

# Beyond Black and White: Biracial Attitudes in Contemporary U.S. Politics

## Appendices

Lauren Davenport\*

### **A-1 Freshman Surveys Format and Methodology**

The Freshman Survey is traditionally administered as a paper survey, but is also available on the web. All degree-granting, accredited institutions of higher education that respond to the U.S. Department of Education's Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) are invited to participate in the Freshman Surveys (Sax et al. 2001).

CIRP also collects data on the national population of all higher education institutions that admit first-time freshmen, grant at least a baccalaureate-level degree, and are listed in the Opening Fall Enrollment of the U.S. Department of Education's IPEDS. All operating institutions that meet these requirements and have a first-time, full-time freshman class of at least 25 students are included in the national population of institutions. Importantly, this national population includes those of "higher education," not "postsecondary education"; most proprietary, special vocational and semiprofessional programs are excluded. Only institutions with regional accreditation are included. The population of eligible institutions, by institution type, along with my Freshman Survey sample of institutions, are listed in Table A-1.

All institutions that are eligible to participate in the Freshman Surveys, including two-year colleges, are divided into stratification groups based on *type* (two-year college, four-year college,

---

\*Assistant Professor, Stanford University, Department of Political Science, 305 Encina Hall West, 616 Serra Street, Stanford, CA 94035-6044; phone: 650-725-2435; fax: 650-723-1808; email: ldd@stanford.edu.

or university); *control* (public, private nonsectarian, Catholic, or Other Religious); *selectivity level* (low, medium, high, or very high); and *institutional race* (predominantly non-Black or predominantly Black).<sup>1</sup> The institutional sample size, as well as the number of participating respondents in my dataset, are listed by survey year in Table A-2.

<sup>1</sup>Institutional selectivity level is based on the average composite SAT score of the entering class. See Sax et al. (2001, 2002, 2003) for additional information.

## A-2 Question Wording, Coding, and Supplementary Analyses

### Question Wording and Response Coding

#### Demographic Covariates

**Race:** “Please indicate the ethnic background of yourself, your father, and your mother. (Mark all that apply in each column.)”

**Mother’s race:** Mother’s race is coded as “Black” if Black and no other race is marked, or as “White” if White and no other race is marked.

**Father’s race:** Father’s race is coded as “Black” if Black and no other race is marked, or as “White” if White and no other race is marked.

**Respondent’s race:** Only respondents who have two White parents, two Black parents, or one White parent and one Black parent are examined. Respondent’s race is coded as singularly “Black” if Black and no other race is marked; singularly “White” if White and no other race is marked; and “White-Black” if White and Black and no other race is marked.

**Gender:** 0=Male, 1=Female.

**Home region:** Indicators created for 5 areas: South (AL, AR, FL, GA, KY, LA, MO, MS, NC, OK, SC, TN, TX, VA, WV); Pacific West (AK, CA, HI, OR, WA); Midwest (IL, IN, IA, MI, MN, OH, WI); Mountains/Plains (AZ, CO, ID, KS, MT, NE, NV, NM, ND, SD, UT, WY); Northeast (CT, DC, ME, MD, MA, NH, NJ, NY, PA, RI, VT).

**Population Density:** Logged values for respondent’s zip code population density (matching respondents’ Freshman Survey zip codes with 2000 Census data).

**Median Household Income:** Median income of respondent’s zip code (“median income” as defined by 2000 Census data); all incomes coded continuously.

**Percent Black non-Hispanic:** Percent of respondent’s zip code that identified as Black, non-Hispanic (as defined by 2000 Census data).

**Father’s education:** “What is the highest level of formal education obtained by [your father]?” Indicators created for High school diploma or less; Some college; College degree; and Some graduate school or graduate degree.

**Mother's education:** "What is the highest level of formal education obtained by [your mother]?" Indicators created for High school diploma or less; Some college; College degree; and Some graduate school or graduate degree.

**Income:** "What is your best estimate of your parents' total income last year? Consider income from all sources before taxes." Indicators created for: \$29,999 or less; \$30,000-\$59,999; \$60,000-\$99,999; \$100,000 or more.

**Parents' status:** "Are your parents both alive and living with each other; both alive, divorced or living apart; [or] one or both deceased?" Two indicators: Parents living together; parent(s) deceased or living apart.

**Religion:** "Current religious preference." Indicators created for Baptist, Roman Catholic, Jewish, Other Christian (including Eastern Orthodox, Episcopal, LDS, Lutheran, Methodist, Presbyterian, Quaker, Seventh Day Adventist, Unitarian, United Church of Christ), Other Religion (including Buddhist, Muslim, and Hindu), and No religion.

## Explicitly Racial Issues

**Racial discrimination:** "Racial discrimination is no longer a major problem in the U.S.": 0=Agree Strongly, 0.33=Agree Somewhat, 0.67=Disagree Somewhat, 1=Disagree Strongly.

**Racial understanding:** "Importance of helping to promote racial understanding.": 0=Not Important, 0.33=Slightly Important, 0.67=Very Important, 1=Essential.

**Affirmative action:** "Affirmative action in college admissions should be abolished.": 0=Agree Strongly, 0.33=Agree Somewhat, 0.67=Disagree Somewhat, 1=Disagree Strongly.

## Implicitly Racial Issues

**Criminals' rights:** "There is too much concern in the courts for the rights of criminals." 0=Agree Strongly, 0.33=Agree Somewhat, 0.67=Disagree Somewhat, 1=Disagree Strongly.

**Death penalty:** "The death penalty should be abolished." 0=Disagree Strongly, 0.33=Disagree Somewhat, 0.67=Agree Somewhat, 1=Agree Strongly.

**Gun prevention:** "The federal government should do more to control the sale of handguns." 0=Disagree Strongly, 0.33=Disagree Somewhat, 0.67=Agree Somewhat, 1=Agree Strongly.

## Nonracial Social Issues

**Abortion:** “Abortion should be legal.”: 0=Disagree Strongly, 0.33=Disagree Somewhat, 0.67=Agree Somewhat, 1=Agree Strongly.

**Married women:** “The activities of married women are best confined to the home and family.” 0=Agree Strongly, 0.33=Agree Somewhat, 0.67=Disagree Somewhat, 1=Disagree Strongly.

**Same-sex marriage:** “Same-sex couples should have the right to legal marital status.”: 0=Disagree Strongly, 0.33=Disagree Somewhat, 0.67=Agree Somewhat, 1=Agree Strongly.

Table A-1: INSTITUTIONAL POPULATION AND SAMPLE: NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS BY TYPE AND YEAR.

