racial identity attitude scale*. Unpublished manuscript, Boston College, Chestnut Hill, MA.

Helms, J. E., Nicolas, G., & Green, C.E. (2012). Racism and Ethnoviolence as Trauma: Enhancing Professional and Research Training. *Traumatology*, 18, 65-74.

Helms, J. E., & Parham, T. A. (1996). The Racial Identity Attitude Scale. *Handbook of tests and measurements for Black populations*, *2*, 167-174.

Helms, J. E., & Weber, A. (In Progress). *The Modified White Racial Identity Attitudes Scale*. Boston College.

Herman, M. (2004). Forced to choose: Some determinants of racial identification in multiracial adolescents. *Child Development, 75*, 730-748.

Inman, A. G. (2006). South Asian women: Identities and conflicts. *Cultural Diversity and*

Ethnic Minority Psychology, 12, 306-319. doi: http://dx.doi.org.proxy.bc.edu/10.1037/1099-9809.12.2.306

Iwamoto, D. K., & Liu, W. M. (2010). The impact of racial identity, ethnic identity, Asian values, and race-related stress on Asian Americans and Asian international college students' psychological well-being. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 57*, 79-91. doi: http://dx.doi.org.proxy.bc.edu/10.1037/a0017393

Jacobs, J. H. (1992). Identity development in Biracial children. In M. P. P. Root (Ed), *Racially mixed people in America* (pp. 190-206). Sage Publications, Inc.

Jernigan, M., Green, C., Perez-Gualdron, Liu, M., Henze, K., Chen, C., Bazelais, K., Satiani, A., Mereish, E., & Helms, J. E. (2015). *#racialtraumaisreal*. Institute for the Study and Promotion of Race and Culture, Chestnut Hill, MA. Retrieved from: https://www.bc.edu/content/dam/bc1/schools/lsoe/sites/isprc/racialtraumaisreal.pdf

Jones & Bullock, US Census Bureau (2012). The Two or More Races Population: 2010 (CB12-182). Retrieved from https://www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/briefs/c2010br-13.pdf

Kerwin, C., & Ponterotto, J. G. (1995). *Biracial identity development: Theory and research*. Sage Publications, Inc.

Khanna, N. (2004). The role of reflected appraisals in racial identity: The case of Multiracial Asians. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 67*, 115-131. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/019027250406700201

Kich, G. K. (1992). The developmental process of asserting a Biracial, bicultural identity.

In M. P. P. Root (Ed), *Racially mixed people in America* (pp. 304-317). Sage Publications, Inc.

Kilson, M. (2001). *Claiming Place: Biracial Young Adults of the Post-Civil Rights Era*. Bergin & Garvey.

King, C., Phillips, C. E., Kivisalu, T. M., & O'Toole, S., K. (2015). A Reliability Generalization of the Racial Identity Attitudes Scale (RIAS), Black Racial Identity Attitudes Scale (BRIAS), People of Color Racial Identity Attitudes Scale (PRIAS), and White Racial Identity Attitudes Scale (WRIAS). *Race, Gender & Class*, *22*, 150-172. Retrieved from https://proxy.bc.edu/login?qurl=https%3A%2F%2Fsearch.proquest.com%2Fdocview%2F1757046166%3Faccountid%3D9673

Lusk, E. M., Taylor, M. J., Nanney, J. T., & Austin, C. C. (2010). Biracial identity and its relation to self-esteem and depression in mixed Black/White Biracial individuals. *Journal of Ethnic & Cultural Diversity in Social Work: Innovation in Theory, Research & Practice, 19*, 109-126. doi: http://dx.doi.org.proxy.bc.edu/10.1080/15313201003771783

Mass, A. I. (1992). Interracial Japanese Americans: The best of both worlds or the end of the Japanese American community? In M. P. P. Root (Ed.), *Racially mixed people in America* (p. 265–279). Sage Publications, Inc.

Milan, S., & Keiley, M. K. (2000). Biracial youth and families in therapy: Issues and interventions. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, *26*, 305-315.

