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Abstract

Family members significantly influence dating behaviors and their support is instrumental for a healthy relationship (e.g., Wang et al., 2006). Although many interracial couples report family disapproval of their relationship (e.g., Inman et al., 2011), few studies have asked family members directly about their attitudes towards these couples. We asked three-hundred twenty-nine White participants how they feel, what they think, and how they would behave towards a couple consisting of either their brother or their sister with a White, Black, or Asian partner. Results revealed that participants’ level of internal motivation to control prejudice (IMS) consistently moderated perceptions of interracial couples. Specifically, high levels of IMS were associated with positive affect, beliefs, and behaviors towards White siblings dating a non-White partner. The findings suggest that IMS may be key in understanding how individuals perceive interracial couples involving a family member.
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Chapter 1
Introduction

In 2010 Shayne and Michelle, an interracial couple living in Nova Scotia, Canada, found a burning cross on their lawn with a noose tied around it (MacDonald, 2010). Two months later, their car was set on fire (MacDonald, 2010). Marlene and Jason, another interracial couple living in Pittsburgh, USA, had “Die Nigger” along with swastikas spray-painted on their home (Crockett Jr., 2014). These are just two examples of countless hate crimes committed against interracial couples in recent years all over North America. Such crimes reflect the continued bigotry that exists against these relationships. Members of interracial couples continue to report various forms of discrimination, such as being stared at and being the target of disapproving comments and racial slurs (Hill & Thomas, 2000). Moreover, the social disapproval that couples suffer comes not only from strangers in the community, but also from the people they depend on the most for social support, their family (Hill & Thomas, 2000; Inman, Altman, Kaduvettoor-Davidson, Carr & Walker, 2011). While some previous work has studied couples’ reports of family disapproval, no research has asked family members directly about their perceptions of interracial dating relationships in their family, nor determined whether those perceptions vary as a function of the partner’s race or of the gender of the family member. This is a gap that I will address in the proposed research.

Prejudice and discrimination against interracial couples continues to exist despite the fact that the number of interracial relationships in North America has been steadily increasing over the past few decades. In Canada the number hit an all-time high in 2011 of over 360,000 married and non-married couples (Statistics Canada, 2014). This trend has been even more noticeable in the United States where the number of interracial marriages grew to 7% of all marriages and the number of unmarried interracial couples grew to 14% of all couples in 2010 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2012). Importantly, almost 85% of all interracial couples in Canada include one partner that is White and one that is not (Statistics Canada, 2014), yet we know very little about how White family members feel about other family members being involved in a cross-race romantic relationship.
1.1 Social Disapproval and its Consequences

Gaines and Ickes (1997) suggested in their review that perceivers may endorse stereotypes about interracial romantic relationships, such as assuming cross-race relationships are based on sexual interests rather than love and respect (see also Lalonde, Giguère, Fontaine & Smith, 2007) and that those relationships are prone to conflict (see also Garcia & Rivera, 1999) as a result of cultural differences. Furthermore, the authors argue that stereotypes about interracial dating are unchanging and persist even when perceivers are provided with evidence that such differences do not exist between the partners (Gaines & Ickes, 1997). In her book *Navigating interracial borders: Black-White couples and their social worlds*, Chito Childs (2005) conducted focus groups where they discussed race relations with students at several university campuses. She found that when she asked students whether they would enter into an interracial dating relationship, students were reluctant to do so for a number of reasons, including that it is unnatural and untraditional to engage in an interracial relationship. Furthermore, Chito Childs found that students were concerned about the degree of commonality between partners and also about family responses to interracial dating. When considering entering into a romantic relationship with a Black person, White students in particular cited cultural stereotypes in their responses. For example, White students referred to stereotypes that Black males are sexually deviant and that interracial dating would cause discomfort. Some White students even revealed that they were reluctant to date interracially because they believe that Whites and Blacks are essentially different (see also Chao, Chen, Roisman & Hong, 2007). Such stereotypes, coupled with the perception that mixed-race couples may be “mismatched” because they do not fit people’s expectations of a prototypical couple (Forgas, 1993), can lead perceivers to view interracial relationships as short-term and thus provide little support for the couple. It is still unclear, however, whether people apply stereotypes and attitudes equally to different racial combinations of interracial couples.