	2001		2002		2003	
	Population	Sample	Population	Sample	Population	Sample
Public university - low select	46	11	48	12	48	12
Public university - medium select	37	13	34	10	34	11
Public university - high select	41	20	42	23	42	18
Private university - medium select	25	20	24	18	23	18
Private university - high select	22	14	21	13	22	14
Private university - very high select	23	15	25	17	25	17
Public 4-yr college - low select	119	37	118	25	118	29
Public 4-yr college - medium select	134	46	135	47	135	41
Public 4-yr college - high select	89	39	88	32	88	29
Public 4-yr college - unknown select	19	3	21	3	23	4
Nonsectarian 4-yr college - low select	103	33	98	25	104	29
Nonsectarian 4-yr college - medium select	90	42	90	47	91	37
Nonsectarian 4-yr college - high select	93	56	91	56	91	53
Nonsectarian 4-yr college - very high select	50	41	55	45	54	43
Nonsectarian 4-yr college - unknown select	48	8	47	7	53	6
Catholic 4-yr college - low select	59	26	59	28	60	23
Catholic 4-yr college - medium select	56	32	58	31	57	33
Catholic 4-yr college - high select	50	35	51	37	51	36
Catholic 4-yr college - unknown select	4	1	4	1	4	1
Other religious 4-yr college - very low select	54	17	51	11	51	15
Other religious 4-yr college - low select	69	28	72	37	72	23
Other religious 4-yr college - medium select	94	37	94	42	94	32
Other religious 4-yr college - high select	90	62	94	72	94	66
Other religious 4-yr college - unknown select	21	3	21	2	21	1
Public 2-yr college - very low enroll	—	3	—	2	—	3
Public 2-yr college - low enroll	—	4	—	4	—	2
Public 2-yr college - medium enroll	—	6	—	4	—	5
Public 2-yr college - high enroll	—	2	—	1	—	1
Public 2-yr college - very high enroll	—	7	—	4	—	7
Private 2-yr college - very low enroll	—	2	—	2	—	2
Private 2-yr college - low enroll	—	10	—	8	—	6
Private 2-yr college - medium enroll	—	3	—	1	—	2
Private 2-yr college - high enroll	—	2	—	1	—	0
Public 4-yr college - predom Black	37	9	37	11	37	13
Nonsectarian 4-yr college - predom Black	48	7	47	6	47	5
Public 2-yr college - predom Black	—	1	—	1	—	1
Private 2-yr college - predom Black	—	1	—	1	—	0
Other religious college 4-yr - predom Black	—	6	—	7	—	6
Catholic 4-yr college - predom Black	—	0	—	1	—	1
Public university - predom Black	—	1	—	0	—	0
Private university - predom Black	—	1	—	1	—	1
Institutional Type unknown	—	41	—	1	—	3
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,521</b>	<b>745</b>	<b>1,525</b>	<b>697</b>	<b>1,539</b>	<b>649</b>

Notes: “—” indicates information not available. See Sax et al. (2001, 2002, 2003) for additional information.

Table A-2: INSTITUTIONAL SAMPLE: NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS BY TYPE AND YEAR.

	2001		2002		2003	
	Schools	Students	Schools	Students	Schools	Students
Public university - low select	11	11,887	12	19,213	12	17,380
Public university - medium select	13	29,306	10	24,446	11	24,524
Public university - high select	20	51,900	23	59,378	18	49,691
Private university - medium select	20	19,116	18	18,628	18	20,748
Private university - high select	14	19,734	13	14,023	14	15,724
Private university - very high select	15	15,404	17	17,542	17	18,969
Public 4-yr college - low select	37	23,770	25	15,919	29	19,861
Public 4-yr college - medium select	46	41,124	47	41,489	41	36,135
Public 4-yr college - high select	39	37,192	32	34,486	29	27,223
Public 4-yr college - unknown select	3	870	3	1,762	4	1,143
Nonsectarian 4-yr college - low select	33	9,541	25	5,587	29	7,466
Nonsectarian 4-yr college - medium select	42	13,262	47	15,190	37	14,448
Nonsectarian 4-yr college - high select	56	23,255	56	21,110	53	22,014
Nonsectarian 4-yr college - very high select	41	16,770	45	19,197	43	19,026
Nonsectarian 4-yr college - unknown select	8	2,111	7	961	6	893
Catholic 4-yr college - low select	26	5,338	28	6,020	23	5,481
Catholic 4-yr college - medium select	32	7,702	31	7,463	33	8,165
Catholic 4-yr college - high select	35	16,744	37	17,619	36	16,680
Catholic 4-yr college - unknown select	1	84	1	108	1	7
Other religious 4-yr college - very low select	17	3,464	11	2,131	15	2,709
Other religious 4-yr college - low select	28	6,814	37	8,523	23	5,406
Other religious 4-yr college - medium select	37	9,468	42	10,250	32	7,783
Other religious 4-yr college - high select	62	22,261	72	26,519	66	24,934
Other religious 4-yr college - unknown select	3	281	2	430	1	93
Public 2-yr college - very low enroll	3	507	2	154	3	269
Public 2-yr college - low enroll	4	750	4	759	2	223
Public 2-yr college - medium enroll	6	1,305	4	996	5	1,477
Public 2-yr college - high enroll	2	704	1	604	1	658
Public 2-yr college - very high enroll	7	4,254	4	3,135	7	3,648
Private 2-yr college - very low enroll	2	341	2	207	2	192
Private 2-yr college - low enroll	10	1,290	8	1,241	6	1,088
Private 2-yr college - medium enroll	3	837	1	90	2	410
Private 2-yr college - high enroll	2	929	1	637	0	0
Public 4-yr college - predom Black	9	4,301	11	4,192	13	6,112
Nonsectarian 4-yr college - predom Black	7	2,308	6	1,579	5	1,575
Public 2-yr college - predom Black	1	58	1	278	1	321
Private 2-yr college - predom Black	1	57	1	68	0	0
Other religious college 4-yr - predom Black	6	2,045	7	2,409	6	1,368
Catholic 4-yr college - predom Black	0	0	1	764	1	683
Public university - predom Black	1	219	0	0	0	0
Private university - predom Black	1	660	1	326	1	383
Institutional Type unknown	41	2,893	1	142	3	3,599
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>745</b>	<b>410,856</b>	<b>697</b>	<b>405,575</b>	<b>649</b>	<b>38,8509</b>

Notes: See Sax et al. (2001, 2002, 2003) for additional information.

Table A-3: DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS AND PERCENTAGE OF BIRACIALS IDENTIFYING AS WHITE, WHITE-BLACK, OR BLACK. N=3,448.