Miville, M. L., Constantine, M. G., Baysden, M. F., & So-Lloyd, G. (2005). Chameleon

changes: An exploration of racial identity themes of multiracial people. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 52*, 507-516. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.52.4.507

Neville, H. A., Heppner, P. P., & Wang, L. (1997). Relations among racial identity attitudes, perceived stressors, and coping styles in African American college students. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 75*, 303-311. doi: http://dx.doi.org.proxy.bc.edu/10.1002/j.1556-6676.1997.tb02345.x

Parham, T. A., & Helms, J. E. (1985). Relation of racial identity attitudes to self-actualization and affective states of Black students. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 32*, 431-440. doi: http://dx.doi.org.proxy.bc.edu/10.1037/0022-0167.32.3.431

Peery, D., & Bodenhausen, G. V. (2008). Black+ White= Black: Hypodescent in reflexive categorization of racially ambiguous faces. *Psychological Science*, *19*(10), 973-977. doi: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2008.02185.x

Perry, J. C., Vance, K. S., & Helms, J. E. (2009). Using the people of color racial identity attitude scale among Asian American college students: An exploratory factor analysis. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 79*, 252-260. Doi: http://dx.doi.org.proxy.bc.edu/10.1037/a0016147

Phillips, L. (2004). Fitting in and feeling good: Patterns of self-evaluation and psychological stress among Biracial adolescent girls. *Women & Therapy, 27*, 217-236. doi: http://dx.doi.org.proxy.bc.edu/10.1300/J015v27n01_15

Phinney, J. S. (1992). The multigroup ethnic identity measure: A new scale for use with diverse groups. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 7*, 156-176.

Pierre, M. R., & Mahalik, J. R. (2005). Examining African self-consciousness and Black racial identity as predictors of Black men's psychological well-being. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 11*, 28-40. Doi: http://dx.doi.org.proxy.bc.edu/10.1037/1099-9809.11.1.28

Poston, W.S.C. (1990). "The Biracial Identity Development Model: A Needed Addition." *Journal of Counseling and Development*, *69*, 152–155.

Pyant, C. T., & Yanico, B. J. (1991). Relationship of racial identity and gender-role attitudes to Black women's psychological well-being. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 38*, 315-322. doi: http://dx.doi.org.proxy.bc.edu/10.1037/0022-0167.38.3.315

Renn, K. A. (2000). "Patterns of Situational Identity Among Biracial and Multiracial College Students." *Review of Higher Education*, *23*, 399–420.

Renn, K. A. (2003). "Understanding the Identities of Mixed-Race College Students Through a Developmental Ecology Lens." *Journal of College Student Development*, *44*, 383–403.

Renn, K. A. (2002). *Mixed Race Students in College: The Ecology of Race, Identity, and Community*. SUNY Press.

Renn, K. A. (2008). Research on biracial and multiracial identity development: Overview and synthesis. *New Directions for Student Services*, 2008, 13-21.

Rockquemore, K.A. (1999). Between Black and White: Exploring the Biracial experience. *Race and Society, 1*, 197-212.

Rockquemore, K. A., & Arend, P. (2002). Opting for white: Choice, fluidity and racial identity construction in post civil-rights America. *Race and Society, 5*(1), 49-64.

Rockquemore, K. A., and Brunsma, D. L. (2002a). *Beyond Black: Biracial Identity in America*. Sage Publications, Inc.

Rockquemore, K. A., & Brunsma, D. L. (2002b). Socially embedded identities: Theories, typologies, and processes of racial identity among Black/White Biracials. *The Sociological Quarterly, 43*, 335-356. Doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1533-8525.2002.tb00052.x

Rockquemore, K. A., Brunsma, D. L., & Delgado, D. J. (2009). Racing to theory or retheorizing race? Understanding the struggle to build a Multiracial identity theory. *Journal of Social Issues, 65*, 13-34. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.2008.01585.x

Root, M.P.P. (1990). "Resolving 'Other' Status: Identity Development of Biracial Individuals." *Women and Therapy*, *9*, 185–205.

Root, M. P. (Ed.). (1992). *Racially mixed people in America*. Sage Publications, Inc.

Root, M. P. (1996). *The multiracial experience: Racial borders as the new frontier*. Sage Publications, Inc.

Root, M. P. P. (1999). The biracial baby boom: Understanding ecological constructions of racial identity in the 21st century. In R. Hernandez Sheets (Ed), *Racial and ethnic identity in school practices: Aspects of human development* (pp. 77-100). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Rosenberg, M. (1979). *Conceiving the Self*. Basic Books.

Salahuddin, N. M., & O'Brien, K. M. (2011). Challenges and resilience in the lives of urban, multiracial adults: An instrument development study. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 58*, 494-507. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0024633

Sanchez, D. T., & Shih, M. (2004). Biracial identity and self-esteem for Multiracials: A comparative analysis. [Unpublished manuscript]. University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.