Recent research examining race and gender stereotypes has shed some light on how different interracial couples may be viewed. In a series of studies, Galinsky, Hall and Cuddy (2013) explored the link between both explicit and implicit racial and gender stereotypes and interracial dating behavior. Their results revealed that, compared to Whites, Asians were viewed as more feminine and Blacks were viewed as more masculine. Additionally, men indicated that they were more attracted to femininity rather than masculinity and women indicated that they were more
attracted to masculinity than to femininity. In accordance with these stereotypes, the US Census showed that not only do males report engaging more in interracial dating, but White males have dated more Asian (69%) than Black women (49%) and White women have dated more Black (37%) than Asian (27%) men. These findings suggest that there may be potentially different levels of social stigma for different racial combinations of couples. Given that men report dating outside of their race more than women, one conclusion that can be drawn is that it may be more acceptable for men to date interracially than for women. Furthermore, given that White male-Asian female and White female-Black male couple combinations are most common among White males and females, respectively, and that they fall in line with racial stereotypes about masculinity and femininity, there should be more acceptance towards these couple combinations compared to other interracial relationships. For instance, interracial couples in which the female is White and the male is Black may be viewed more positively than those in which the female is White and the male is Asian. This is one possible outcome of the present study that I assessed.

Research focusing on the success of interracial marriages suggests a different set of possible outcomes. When looking at data from a nationally representative U.S. sample, Bratter and Eschbach (2006) found that White women in an interracial marriage experienced greater psychological distress than those married to White men. When focusing on divorce rates, Bratter and King (2008) found that interracial married couples on the whole are more likely to be divorced after 10 years of marriage. A closer look at the results revealed that the likelihood of divorce varied by the racial and gender combinations of the couples. Specifically, couples in which the female was White and the male was non-White showed a greater divorce rate compared to White-White couples. However, interracial couples involving a White male and non-White female showed either similar or even lower divorce rates than White-White couples. Zhang and Van Hook (2009) found similar results in their study on divorce rates of interracial couples. Specifically, they replicated findings by Bratter and King (2008) showing that interracial couples have a higher divorce rate than White-White couples do and that interracial couples in which the woman is White and the man is Black have the highest divorce rate. Importantly, Zhang and Van Hook (2009) did not find this to be true with interracial couples involving a White female and a minority non-Black male. Similar to findings by Galinsky and colleagues (2013), research on the success of interracial marriages revealed that different couple
combinations may experience varying levels of bigotry. In particular, there may be more social disapproval for White females who have partners outside their own race.

The discrepancy in Bratter and King (2008) and Zhang and Van Hook’s (2009) findings can also be seen in other research on stigma against interracial couples. Both Yancey (2007) and Byrd and Garwick (2006) interviewed interracial couples and found that those in which the female was White and the male was Black reported incidences of discrimination that other racial combinations did not and those same couples internalized these incidences on a deeper level than other interracial couples did. According to this research, one conclusion would be that interracial couples involving a White female and a Black male are viewed in a more negative light than all other interracial couples. This is an alternative hypothesis that I explored.

Other research has also shown that interracial couples that include a White female and a non-White male encounter more social disapproval than those involving a White male with a non-White female, irrespective of the race of the minority partner (Miller, Olson & Fazio, 2004). Specifically, a White female with an Asian male partner or a White female with a Black male partner report similar amounts of social disapproval from family and friends (Miller et al., 2004). Although previous findings are mixed on whether White-Black interracial relationships endure more social disapproval than other interracial relationships, a consistent finding is that interracial couples involving a White female and a non-White male report experiencing more bigotry than couples involving a White male and a non-White female.

Previous research has also shown that family members may have a large influence on the dating decisions people make when a potential partner is outside of their race. In their study, Harris and Kalbfeisch (2000) asked White and Black participants about strategies they would use to initiate a date with a same- and other-race person. They found that not only are people dissuaded from dating outside of their own race, but this deterrence is primarily due to disapproval from their families. Further research on the success of interracial relationships has looked at the stability and the duration of couples. For instance, Wang, Kao, and Joyner (2006) analyzed data from a national longitudinal study which revealed that adolescent interracial couples tend to hide their relationship from their family and from the public and are less likely to meet the parents of their romantic partner than intraracial couples. These findings support Harris and Kalbfeisch’s (2000)
research suggesting that interracial couples are aware that their family members are less supportive of interracial dating, which affects their dating behaviours.