	N	Percent of Sample	Percent Identifying as White	Percent Identifying as White-Black	Percent Identifying as Black
Overall Total	3,448	100.0	7.0	54.6	38.4
Parents' Races					
White Mother, Black Father	2,646	76.7	6.8	56.6	36.6
Black Mother, White Father	802	23.3	7.6	48.1	44.3
Parents' Marital Status					
Married Parents	1,646	48.5	8.1	55.0	36.9
Unmarried Parents	1,747	51.5	5.9	54.4	39.7
Gender					
Male	1,621	47.1	7.7	46.7	45.6
Female	1,822	52.9	6.4	61.7	31.9
Family Income					
Less than \$30,000	742	23.8	5.7	54.5	39.9
\$30,000-\$59,999	931	29.9	6.4	53.8	39.7
\$60,000-\$99,999	799	25.7	6.0	54.2	39.8
\$100,000 or more	640	20.6	10.3	57.0	32.7
White Parent's Education					
High School or Less	975	28.3	7.0	52.5	40.5
Some College	851	24.7	7.2	55.2	37.6
College Grad	890	25.8	8.1	53.2	38.8
Grad School	732	21.2	5.5	58.6	35.9
Black Parent's Education					
High School or Less	1,159	33.6	6.8	53.9	39.3
Some College	821	23.8	6.3	57.3	36.4
College Grad	763	22.1	7.9	53.7	38.4
Grad School	705	20.5	7.1	53.8	39.2
Religion					
Baptist	519	15.7	4.4	46.8	48.8
Catholic	544	16.5	6.8	56.1	37.1
Other Christian	1,117	33.8	7.0	55.5	37.5
Jewish	72	2.2	23.6	41.7	34.7
Other Religion	182	5.5	11.0	50.0	39.0
No Religion	867	26.3	6.7	58.8	34.5
Region					
South	715	22.1	7.6	46.9	45.6
Pacific	566	17.5	6.7	61.3	32.0
Midwest	697	21.5	5.3	57.7	37.0
Northeast	1,074	33.2	7.4	56.7	35.9
Mountains/Plains	188	5.8	9.0	49.5	41.5
Zip Code Median Household Income					
Lowest Quartile	961	30.6	5.3	51.0	43.7
Highest Quartile	525	16.7	11.1	56.4	32.6
Zip Code Population Density			7		
Lowest Quartile	514	16.3	10.3	47.5	42.2
Highest Quartile	1,134	36.1	5.2	59.7	35.1

Table A-4: ORDERED LOGISTIC REGRESSION PREDICTING SUPPORT FOR EXPLICITLY RACIAL ISSUES—WHITE IDENTIFIERS.

	Racism Major Problem	Promote Racial Understanding	Affirmative Action
Biracial White	0.14 (0.16)	<b>0.49 (0.16)</b>	<b>0.47 (0.16)</b>
Black Mother/White Father	-0.44 (0.34)	-0.48 (0.32)	0.04 (0.33)
Parents Not Currently Together	<b>0.10 (0.03)</b>	<b>0.11 (0.03)</b>	0.06 (0.03)
Female	<b>0.42 (0.03)</b>	<b>0.30 (0.03)</b>	<b>0.48 (0.03)</b>
Father—Some College	0.01 (0.04)	0.06 (0.04)	<b>-0.08 (0.04)</b>
Father—College Graduate	0.03 (0.04)	0.04 (0.04)	<b>-0.13 (0.04)</b>
Father—Graduate School	<b>0.10 (0.05)</b>	<b>0.26 (0.05)</b>	<b>-0.11 (0.05)</b>
Mother—Some College	<b>0.07 (0.04)</b>	<b>0.11 (0.04)</b>	<b>-0.15 (0.04)</b>
Mother—College Graduate	<b>0.09 (0.04)</b>	0.08 (0.04)	<b>-0.11 (0.04)</b>
Mother—Graduate School	<b>0.22 (0.05)</b>	<b>0.25 (0.05)</b>	0.02 (0.05)
Income—\$30,000-\$59,999	-0.03 (0.04)	<b>-0.11 (0.04)</b>	<b>-0.10 (0.04)</b>
Income—\$60,000-\$99,999	0.02 (0.05)	<b>-0.15 (0.05)</b>	<b>-0.20 (0.05)</b>
Income—\$100,000+	-0.05 (0.05)	<b>-0.13 (0.05)</b>	<b>-0.28 (0.05)</b>
Baptist	<b>-0.48 (0.06)</b>	<b>-0.17 (0.06)</b>	<b>0.17 (0.06)</b>
Catholic	<b>-0.39 (0.04)</b>	0.05 (0.04)	-0.06 (0.04)
Other Christian	<b>-0.37 (0.04)</b>	-0.00 (0.04)	0.07 (0.04)
Jewish	0.03 (0.07)	<b>0.22 (0.07)</b>	0.11 (0.07)
Other Religion	0.03 (0.06)	<b>0.53 (0.06)</b>	<b>0.21 (0.06)</b>
South	<b>-0.19 (0.05)</b>	0.06 (0.05)	<b>0.23 (0.05)</b>
Mountains/Plains	0.03 (0.07)	0.06 (0.06)	<b>0.41 (0.06)</b>
Northeast	0.02 (0.04)	0.06 (0.04)	<b>0.31 (0.04)</b>
Midwest	0.01 (0.05)	0.05 (0.05)	<b>0.19 (0.05)</b>
Population Density	<b>0.06 (0.02)</b>	<b>0.11 (0.02)</b>	<b>-0.04 (0.02)</b>
Percent Black	0.19 (0.12)	0.23 (0.12)	<b>-0.42 (0.12)</b>
Median Household Income	0.01 (0.02)	0.01 (0.02)	<b>-0.07 (0.02)</b>
cut1	<b>-3.29 (0.10)</b>	-0.17 (0.09)	<b>-1.30 (0.09)</b>
cut2	<b>-1.10 (0.10)</b>	<b>1.75 (0.09)</b>	<b>0.21 (0.09)</b>
cut3	<b>1.04 (0.10)</b>	<b>3.40 (0.09)</b>	<b>2.52 (0.09)</b>

Notes: Biracial Whites compared to Monoracial Whites. Standard errors in parentheses. Regressions also include controls for year surveyed. Coefficients in bold reflect significance at a level of 95% confidence. N=854,014.

Table A-5: ORDERED LOGISTIC REGRESSION PREDICTING SUPPORT FOR EXPLICITLY RACIAL ISSUES—BLACK IDENTIFIERS.