Sanchez, D. T., Shih, M., & Garcia, J. A. (2009). Juggling multiple racial identities: Malleable racial identification and psychological well-being. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 15*, 243-254. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0014373

Shih, M., & Sanchez, D. T. (2005). Perspectives and research on the positive and negative implications of having multiple racial identities. *Psychological Bulletin, 131*, 569-591. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.131.4.569

Smith, L.E. (2014). *Racial malleability and authenticity in Multiracial well-being.* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Miami]. Open Access Dissertations.

Speight, S. L., Vera, E. M., & Derrickson, K. B. (1996). Racial self-designation, racial identity, and self-esteem revisited. *Journal of Black Psychology*, *22*, 37-52.

Stephan, C. W., & Stephan, W. G. (1991). Intermarriage: Effects on personality, adjustment and intergroup relations in two samples of students. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 53*, 241–250.

Stonequist, E. V. (1937). *The marginal man: A study in personality and culture conflict*. Scribner/Simon & Schuster.

Suzuki-Crumly, J., & Hyers, L. L. (2004). The relationship among ethnic identity, psychological well-being, and intergroup competence: An investigation of two biracial groups. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 10*, 137-150. doi: http://dx.doi.org.proxy.bc.edu/10.1037/1099-9809.10.2.137

Tabachnick B. G., & Fidell L. S. (2018). *Using Multivariate Statistics*. [VitalSource Bookshelf]. Retrieved from https://bookshelf.vitalsource.com/#/books/9780134792866/

Tavakol, M., & Dennick, R. (2011). Making sense of Cronbach's alpha. *International Journal of Medical Education*, *2*, 53–55. https://doi.org/10.5116/ijme.4dfb.8dfd

Takaki, R. (2000). Asian Americans: The myth of the model minority. *Crisis in American institutions*, 185-192.

Torkelson, N.C. (2016). *A contextual model of multiracial identity and well-being* (Order No. 10102223). [Doctoral dissertation, Boston College]. Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (1785783412).

Torkelson, N.C., Helms, J.E., Wilson, E.S., & Ashby, K.M. (2013, January*). The Impact of Phenotype and Contextual Variables on Multiracial Identity Development.* [Poster session]. National Multicultural Conference and Summit 2013, Houston, TX.

Torkelson, N.C., Helms, J.E., Wilson, E.S., Ashby, K.M., & Hernandez Owusu, H. E. (2014, November*). Seeking Self: Intersecting Influences on Multiracial Identity.* [Conference session]. Critical Mixed Race Studies Conference 2014, Chicago, IL.

Townsend, S. S. M., Markus, H. R., & Bergsieker, H. B. (2009). My choice, your categories: The denial of Multiracial identities. *Journal of Social Issues, 65*, 185-204. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.2008.01594.x

Wallace, K. R. (2001). *Relative/Outsider: The Art and Politics of Identity Among Mixed Heritage Students*. Ablex.

Xiong, J., Lipsitz, O., Nasri, F., Lui, L.M., Gill, H., Phan, L., Chen-Li, D., Iacobucci, M.,

Ho, R., Majeed, A. & McIntyre, R.S., (2020). Impact of COVID-19 pandemic on mental health in the general population: A systematic review. *Journal of affective disorders*, *277*, 55-64. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2020.08.001.

Appendix A: Demographic Questionnaire

1) What is your age?

2) Gender Identity - Please select the option that best describes your gender identity

a) Female
b) Male
c) Transgender
d) Non-binary
e) Other _____

3) Socioeconomic Status
a) Lower class b) Lower Middle Class c) Middle Class
d) Upper Middle e) Upper Class

4) Where did you grow up? (City, State)
_____

5) Current Place of Residence (City, State)
_____

6) Education
a) Some high school b) High School graduate c) Some College
d) Associates Degree e) Bachelor's Degree f) Some Graduate School
g) Advanced Degree (MA, PhD, PsyD, EdD, JD, MD)

7) Race (Choose as many as apply)
a) African American/Black b) White/Caucasian c) Asian/Pacific Islander
d) White Latinx/Hispanic e) Latinx/Hispanic of Color
f) Native American

8) Race of Biological Mother (Please choose **one**)
a) African American/Black b) White/Caucasian c) Asian/Pacific Islander
d) Latinx/Hispanic e) Native American
f) Biracial/Multiracial (Please list which races) _____

9) Race of Biological Father (Please choose **one**)
a) African American/Black b) White/Caucasian c) Asian/Pacific Islander
d) Latinx/Hispanic e) Native American
f) Biracial/Multiracial (Please list which races) _____

Appendix B: Measure of Multiracial Self-Designation (MMSD)

Instructions: For each of the following statements, please indicate how often you use each self-designation option when you identify racially.