Lehmiller and Agnew (2006) investigated whether people’s level of commitment to their partner was compromised when they were a part of a marginalized couple such as an interracial couple. They assessed three components of commitment: 1) investment in the relationship, 2) quality of alternative options, and 3) relationship satisfaction. The authors found that partners in interracial relationships tended to invest less in the relationship than partners in intraracial relationships, thus significantly lowering their overall levels of commitment to the relationship. They also found that in an effort to boost commitment levels, partners in interracial relationships attempted to compensate for their lack of commitment by unconsciously perceiving their available relationship alternatives to be of low quality (Lehmiller & Agnew, 2006).

The resulting effects of lower levels of commitment from stigmatization can be seen in research on the success or failure of interracial dating relationships. Much like the research on divorce rates, researchers found that interracial dating couples are more likely than intraracial couples to break up rather than continue on to marriage (Wang et al., 2006). Joyner and Kao (2005) observed a similar finding when looking at the likelihood of entering into an interracial relationship throughout the lifespan. In their analysis of the same national sample used by Wang and colleagues (2006), they found that as age increased between 18 and 35 years old, people were less likely to engage in an interracial romantic relationship. Moreover, people were less likely to enter into an interracial marriage and more likely to be involved in a dating or co-habitating relationship with a partner of a different race (Joyner & Kao, 2005). Taken together, these results suggest that interracial couples do not seem to commit to one another long-term and thus these relationships may not result in marriage.

1.2 Present Study

Previous research has mainly focused on target couples’ experiences of bigotry and little research has focused on the perceivers’, or outsiders’, reactions to interracial relationships. To date, no research has systematically focused on family members’ perceptions of interracial dating. Golebiowsk (2007) used data from the General Social Survey conducted in 2000 to examine White Americans’ attitudes towards family members marrying interracially. She found that about 1/3 of the respondents opposed having a Black person marry into their family and
about 1/5 of respondents opposed having a Hispanic or an Asian person marry into the family. However this still leaves a number of questions about interracial dating specifically which may yield different results because it may be viewed as less permanent and more casual than interracial marriage (Firmin & Firebaugh, 2008; Fujino, 1997; Yancey, 2002).

Given that people largely make decisions about whom they are willing to date based on their family’s approval of the partner (e.g., Harris & Kalbfleisch, 2000), the goal of this study is to examine people’s reactions to interracial dating within their family. In her qualitative research, Chito Childs (2005) tried to investigate how students would react if their family member were dating interracially. However, White students were reluctant to openly divulge their views on the matter and evaded the question. In the current study, White participants completed an online survey in which they were asked to imagine that their sibling is either in a White-White intraracial dating relationship, or in a White-Asian or a White-Black interracial relationship. I hypothesized that participants would feel more negatively and would have less positive beliefs about their sibling’s relationship (such as having a lower quality of relationship) when it is interracial as opposed to intraracial. Additionally, I expected that participants would show different behavioral intentions towards interracial than intraracial couples by offering them less social support. Finally, I predicted that these results would be especially true for interracial couples in which the family member is a White sister dating a non-White man as opposed to a White brother dating a non-White woman.