	Racism Major Problem	Promote Racial Understanding	Affirmative Action
Biracial Black	<b>-0.20 (0.08)</b>	-0.01 (0.07)	-0.10 (0.07)
Black Mother/White Father	<b>0.30 (0.15)</b>	0.17 (0.13)	0.03 (0.13)
Parents Not Currently Together	<b>0.06 (0.02)</b>	0.01 (0.02)	0.03 (0.02)
Female	<b>0.33 (0.02)</b>	<b>0.15 (0.02)</b>	<b>0.30 (0.02)</b>
Father—Some College	<b>0.08 (0.02)</b>	<b>0.10 (0.02)</b>	0.04 (0.02)
Father—College Graduate	<b>0.08 (0.03)</b>	<b>0.13 (0.02)</b>	0.07 (0.03)
Father—Graduate School	0.06 (0.03)	<b>0.25 (0.03)</b>	0.12 (0.03)
Mother—Some College	<b>0.15 (0.02)</b>	0.04 (0.02)	<b>0.13 (0.02)</b>
Mother—College Graduate	<b>0.19 (0.03)</b>	<b>0.13 (0.02)</b>	<b>0.18 (0.02)</b>
Mother—Graduate School	<b>0.27 (0.03)</b>	<b>0.17 (0.03)</b>	<b>0.30 (0.03)</b>
Income—\$30,000-\$59,999	<b>0.15 (0.02)</b>	0.05 (0.02)	<b>0.10 (0.02)</b>
Income—\$60,000-\$99,999	<b>0.21 (0.03)</b>	0.06 (0.03)	<b>0.14 (0.03)</b>
Income—\$100,000+	<b>0.35 (0.04)</b>	<b>0.15 (0.03)</b>	<b>0.24 (0.03)</b>
Baptist	-0.01 (0.03)	<b>0.16 (0.03)</b>	<b>0.07 (0.03)</b>
Catholic	<b>-0.17 (0.04)</b>	<b>0.31 (0.04)</b>	<b>-0.02 (0.04)</b>
Other Christian	-0.06 (0.03)	0.19 (0.03)	0.05 (0.03)
Jewish	-0.02 (0.28)	0.07 (0.28)	0.16 (0.25)
Other Religion	<b>-0.09 (0.05)</b>	0.14 (0.04)	0.04 (0.04)
South	<b>-0.09 (0.04)</b>	0.06 (0.04)	<b>-0.09 (0.04)</b>
Mountains/Plains	-0.10 (0.09)	0.04 (0.08)	<b>-0.15 (0.08)</b>
Northeast	-0.01 (0.04)	-0.02 (0.03)	<b>-0.13 (0.04)</b>
Midwest	<b>-0.09 (0.04)</b>	0.04 (0.04)	0.07 (0.04)
Population Density	<b>0.05 (0.02)</b>	<b>0.04 (0.01)</b>	<b>0.09 (0.01)</b>
Percent Black	<b>-0.14 (0.04)</b>	-0.27 (0.03)	0.05 (0.03)
Median Household Income	0.00 (0.01)	<b>0.02 (0.01)</b>	0.02 (0.01)
cut1	<b>-3.30 (0.08)</b>	<b>-1.57 (0.07)</b>	<b>-2.25 (0.08)</b>
cut2	<b>-1.72 (0.08)</b>	<b>0.23 (0.07)</b>	<b>-0.41 (0.07)</b>
cut3	<b>-0.15 (0.08)</b>	<b>1.72 (0.07)</b>	<b>1.38 (0.07)</b>

Notes: Biracial Blacks compared to Monoracial Blacks. Standard errors in parentheses. Regressions also include controls for year surveyed. Coefficients in bold reflect significance at a level of 95% confidence. N=80,792.

Table A-6: ORDERED LOGISTIC REGRESSION PREDICTING SUPPORT FOR EXPLICITLY RACIAL ISSUES—BIRACIALS.

	Racism Major Problem	Promote Racial Understanding	Affirmative Action
Biracial White	<b>-0.92 (0.15)</b>	<b>-0.86 (0.15)</b>	<b>-0.74 (0.15)</b>
Biracial Black	0.13 (0.09)	-0.12 (0.08)	<b>0.30 (0.08)</b>
Black Mother/White Father	0.14 (0.10)	0.11 (0.09)	0.03 (0.09)
Parents Not Currently Together	-0.11 (0.09)	-0.14 (0.08)	0.03 (0.08)
Female	<b>0.16 (0.08)</b>	<b>0.48 (0.07)</b>	<b>0.18 (0.08)</b>
Father—Some College	-0.10 (0.11)	0.11 (0.10)	-0.17 (0.10)
Father—College Graduate	-0.05 (0.12)	0.18 (0.11)	-0.11 (0.11)
Father—Graduate School	0.17 (0.13)	0.21 (0.12)	0.18 (0.13)
Mother—Some College	0.04 (0.11)	0.02 (0.10)	0.11 (0.11)
Mother—College Graduate	0.15 (0.11)	0.08 (0.11)	<b>0.31 (0.11)</b>
Mother—Graduate School	<b>0.41 (0.14)</b>	0.18 (0.12)	<b>0.40 (0.13)</b>
Income—\$30,000-\$59,999	0.05 (0.11)	-0.04 (0.10)	-0.10 (0.10)
Income—\$60,000-\$99,999	0.02 (0.12)	0.08 (0.11)	0.01 (0.12)
Income—\$100,000+	<b>-0.29 (0.14)</b>	-0.06 (0.13)	-0.23 (0.14)
Baptist	0.17 (0.13)	<b>0.45 (0.12)</b>	<b>0.31 (0.12)</b>
Catholic	-0.15 (0.12)	<b>0.34 (0.11)</b>	0.03 (0.12)
Other Christian	-0.12 (0.09)	<b>0.20 (0.09)</b>	0.07 (0.10)
Jewish	-0.19 (0.28)	0.40 (0.27)	0.26 (0.27)
Other Religion	0.13 (0.18)	<b>0.33 (0.17)</b>	0.09 (0.17)
South	-0.15 (0.13)	0.08 (0.12)	-0.05 (0.13)
Mountains/Plains	-0.15 (0.18)	0.06 (0.18)	0.24 (0.18)
Northeast	-0.14 (0.12)	0.11 (0.11)	0.10 (0.11)
Midwest	-0.05 (0.13)	0.07 (0.12)	<b>0.29 (0.12)</b>
Population Density	0.02 (0.06)	0.04 (0.06)	0.06 (0.06)
Percent Black	0.31 (0.23)	0.01 (0.20)	0.40 (0.21)
Median Household Income	-0.03 (0.05)	-0.03 (0.05)	<b>0.10 (0.05)</b>
cut1	<b>-3.82 (0.31)</b>	<b>-1.46 (0.27)</b>	<b>-1.76 (0.27)</b>
cut2	<b>-2.23 (0.29)</b>	0.31 (0.26)	-0.01 (0.26)
cut3	-0.28 (0.28)	<b>1.81 (0.27)</b>	<b>2.06 (0.27)</b>

Notes: Biracial Whites and Biracial Blacks compared to Biracial White-Blacks. Standard errors in parentheses. Regressions also include controls for year surveyed. Coefficients in bold reflect significance at a level of 95% confidence. N=3,448.