- 1 – Never
- 2 – Rarely
- 3 – Occasionally
- 4 – Often
- 5 – Always

__ "I identify as my racial group of Color"

__ "I identify as White"

__ "I identify as White and my racial group of Color"

__ "I identify as Multiracial or Biracial"

__ "I do not identify with a racial group/I do not believe in racial categories"

Coding:

1 = Monoracial Minority

2 = Monoracial White

3 = Two or More Races

4 = Multiracial

5 = Extra-Racial

Appendix C: People of Color Racial Identity Attitudes Scale (PRIAS)

(Helms, 2005)

Instructions: This questionnaire is designed to measure people's social and political attitudes concerning race and ethnicity. Since different people have different opinions, there are no right or wrong answers. Use the scale below to respond to each statement according to the way you see things. Be as honest as you can.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	**Disagree**	**Uncertain**	**Agree**	**Strongly Agree**

1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	1. In general, I believe that Whites are superior to other racial groups.
1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	2. I feel more comfortable being around Whites than I do being around people of my own race.
1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	3. In general, people of my race have not contributed very much to White society.
1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	4. I am embarrassed to be the race I am.
1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	5. I would have accomplished more in life if I had been born White.
1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	6. Whites are more attractive than people of my race.
1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	7. People of my race should learn to think and act like Whites.
1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	8. I limit myself to White activities.
1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	9. I think racial minorities blame Whites too much for their problems.
1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	10. I feel unable to involve myself in Whites' experiences, and am increasing my involvement in experiences involving people of my race.
1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	11. When I think about how Whites have treated people of my race, I feel an overwhelming anger.
1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	12. I want to know more about my culture.
1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	13. I limit myself to activities involving people of my own race.
1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	14. Most Whites are untrustworthy.
1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	15. White society would be better off if it were based on the cultural values of my people.
1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	16. I am determined to find my cultural identity.
1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	17. Most Whites are insensitive.
1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	18. I reject all White values.
1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	19. My most important goal in life is to fight the oppression of my people.
1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	20. I believe that being from my cultural background has caused me to have many strengths.

1 2 3 4 5 21. I am comfortable with people regardless of their race.
1 2 3 4 5 22. People, regardless of their race, have strengths and limitations.
1 2 3 4 5 23. I think people of my culture and the White culture differ from each other in some ways, but neither group is superior.
1 2 3 4 5 24. My cultural background is a source of pride to me.
1 2 3 4 5 25. People of my culture and White culture have much to learn from each other.
1 2 3 4 5 26. Whites have some customs that I enjoy.
1 2 3 4 5 27. I enjoy being around people regardless of their race.
1 2 3 4 5 28. Every racial group has some good people and some bad people.
1 2 3 4 5 29. Minorities should not blame Whites for all of their social problems.
1 2 3 4 5 30. I do not understand why Whites treat minorities as they do.
1 2 3 4 5 31. I am embarrassed about some of the things I feel about my people.
1 2 3 4 5 32. I am not sure where I really belong.
1 2 3 4 5 33. I have begun to question my beliefs.
1 2 3 4 5 34. Maybe I can learn something from people of my race.
1 2 3 4 5 35. White people can teach me more about surviving in this world than people of my own race can, but people of my race can teach me more about being human.
1 2 3 4 5 36. I don't know whether being the race I am is an asset or a deficit.
1 2 3 4 5 37. Sometimes I think Whites are superior and sometimes I think they're inferior to people of my race.
1 2 3 4 5 38. Sometimes I am proud of the racial group to which I belong and sometimes I am ashamed of it.
1 2 3 4 5 39. Thinking about my values and beliefs takes up a lot of my time.
1 2 3 4 5 40. I'm not sure how I feel about myself.
1 2 3 4 5 41. White people are difficult to understand.
1 2 3 4 5 42. I find myself replacing old friends with new ones who are from my culture.
1 2 3 4 5 43. I feel anxious about some of the things I feel about people of my race.
1 2 3 4 5 44. When someone of my race does something embarrassing in public, I feel embarrassed.
1 2 3 4 5 45. When both White people and people of my race are present in a social situation, I prefer to be with my own racial group.
1 2 3 4 5 46. My values and beliefs match those of Whites more than they do people of my race.
1 2 3 4 5 47. The way Whites treat people of my race makes me angry.
1 2 3 4 5 48. I only follow the traditions and customs of people of my racial group.