Given the exploratory nature of this experiment, I also assessed a number of potential moderators, including participants’ levels of ethnic identity, race essentialism, social dominance orientation (SDO), openness to interracial dating, general stereotypes about interracial dating, general prejudice towards minorities, internal and external motivation to control prejudice, ambivalent sexism and participants’ personal experiences with interracial dating. Specifically, my goal was to identify which models containing these moderators were the most probable predictors of how different types of couples were viewed. Although some previous work has been done using these potential moderators, to my knowledge none have compared the effects of each of these moderators to each other. It would be difficult to predict which of these individual difference variables would be most predictive of perceptions of different couple types because each seemed like a potential moderator. However, I expected that increases in all of these constructs except for motivation to control prejudice and experiences with interracial dating
would be associated with increases in negative affect and negative stereotyping, and decreases in social support offered to interracial couples. Conversely, I predicted that increases in motivation to control prejudice would be associated with decreases in negative affect and negative stereotyping, and increases in social support offered to interracial couples. Depending on whether participants have positive or negative personal experiences, the levels of stereotypic beliefs, negative attitudes, and intended social support may vary. Thus, it is unclear how previous interracial dating history will affect evaluations of interracial couples. The results from this study will constitute the first step towards uncovering the mechanisms involved in family members’ perceptions of interracial dating.
Chapter 2
Current Study

2 Method

2.1 Participants

An online community sample of 478 White participants from the United States were recruited via Amazon’s Mechanical Turk (MTurk), a website in which individuals complete tasks in exchange for monetary compensation. Given that more than 80% of interracial couples include a partner that is White (Statistics Canada, 2014) and that there may be greater pressure for White women to date same-race partners (e.g., Miller et al., 2004), I was interested in White individuals’ perceptions of interracial dating and thus this initial study focussed on data only from this demographic. Of the 478 participants, 149 were excluded because they failed two out of five attention checks \( (n = 6) \), they incorrectly responded to one of the manipulation check questions \( (n_{\text{name of partner}} = 12, n_{\text{race makeup of couple}} = 127, n_{\text{relationship of family member}} = 2) \), or they completed the study in under 10 minutes \( (n = 2) \) leaving a final sample of 329 White participants. Participants ranged from 18 to 77 years old \( (M = 35.53, SD = 12.84) \) and 64% of them were women.

2.2 Procedure and Design

Upon selecting the study, participants were directed to the consent form in which they were informed that the purpose of the study was to explore people’s attitudes towards couples in a romantic relationship. After consenting, participants were directed to the first screen of the questionnaire, where they were asked to choose a number from a set of choices ranging from one to nine in order to randomly select a couple for them to read about. In reality, the computer randomly generated the condition regardless of the number participants choose. This was done so that participants did not think that their condition had been pre-set and to make the experience more authentic.

Participants were asked to imagine that either their 20-30 year old sister was in a romantic dating relationship with a White, an East Asian, or a Black man or their 20-30 year old brother was in a romantic dating relationship with a White, an East Asian, or a Black woman. In order to
manipulate race of the imagined partner, I used names that were pilot-tested in a separate sample (N = 17) prior to the start of this study. These names were tested for the degree to which they were prototypical White, Black, and East Asian names. Additionally, the gender and age associated with each name was tested. The resulting names used were Christopher and Molly for a White man and woman, respectively, Chung and Mei for an East Asian man and woman, respectively, and Jamal and Shanice for a Black man and woman, respectively. Thus, this study utilized a 2(sibling: sister vs. brother) x 3(race of partner: White vs. East Asian vs. Black) between-subjects design. Given the design of the current study and previous effect sizes, it was determined that I would need to run 50 participants per cell in order to find a small to medium effect size of \( f = .2 \) and to achieve 88% power.

After participants imagined a sibling in either a same- or cross-race relationship, they then responded to a series of questions about emotions they felt towards the couple and beliefs they had about the relationship, as well as the amount of social support they would be willing to offer to the couple. Participants also evaluated the couple on a number of relationship measures, including quality of relationship, openness to enter into such a relationship, compatibility of the couple, and commonality of the partners. Additionally, participants completed a number of scales related to individual differences (e.g., ethnic identity, motivation to control prejudice). Finally, participants provided demographic information, including their previous interracial dating history and that of their family members. After completing the study, participants were debriefed and compensated.

### 2.3 Dependent Measures

#### 2.3.1 Overall Affect towards the Couple

To indicate their emotions towards the couple, participants completed a measure adapted from Bell, Esses, and Maio (1996) where they listed up to five words that show how they felt towards the couple. For each word, they rated how positive or negative it is on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = *very negative*; 7 = *very positive*). The mean score of participants’ ratings of their self-generated items was used in the current analyses. Higher scores indicate greater positive (and less negative) emotions towards the target couple. Additionally, participants had the opportunity to explain their word choices by writing why they feel these emotions towards the couple. The feelings
participants listed as well as their explanation for their word choices will be used in future studies and was not included in the analyses.