Table A-7: ORDERED LOGISTIC REGRESSION PREDICTING SUPPORT FOR IMPLICITLY RACIAL ISSUES—WHITE IDENTIFIERS.

	Criminals' Rights	Death Penalty	Gun Control
Biracial White	-0.07 (0.16)	0.28 (0.16)	0.28 (0.16)
Black Mother/White Father	0.28 (0.33)	-0.06 (0.33)	-0.08 (0.33)
Parents Not Currently Together	<b>0.11 (0.03)</b>	0.04 (0.03)	<b>0.07 (0.03)</b>
Female	<b>0.22 (0.03)</b>	<b>0.44 (0.03)</b>	<b>0.82 (0.03)</b>
Father—Some College	0.03 (0.04)	<b>0.12 (0.04)</b>	<b>-0.08 (0.04)</b>
Father—College Graduate	<b>0.11 (0.04)</b>	<b>0.19 (0.04)</b>	-0.04 (0.04)
Father—Graduate School	<b>0.26 (0.05)</b>	<b>0.37 (0.05)</b>	0.06 (0.05)
Mother—Some College	0.05 (0.04)	0.04 (0.04)	-0.01 (0.04)
Mother—College Graduate	<b>0.20 (0.04)</b>	<b>0.18 (0.04)</b>	-0.00 (0.04)
Mother—Graduate School	<b>0.41 (0.05)</b>	<b>0.43 (0.05)</b>	<b>0.14 (0.05)</b>
Income—\$30,000-\$59,999	-0.03 (0.04)	-0.05 (0.04)	-0.05 (0.04)
Income—\$60,000-\$99,999	-0.03 (0.05)	<b>-0.16 (0.04)</b>	-0.06 (0.04)
Income—\$100,000+	0.03 (0.05)	-0.09 (0.05)	-0.00 (0.05)
Baptist	<b>-0.57 (0.06)</b>	<b>-0.53 (0.06)</b>	<b>-0.22 (0.06)</b>
Catholic	<b>-0.37 (0.04)</b>	0.08 (0.04)	0.04 (0.04)
Other Christian	<b>-0.39 (0.04)</b>	<b>-0.25 (0.04)</b>	<b>-0.11 (0.04)</b>
Jewish	-0.13 (0.07)	-0.10 (0.07)	<b>0.49 (0.07)</b>
Other Religion	<b>0.19 (0.06)</b>	<b>0.28 (0.06)</b>	<b>-0.02 (0.06)</b>
South	<b>-0.13 (0.05)</b>	<b>-0.11 (0.05)</b>	0.07 (0.05)
Mountains/Plains	<b>0.14 (0.07)</b>	0.09 (0.06)	-0.05 (0.06)
Northeast	-0.00 (0.05)	<b>0.11 (0.04)</b>	<b>0.32 (0.04)</b>
Midwest	-0.03 (0.05)	<b>0.22 (0.05)</b>	<b>0.11 (0.05)</b>
Population Density	<b>0.11 (0.02)</b>	0.15 (0.02)	<b>0.26 (0.02)</b>
Percent Black	0.20 (0.12)	0.26 (0.11)	0.09 (0.12)
Median Household Income	<b>0.06 (0.02)</b>	0.01 (0.01)	<b>0.05 (0.02)</b>
cut1	<b>-1.34 (0.09)</b>	<b>0.64 (0.10)</b>	<b>-1.23 (0.09)</b>
cut2	<b>1.19 (0.09)</b>	<b>2.31 (0.10)</b>	0.09 (0.09)
cut3	<b>3.17 (0.09)</b>	<b>3.44 (0.10)</b>	<b>1.85 (0.09)</b>

Notes: Biracial Whites compared to Monoracial Whites. Standard errors in parentheses. Regressions also include controls for year surveyed. Coefficients in bold reflect significance at a level of 95% confidence. N=854,014.

Table A-8: ORDERED LOGISTIC REGRESSION PREDICTING SUPPORT FOR IMPLICITLY RACIAL ISSUES—BLACK IDENTIFIERS.

	Criminals' Rights	Death Penalty	Gun Control
Biracial Black	0.08 (0.07)	-0.12(0.07)	<b>-0.30 (0.07)</b>
Black Mother/White Father	-0.13 (0.13)	0.12(0.13)	<b>0.36 (0.14)</b>
Parents Not Currently Together	<b>0.09 (0.02)</b>	<b>0.04(0.02)</b>	0.01 (0.01)
Female	<b>0.10 (0.02)</b>	<b>0.15(0.02)</b>	<b>0.62 (0.02)</b>
Father—Some College	0.02 (0.02)	0.03 (0.02)	-0.01 (0.02)
Father—College Graduate	-0.01 (0.03)	<b>0.07(0.02)</b>	-0.00 (0.03)
Father—Graduate School	<b>0.08 (0.03)</b>	<b>0.15(0.03)</b>	0.02 (0.03)
Mother—Some College	0.03 (0.02)	-0.02(0.02)	-0.02 (0.02)
Mother—College Graduate	0.02 (0.02)	0.04(0.02)	-0.03 (0.03)
Mother—Graduate School	<b>0.10 (0.03)</b>	0.04(0.03)	-0.00 (0.03)
Income—\$30,000-\$59,999	0.01 (0.02)	<b>-0.06(0.02)</b>	<b>-0.08 (0.02)</b>
Income—\$60,000-\$99,999	-0.04 (0.03)	<b>-0.08(0.02)</b>	<b>-0.09 (0.03)</b>
Income—\$100,000+	0.04 (0.03)	-0.04(0.03)	<b>-0.07 (0.03)</b>
Baptist	<b>-0.18 (0.03)</b>	-0.01(0.03)	<b>0.09 (0.03)</b>
Catholic	<b>-0.13 (0.04)</b>	<b>0.23(0.04)</b>	<b>0.19 (0.04)</b>
Other Christian	<b>-0.19 (0.03)</b>	<b>0.07(0.03)</b>	<b>0.16 (0.03)</b>
Jewish	-0.27 (0.30)	-0.36(0.24)	0.30 (0.28)
Other Religion	<b>-0.11 (0.05)</b>	0.07(0.04)	<b>0.15 (0.05)</b>
South	-0.07(0.04)	<b>0.08(0.03)</b>	-0.07 (0.04)
Mountains/Plains	<b>-0.19(0.08)</b>	-0.10(0.08)	<b>-0.23 (0.08)</b>
Northeast	<b>-0.07(0.03)</b>	<b>0.15(0.03)</b>	<b>0.16 (0.04)</b>
Midwest	-0.05(0.04)	<b>0.18(0.04)</b>	<b>-0.09 (0.04)</b>
Population Density	<b>0.08(0.01)</b>	<b>0.06(0.01)</b>	<b>0.17 (0.01)</b>
Percent Black	<b>0.14(0.03)</b>	<b>0.09(0.03)</b>	<b>0.12 (0.04)</b>
Median Household Income	0.02 (0.01)	<b>-0.02 (0.01)</b>	0.01 (0.01)
cut1	<b>-1.86 (0.07)</b>	<b>-0.84 (0.07)</b>	<b>-2.31 (0.08)</b>
cut2	<b>0.53 (0.07)</b>	<b>0.89 (0.07)</b>	<b>-1.22 (0.08)</b>
cut3	<b>2.32 (0.08)</b>	<b>1.99 (0.07)</b>	<b>0.42 (0.08)</b>