1 2 3 4 5 49. When people of my race act like Whites I feel angry.
1 2 3 4 5 50. I am comfortable being the race I am.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission

Appendix D: Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSES)

(Rosenberg, 1979)

Instructions: Below is a list of statements dealing with your general feelings about yourself. Please record the appropriate answer for each item, depending on whether you Strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree with it.

1 = Strongly agree
2 = Agree
3 = Disagree
4 = Strongly disagree

_____ 1. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.

_____ 2. At times I think I am no good at all.

_____ 3. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.

_____ 4. I am able to do things as well as most other people.

_____ 5. I feel I do not have much to be proud of.

_____ 6. I certainly feel useless at times.

_____ 7. I feel that I'm a person of worth.

_____ 8. I wish I could have more respect for myself.

_____ 9. All in all, I am inclined to think that I am a failure.

_____ 10. I take a positive attitude toward myself.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Appendix E: Brief Symptom Inventory 18 (BSI 18)

(Derogatis, 2001)

These items are copyrighted.

Appendix F: Modified White Racial Identity Attitudes Scale (WRIAS)

(Helms & Weber, In Progress)

Directions: These questions are designed to measure people's attitudes about social and political issues. There are no right or wrong answers. Different people have different viewpoints. So try to be as honest as you can. Beside each statement, circle the number that best describes how you feel. Use the scale below to respond to each statement.

1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree		**Disagree**	**Uncertain**	**Agree**	**Strongly Agree**
1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	1. I get angry when I think about how Whites have been treated by {*Blacks or Asians*}.
1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	2. I am making a special effort to understand the significance of being White.
1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	3. I involve myself in causes regardless of the race of the people involved in them.
1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	4. I find myself watching {*Black or Asian*} people to see what they are like.
1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	5. I feel depressed after I have been around {*Black or Asian*} people.
1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	6. I am taking definite steps to define an identity for myself that includes working against racism.
1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	7. I seek out new experiences even if I know that no other Whites will be involved in them.
1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	8. I wish I had more {*Black or Asian*} friends.
1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	9. I do not believe that I have the social skills to interact with {*Black or Asian*} people effectively.
1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	10. {*A Black or an Asian*} person who tries to get close to you is usually after something.
1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	11. {*Blacks or Asians*} and Whites have much to learn from each other.
1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	12. I just refuse to participate in discussions about race.
1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	13. I would rather socialize with Whites only.
1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	14. I believe that {*Blacks or Asians*} would not be different from Whites if they had been given the same opportunities.
1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	15. I believe that I receive special privileges because I am White.
1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	16. When {*a Black or an Asian*} person holds an opinion with which I disagree, I am not afraid to express my opinion.
1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	17. It is possible for {*Blacks or Asians*} and Whites to have meaningful social relationships with each other.

1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	18. I am making an effort to decide what type of White person I want to be.
1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	19. I am curious to learn in what ways {*Black or Asian*} people and White people differ from each other.
1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	20. Society may have been unfair to {*Blacks or Asians*}, but it has been just as unfair to Whites.
1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	21. I am examining how racism relates to who I am.
1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	22. I am comfortable being myself in situations in which there are no other White people.
1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	23. When I interact with {*Black or Asian*} people, I usually let them make the first move because I do not want to offend them.
1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	24. I feel hostile when I am around {*Blacks or Asians*}.
1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	25. I believe that {*Black or Asian*} people know more about racism than I do.
1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	26. I am involved in discovering how other White people have positively defined themselves as White people.
1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	27. I believe that {*Blacks or Asians*} are inferior to Whites.
1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	28. I am becoming aware of the strengths and limitations of my White culture.
1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	29. I think that White people must end racism in this country because they created it.
1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	30. Think that dating {*Black or Asian*} people is a good way for White people to learn about {*Black or Asian*} culture.
1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	31. Sometimes I am not sure what I think or feel about {*Black or Asian*} people.
1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	32. {*Blacks or Asians*} and Whites differ from each other in some ways, but neither race is superior.
1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	33. I think White people should become more involved in socializing with {*Blacks or Asians*}.
1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	34. I do not understand why {*Black or Asian*} people blame me for their social misfortunes.
1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	35. I believe that Whites are more attractive and express themselves better than {*Blacks or Asians*}.
1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	36. I am continually examining myself to make sure that my way of being White is not racist

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.