Participants also rated the extent to which they felt six positive (happy, joyful, content, excited, enthusiastic, pleased) and six negative (annoyed, angry, concerned, anxious, worried, upset) emotions about the couple on a seven-point Likert scale (1 = not at all; 7 = extremely). Negative emotions were reverse scored and the mean of participants’ scores were used such that positive scores on scale items were associated with greater positive (and less negative) emotions towards the target couple. Cronbach’s alpha for the scale showed excellent reliability, $\alpha = .91$.

There was a large correlation between the mean of participants’ ratings of their generated feelings and the mean of their ratings of positive and negative emotions that I provided, $r(326) = .78$, $p < .01$. Because of this, I created an overall affect score for every participant by computing the mean of the two measures.

### 2.3.2 Descriptions of the Couple

Participants’ beliefs about the target couple were assessed using the same open-ended procedure as for the emotions task (Bell, et al., 1996), whereby they listed up to five words that they thought described the couple and then rated how positive or negative each word was on the same 7-point Likert scale. The mean score of participants’ ratings of their self-generated items was used in the current analyses. Higher scores indicate greater positive (and less negative) descriptors participants attributed to the target couple. As before, participants had the opportunity to explain their word choices. The descriptions participants provided as well as the explanation for their word choices will be used in future studies and was not included in the analyses.

### 2.3.3 Perceptions of the Quality of the Relationship

In order to assess participants’ perceptions of the quality of the target couple’s relationship, participants completed the *Perceived Relationship Quality Components Inventory* (Fletcher, Simpson & Thomas, 2000) which assesses six components of relationship quality including relationship satisfaction, commitment, intimacy, trust, passion and love on a seven-point Likert scale (1 = not at all; 7 = extremely). Every component was comprised of three questions amounting to a total of 18 items. For example: how satisfied is the couple in their relationship? Items were presented in a randomized order. Cronbach’s alpha indicated that the scale had
excellent reliability, $\alpha = .98$, thus an overall mean score of all of the items was created for every participant and used in further analyses. Higher scores indicate that participants believe that the target couple has greater relationship quality.

### 2.3.4 Intended Social Support towards the Couple

I adapted an eight-item scale that assesses four types of social support (emotional, tangible, informational, network) from Cohen and Hoberman’s (1983) *Interpersonal Support Evaluation List* (e.g., I would accept and express my support for this relationship). Every type of social support includes two items: one positive and one negative, where negative items were reverse scored. Participants rated the extent to which each item is descriptive of how they would interact with the couple on a seven-point Likert scale ($1 = \text{not descriptive at all}; 7 = \text{very descriptive}$). Items were presented in a randomized order.

I factor analyzed the eight items using an exploratory factor analysis with a maximum likelihood extraction method to identify any common dimensions within the social support scale. I used a promax rotation, an oblique rotation method because this allows the underlying factors to be correlated. The items loaded onto one factor because the first eigenvalue ($\text{value} = 4.21$) was substantially greater than one and all other eigenvalues were below one. As seen in Table 1 (Appendix A), I deleted one item because it was below the cutoff point of .5, leaving a scale of seven items with good reliability, Cronbach’s $\alpha = .87$. I computed a mean score of participants’ responses to these seven items whereby higher scores indicate greater willingness to offer social support to the target couple.

Additional relationship measures were collected for use in future studies however they will not be discussed here.\(^1\)

---

\(^1\) Participants completed a modified version of the *Inclusion of Other in the Self (IOS) Scale* (Aron, Aron & Smollan, 1992), rated how easy it is for them to imagine themselves in a relationship such as the target couple’s, responded to seven items rating their perceptions of the compatibility of the target couple, and responded to two items assessing the commonality of the target couple.
2.4 Potential Moderators

I assessed a number of possible moderators that may have an effect on participants’ responses to the main measures. Unless otherwise indicated, all the scales below use a seven-point Likert scale (1 = *strongly disagree*; 7 = *strongly agree*). Participants viewed the items from each of the following scales in a randomized order. Participants’ mean scores on each scale were centered by transforming them into z-scores prior to analyses.