Notes: Biracial Blacks compared to Monoracial Blacks. Standard errors in parentheses. Regressions also include controls for year surveyed. Coefficients in bold reflect significance at a level of 95% confidence. N=80,792.

Table A-9: ORDERED LOGISTIC REGRESSION PREDICTING SUPPORT FOR IMPLICITLY RACIAL ISSUES—BIRACIALS.

	Criminals' Rights	Death Penalty	Gun Control
Biracial White	<b>-0.32 (0.15)</b>	-0.13 (0.15)	-0.25 (0.15)
Biracial Black	0.02 (0.08)	0.02 (0.08)	0.11 (0.08)
Black Mother/White Father	0.06 (0.09)	-0.03 (0.09)	<b>0.19 (0.09)</b>
Parents Not Currently Together	<b>0.20 (0.08)</b>	0.006 (0.08)	<b>0.17 (0.08)</b>
Female	0.04 (0.07)	<b>0.46 (0.07)</b>	<b>0.78 (0.08)</b>
Father—Some College	<b>0.26 (0.10)</b>	0.09 (0.10)	-0.11 (0.11)
Father—College Graduate	0.10 (0.11)	-0.03 (0.10)	0.21 (0.11)
Father—Graduate School	<b>0.24 (0.12)</b>	0.13 (0.12)	0.09 (0.13)
Mother—Some College	0.02 (0.11)	0.18 (0.10)	-0.02 (0.11)
Mother—College Graduate	0.03 (0.11)	<b>0.28 (0.11)</b>	-0.04 (0.11)
Mother—Graduate School	<b>0.35 (0.12)</b>	<b>0.54 (0.12)</b>	-0.19 (0.13)
Income—\$30,000-\$59,999	-0.12 (0.10)	-0.05 (0.10)	-0.04 (0.11)
Income—\$60,000-\$99,999	-0.09 (0.11)	-0.01 (0.11)	0.06 (0.12)
Income—\$100,000+	-0.05 (0.13)	0.05 (0.13)	0.12 (0.14)
Baptist	<b>-0.57 (0.13)</b>	-0.15 (0.12)	-0.12 (0.13)
Catholic	<b>-0.41 (0.12)</b>	<b>0.28 (0.11)</b>	-0.06 (0.12)
Other Christian	<b>-0.43 (0.09)</b>	-0.17 (0.09)	-0.11 (0.10)
Jewish	0.007 (0.28)	-0.16 (0.27)	<b>0.76 (0.31)</b>
Other Religion	-0.22 (0.17)	0.12 (0.17)	-0.25 (0.18)
South	-0.22 (0.13)	0.13 (0.12)	-0.06 (0.13)
Mountains/Plains	-0.03 (0.18)	-0.29 (0.18)	-0.19 (0.18)
Northeast	-0.09 (0.11)	0.20 (0.11)	0.02 (0.12)
Midwest	-0.05 (0.12)	<b>0.34 (0.12)</b>	-0.18 (0.12)
Population Density	<b>0.18 (0.06)</b>	<b>0.22 (0.06)</b>	<b>0.23 (0.06)</b>
Percent Black	<b>0.46 (0.21)</b>	0.04 (0.20)	0.26 (0.22)
Median Household Income	0.03 (0.05)	0.05 (0.05)	-0.02 (0.05)
cut1	<b>-1.75 (0.27)</b>	0.25 (0.26)	<b>-2.07 (0.28)</b>
cut2	<b>0.72 (0.27)</b>	<b>1.90 (0.26)</b>	<b>-0.81 (0.27)</b>
cut3	<b>2.66 (0.28)</b>	<b>3.05 (0.27)</b>	<b>0.95 (0.27)</b>

Notes: Biracial Whites and Biracial Blacks compared to Biracial White-Blacks. Standard errors in parentheses. Regressions also include controls for year surveyed. Coefficients in bold reflect significance at a level of 95% confidence. N=3,448.

Table A-10: ORDERED LOGISTIC REGRESSION PREDICTING SUPPORT FOR NON-RACIAL ISSUES—WHITE IDENTIFIERS.