2.4.1 Ethnic Identity

Participants completed the 20-item *Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure* developed by Phinney (1992) which measures the importance of being a member of one’s racial group by assessing aspects such as feelings of pride, belonging, commitment, and interest in one’s racial group. For example: I feel good about my cultural or ethnic background. Where necessary, items were reverse scored such that higher scores indicate greater ethnic identity. Cronbach’s alpha indicated that the scale has good reliability, $\alpha = .86$.

2.4.2 Race Essentialism

Participants responded to a three-item scale modified from the *Race Essentialism Scale* (Chao et al., 2007; Chao, Hong & Chiu, 2013) which assesses the extent to which people believe that different racial groups are essentially different based on the degree to which they think that race is deeply rooted in biological makeup, that it is unchangeable and that it reveals a person’s traits and characteristics. For example: a person’s race is something very basic about them and it can’t be changed much. Higher scores indicate a greater belief that racial groups are essentially different from one another. Cronbach’s alpha indicated that the scale has good reliability, $\alpha = .83$.

2.4.3 SDO

Participants completed the 14-item *Social Dominance Orientation (SDO) Scale* (Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth & Malle, 1994) which measures the degree to which people would like the group that they are a member of to dominate over other groups mirroring their beliefs about social equality. For example: some people are just inferior to others. Responses were on a seven-point Likert scale (1 = *very negative*, 7 = *very positive*) and items were reverse scored where necessary such
that higher scores indicate a greater desire to maintain intergroup relations that are hierarchical rather than equal. Cronbach’s alpha indicated that the scale has excellent reliability, $\alpha = .94$.

2.4.4 Openness to Interracial Dating

Participants completed a modified version of Cila and Lalonde’s (2014) *Personal Openness to Interfaith Dating Scale* to assess the degree to which participants are open to dating interracially. For example: I am open to dating someone of a different ethnic background than me. Negatively worded items were reverse scored such that higher scores indicate greater openness to personally enter into an interracial relationship. Cronbach’s alpha indicated that the scale has excellent reliability, $\alpha = .93$.

2.4.5 Interracial Dating Stereotypes

Participants completed a 15-item measure developed by Lalonde and colleagues (2007) that assesses stereotypes of Black-White interracial relationships. This scale was slightly modified in that the word *Black* was changed to *non-White* so that the scale can be generalized to all interracial couples. For example: non-White people who date Whites hate themselves. Higher scores indicate greater endorsement of stereotypes towards interracial dating. Cronbach’s alpha indicated that the scale has excellent reliability, $\alpha = .94$.

2.4.6 General Prejudice

Participants completed the 20-item *Whites’ Attitudes towards Blacks (ATB) Scale* (Brigham, 1993). In order to assess participants’ prejudice towards minorities in general, the word *Black* in the scale was changed to *someone of a different racial group* or *other racial groups* depending on the sentence structure. For example: generally, other racial groups are not as smart as Whites. Where necessary, items were reverse scored such that higher scores indicate more positive attitudes and less general prejudice towards minorities. Cronbach’s alpha indicated that the scale has excellent reliability, $\alpha = .91$.

2.4.7 Motivation to Control Prejudice

Participants completed the *Motivation to Control Prejudice Scale* developed by Plant and Devine (1998). Five items tap into external motivations (EMS) to control prejudice which are motivations based on how others regard an individual (e.g., I try to act non-prejudiced toward...
minorities because of pressure from others) and five items tap into internal motivations (IMS) to control prejudice which are motivations based on internalized values and beliefs against prejudice (e.g., being non-prejudiced toward minorities is important to my self-concept). In order to generalize the scale to minorities, the scale was slightly adapted from the original in that the word Black was changed to minorities. One IMS item was reverse scored and higher scores on both the EMS and the IMS measures indicate a greater motivation to control prejudice. Cronbach’s alpha indicated that each of the subscales has good reliability, α’s > .87.