	Abortion Rights	Married Women	Same-Sex Marriage
Biracial White	-0.07 (0.16)	-0.33 (0.17)	0.13 (0.16)
Black Mother/White Father	0.34 (0.32)	-0.09 (0.33)	-0.29 (0.33)
Parents Not Currently Together	<b>0.40 (0.03)</b>	<b>0.16 (0.03)</b>	<b>0.41 (0.03)</b>
Female	<b>0.06 (0.03)</b>	<b>1.20 (0.03)</b>	<b>0.79 (0.03)</b>
Father—Some College	0.08 (0.04)	<b>0.11 (0.04)</b>	0.02 (0.04)
Father—College Graduate	<b>0.08 (0.04)</b>	<b>0.13 (0.04)</b>	<b>0.14 (0.04)</b>
Father—Graduate School	<b>0.10 (0.05)</b>	<b>0.25 (0.05)</b>	<b>0.16 (0.05)</b>
Mother—Some College	0.04 (0.04)	<b>0.12 (0.04)</b>	0.07 (0.04)
Mother—College Graduate	<b>0.13 (0.04)</b>	<b>0.16 (0.04)</b>	0.10 (0.04)
Mother—Graduate School	<b>0.38 (0.05)</b>	<b>0.45 (0.05)</b>	<b>0.42 (0.05)</b>
Income—\$30,000-\$59,999	<b>0.11 (0.04)</b>	<b>0.10 (0.05)</b>	0.10 (0.04)
Income—\$60,000-\$99,999	<b>0.10 (0.04)</b>	0.07 (0.05)	<b>0.17 (0.05)</b>
Income—\$100,000+	<b>0.33 (0.05)</b>	0.08 (0.05)	<b>0.21 (0.05)</b>
Baptist	<b>-2.15 (0.06)</b>	<b>-0.89 (0.06)</b>	<b>-2.23 (0.06)</b>
Catholic	<b>-1.60 (0.04)</b>	<b>-0.59 (0.05)</b>	<b>-1.16 (0.04)</b>
Other Christian	<b>-1.52 (0.04)</b>	<b>-0.63 (0.04)</b>	<b>-1.54 (0.04)</b>
Jewish	<b>-0.20 (0.07)</b>	<b>-0.45 (0.07)</b>	<b>-0.43 (0.07)</b>
Other Religion	<b>-0.58 (0.07)</b>	<b>-0.14 (0.06)</b>	<b>-0.24 (0.06)</b>
South	-0.09 (0.05)	<b>-0.15 (0.05)</b>	0.79 (0.05)
Mountains/Plains	<b>-0.15 (0.06)</b>	-0.14 (0.07)	<b>0.20 (0.06)</b>
Northeast	<b>0.25 (0.04)</b>	-0.04 (0.05)	<b>0.51 (0.04)</b>
Midwest	<b>-0.18 (0.05)</b>	0.02 (0.06)	<b>0.15 (0.05)</b>
Population Density	<b>0.10 (0.02)</b>	-0.00 (0.02)	<b>0.17 (0.02)</b>
Percent Black	0.18 (0.12)	0.22 (0.13)	<b>0.22 (0.12)</b>
Median Household Income	<b>0.15 (0.02)</b>	-0.02 (0.02)	<b>0.08 (0.02)</b>
cut1	<b>-0.73 (0.09)</b>	<b>-2.80 (0.10)</b>	<b>-0.73 (0.09)</b>
cut2	<b>1.87 (0.09)</b>	<b>-1.20 (0.09)</b>	<b>0.40 (0.09)</b>
cut3	<b>3.31 (0.09)</b>	0.09 (0.09)	<b>1.85 (0.09)</b>

Notes: Biracial Whites compared to Monoracial Whites. Standard errors in parentheses. Regressions also include controls for year surveyed. Coefficients in bold reflect significance at a level of 95% confidence. N=854,014.

Table A-11: ORDERED LOGISTIC REGRESSION PREDICTING SUPPORT FOR NON-RACIAL ISSUES—BLACK IDENTIFIERS.

	Abortion Rights	Married Women	Same-Sex Marriage
Biracial Black	<b>0.32 (0.07)</b>	<b>0.30 (0.07)</b>	<b>0.54 (0.07)</b>
Black Mother/White Father	-0.06 (0.13)	-0.08 (0.14)	-0.20 (0.13)
Parents Not Currently Together	<b>0.32 (0.02)</b>	<b>0.07 (0.03)</b>	<b>0.31 (0.02)</b>
Female	<b>0.11 (0.02)</b>	<b>0.83 (0.02)</b>	<b>0.50 (0.02)</b>
Father—Some College	<b>0.07 (0.02)</b>	<b>0.06 (0.02)</b>	-0.00 (0.02)
Father—College Graduate	<b>0.05 (0.02)</b>	<b>0.06 (0.03)</b>	0.03 (0.02)
Father—Graduate School	<b>0.08 (0.03)</b>	<b>0.15 (0.03)</b>	0.00 (0.03)
Mother—Some College	<b>0.07 (0.03)</b>	<b>0.14 (0.02)</b>	0.02 (0.02)
Mother—College Graduate	<b>0.08 (0.02)</b>	<b>0.22 (0.03)</b>	0.03 (0.02)
Mother—Graduate School	<b>0.20 (0.02)</b>	<b>0.27 (0.03)</b>	<b>0.13 (0.03)</b>
Income—\$30,000-\$59,999	<b>0.13 (0.02)</b>	<b>0.12 (0.02)</b>	<b>0.05 (0.02)</b>
Income—\$60,000-\$99,999	<b>0.22 (0.02)</b>	<b>0.21 (0.03)</b>	<b>0.12 (0.03)</b>
Income—\$100,000+	<b>0.44 (0.03)</b>	<b>0.35 (0.03)</b>	<b>0.31 (0.03)</b>
Baptist	<b>-0.60 (0.03)</b>	<b>-0.25 (0.03)</b>	<b>-0.84 (0.03)</b>
Catholic	<b>-0.80 (0.04)</b>	<b>-0.15 (0.04)</b>	<b>-0.41 (0.04)</b>
Other Christian	<b>-0.92 (0.03)</b>	<b>-0.20 (0.03)</b>	<b>-1.22 (0.03)</b>
Jewish	0.01 (0.26)	<b>-0.58 (0.24)</b>	-0.20 (0.25)
Other Religion	<b>-0.94 (0.04)</b>	<b>-0.30 (0.04)</b>	<b>-1.24 (0.04)</b>
South	<b>-0.32 (0.04)</b>	<b>-0.17 (0.04)</b>	<b>-0.10 (0.04)</b>
Mountains/Plains	<b>-0.27 (0.08)</b>	-0.06 (0.08)	0.06 (0.08)
Northeast	<b>-0.08 (0.03)</b>	-0.07 (0.04)	<b>0.16 (0.03)</b>
Midwest	<b>-0.27 (0.04)</b>	<b>-0.13 (0.04)</b>	<b>0.09 (0.04)</b>
Population Density	<b>0.16 (0.01)</b>	<b>0.05 (0.01)</b>	<b>0.05 (0.01)</b>
Percent Black	0.06 (0.03)	<b>-0.14 (0.03)</b>	<b>-0.17 (0.03)</b>
Median Household Income	<b>0.09 (0.01)</b>	0.02 (0.01)	<b>0.05 (0.01)</b>
cut1	<b>-0.78 (0.07)</b>	<b>-1.67 (0.07)</b>	<b>-1.16 (0.07)</b>
cut2	<b>0.16 (0.07)</b>	-0.42 (0.07)	-0.08 (0.07)
cut3	<b>1.67 (0.07)</b>	<b>0.48 (0.07)</b>	1.33 (0.07)

Notes: Biracial Blacks compared to Monoracial Blacks. Standard errors in parentheses. Regressions also include controls for year surveyed. Coefficients in bold reflect significance at a level of 95% confidence. N=80,792.

Table A-12: ORDERED LOGISTIC REGRESSION PREDICTING SUPPORT FOR NON-RACIAL ISSUES—BIRACIALS.

	Abortion Rights	Married Women	Same-Sex Marriage
Biracial White	-0.20 (0.15)	<b>-0.70 (0.16)</b>	<b>-0.32 (0.15)</b>
Biracial Black	-0.03 (0.08)	<b>-0.29 (0.09)</b>	-0.11 (0.08)
Black Mother/White Father	0.05 (0.09)	-0.13 (0.10)	-0.11 (0.09)
Parents Not Currently Together	<b>0.25 (0.08)</b>	0.04(0.09)	<b>0.26 (0.08)</b>
Female	<b>0.29 (0.07)</b>	<b>1.10 (0.09)</b>	<b>0.85 (0.08)</b>
Father—Some College	-0.01 (0.10)	-0.17 (0.11)	-0.08 (0.10)
Father—College Graduate	0.05 (0.11)	0.10 (0.12)	0.07 (0.11)
Father—Graduate School	0.24 (0.13)	0.23 (0.14)	0.20 (0.13)
Mother—Some College	0.04 (0.10)	<b>0.36 (0.12)</b>	0.06 (0.10)
Mother—College Graduate	0.004 (0.11)	<b>0.41 (0.12)</b>	0.05 (0.11)
Mother—Graduate School	0.20 (0.13)	<b>0.49 (0.14)</b>	0.17 (0.13)
Income—\$30,000-\$59,999	0.04 (0.10)	0.11 (0.11)	0.09 (0.10)
Income—\$60,000-\$99,999	0.08 (0.11)	0.21 (0.13)	0.18 (0.12)
Income—\$100,000+	<b>0.49 (0.13)</b>	0.28 (0.15)	<b>0.28 (0.14)</b>
Baptist	<b>-1.38 (0.12)</b>	<b>-0.44 (0.14)</b>	<b>-1.36 (0.12)</b>
Catholic	<b>-1.50 (0.12)</b>	<b>-0.37 (0.13)</b>	<b>-0.74 (0.12)</b>
Other Christian	<b>-1.46 (0.10)</b>	<b>-0.43 (0.11)</b>	<b>-1.50 (0.10)</b>
Jewish	0.48 (0.31)	<b>-0.47 (0.20)</b>	-0.09 (0.29)
Other Religion	<b>-0.57 (0.18)</b>	-0.29 (0.20)	<b>-0.58 (0.19)</b>
South	-0.14 (0.12)	0.01 (0.14)	0.14 (0.13)
Mountains/Plains	<b>-0.41 (0.18)</b>	-0.36 (0.20)	0.13 (0.18)
Northeast	0.10 (0.11)	-0.05 (0.13)	<b>0.38 (0.11)</b>
Midwest	-0.22 (0.12)	-0.04 (0.14)	0.24 (0.12)
Population Density	<b>0.25 (0.06)</b>	0.04 (0.07)	<b>0.24(0.06)</b>
Percent Black	0.28 (0.20)	-0.10 (0.23)	<b>-0.48 (0.21)</b>
Median Household Income	0.10 (0.05)	-0.07 (0.05)	-0.003 (0.05)
cut1	<b>-1.04 (0.27)</b>	<b>-2.47 (0.30)</b>	<b>-1.04 (0.27)</b>
cut2	-0.22 (0.27)	<b>-1.22 (0.30)</b>	-0.03 (0.27)
cut3	<b>1.16 (0.27)</b>	-0.13 (0.30)	<b>1.20 (0.27)</b>

Notes: Biracial Whites and Biracial Blacks compared to Biracial White-Blacks. Standard errors in parentheses. Regressions also include controls for year surveyed. Coefficients in bold reflect significance at a level of 95% confidence. N=3,448.

## A-3 Interview Methodology

I supplemented the Freshman Survey data with in-depth interviews of current college students. Because the abundance of quantitative national survey data enabled me to empirically disentangle the relationship between racial background and political attitude construction, the purpose of the interviews was to clarify mechanisms that are obscured by close-ended survey responses and also shed light on the effects other forces—such as parentage, social networks, and discrimination—on identification and political attitudes.

After careful consideration, I decided to interview multiracial college students in the San Francisco Bay Area. I chose the Bay Area for several reasons. The first has to do with its sheer size: the fifth largest urban area in the United States, the Bay Area includes several major cities and metropolitan areas (San Francisco, San Jose, and Oakland, CA) as well as smaller towns and rural areas. In addition, a valuable feature for my purposes is the region’s notable racial and ethnic diversity. According to the 2010 Census, the racial composition of the Bay Area was 42.4 percent White, 23 percent Asian, 6.4 percent Black, 3.5 percent with two or more races, and 23.5 percent Hispanic (of any race).<sup>2</sup> Finally, the region was useful because it encompasses a large and varied number of institutions of higher learning, including several public state universities and private universities, as well as technical and junior colleges that range widely in size, selectivity, and location setting.

Because the Bay Area is known for its liberal politics and wealth, I took several steps to recruit a politically and socioeconomically diverse sample. My interview sample was derived from postings and advertisements on university Facebook pages; emails describing the study that were sent to campus ethnic organizations and faculty teaching social science or ethnic studies courses; snowball sampling; and a joint research program between my home institution and two local colleges in which study participants were selected via student opt-in samples.

As a result, the final set of 12 biracial, White-Black interviewees was quite varied racially, socioeconomically, and geographically. Participants came from a range of higher learning institutions; while the majority of respondents grew up in California, many did not, and all major

---

<sup>2</sup>More generally, the state of California has one of the highest interracial marriage rates in the nation and boasts the largest number of multiple-race identifiers—1.8 million in 2010, more than double that of Texas, the next most populous state (Wang 2012; Jones and Bullock 2012).

regions of the country were represented in the interviews.

Most interviews were conducted in-person, though some were via phone or video chat. Students were asked about their experiences growing up, their family life, their encounters with discrimination, their friendship networks and neighborhoods, how they developed their political views, and their opinions on a wide range of racial topics (including bilingual education, immigration, affirmative action, stop-and-frisk policies, and the repeal of the Voting Rights Act) as well as covertly racial and nonracial policies (such as welfare and same-sex marriage).

## References

Jones, Nicholas A. and Jungmiwha Bullock. 2012. "The Two or More Races Population: 2010." *Census 2010 Brief*.

Sax, Linda, Alexander W. Astin, Jennifer A. Lindholm, William S. Korn, Victor B. Saenz and Kathryn M. Mahoney. 2003. *The American Freshmen: National Norms for Fall 2003*. Los Angeles, CA: Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA.

Sax, Linda, Jennifer A. Lindholm, Alexander W. Astin, William S. Korn and Kathryn M. Mahoney. 2001. *The American Freshmen: National Norms for Fall 2001*. Los Angeles, CA: Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA.

Sax, Linda, Jennifer A. Lindholm, Alexander W. Astin, William S. Korn and Kathryn M. Mahoney. 2002. *The American Freshmen: National Norms for Fall 2002*. Los Angeles, CA: Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA.

Wang, Wendy. 2012. *The Rise of Intermarriage: Rates, Characteristics Vary by Race and Gender*. Washington, D.C.: Pew Research Center.