2.4.8 Sexism

Participants completed the 22-item Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI; Glick & Fiske, 1996) which assesses participants’ hostile sexism which is antagonistic and benevolent sexism which, while still limiting and harmful, contains positive emotions and can elicit prosocial behaviours. For example: women are too easily offended. Where necessary, items were reverse scored such that higher scores on this measure indicate greater sexism towards women. Cronbach’s alpha indicated that the scale has excellent reliability, α = .91.

2.4.9 Demographic Information

Aside from collecting standard demographic information, including participants’ race, I assessed participants’ personal interracial dating experience. Specifically, I asked participants if they have ever been in an interracial relationship, or if anyone in their family has ever dated someone of a different racial background than them. If participants answered “yes” to at least one of these two questions, they were coded as having experience with interracial dating and thus being familiar with it. If participants answered “no” to both questions, they were coded as not being familiar with interracial dating. If participants answered “no” to one of the two questions and did not answer the second question, then they were excluded from analyses involving the familiarity measure because it is impossible to know whether these participants have any previous experiences with interracial dating or not.
Chapter 3
Results

3 Analytic Strategy

I first conducted a MANOVA to examine how participants view different types of couples as a function of the sibling’s gender and the partner’s race. Additionally, the MANOVA allowed me to determine if participants’ own gender and familiarity with interracial relationships (both categorical variables) moderated the effects of the sibling’s gender and the partner’s race. Next, in order to identify which potential moderators were better at predicting perceptions of interracial dating, I performed Akaike information criterion (AIC)-based model comparisons that pitted the different potential moderators against one another. Finally, I ran regressions which included moderators that consistently beat the minimum selection criteria in the AIC-based model comparisons. The dependent variables I used for all of the analyses were participants’ ratings of their overall affect towards the couple, their descriptions of the couple, their perceptions of the quality of the relationship, and their intended social support towards the target couple.

3.1 Perceptions of Interracial Dating

To test if participants view some types of couples in a more positive light than other types of couples and to assess whether participant gender and participant familiarity with previous interracial dating affected how they viewed the couples, I conducted a 2 (gender of sibling) x 3 (race of partner) x 2 (sex of participant) x 2 (familiarity) between-subjects MANOVA on the four dependent variables listed above. The results revealed that, as a whole, there was no significant difference between how participants perceived different types of couples based on the gender of the sibling and the race of the sibling’s partner, Wilks’ \( \lambda = .959, F(8, 530) = 1.41, p = .191 \), \( \eta^2_p = .021 \). There were also no significant main effects of the gender of the sibling or of the race of the sibling’s partner, \( Fs < 1.6, ps > .1 \). Given that there were no effects of partner race in the MANOVA, and thus there were no significant differences between siblings who date an Asian or a Black partner, the rest of the analyses compared same-race (i.e., White) versus other-race (i.e., Asian/Black) partners.

Although significance was not achieved in perceptions of different types of couples, the general pattern was as follows: participants felt more positively towards a brother dating a White same-
race partner, provided more positive descriptions, and perceived this target couple to have a higher relationship quality than a sister dating a White same-race partner. However, participants intended on providing a sister slightly more social support than a brother in a same-race relationship. Additionally, participants felt more positively, provided more positive descriptions, perceived relationship quality to be higher, and intended on providing greater social support to brothers dating either an Asian or a Black woman compared to a sister dating an Asian or a Black man (see Table 2 in Appendix B).

Additionally, sex of the participant and familiarity with interracial dating did not moderate perceptions of target couples, $F$s< 1.7, $p$s > .1. Thus, these two measures are not considered in further analyses.

3.2 Model Comparisons

I conducted AIC-based model comparisons in order to determine which individual difference variables served as consistent moderators. For every dependent variable, I compared nine different individual difference measures that could potentially serve as moderators. Thus, I created nine models (each model contained one potential moderator) which I compared for every dependent variable. To conduct the model comparisons, I first extracted the AIC of every model in order to determine which potential moderator has a model that best fits the data. The lower the value of the AIC, the better the model fit, thus the model with the lowest AIC value fit the data the best. Next, I computed the relative likelihood (RL) of every model, which is the likelihood of every model relative to the best-fitting model, that is, to the model with the lowest AIC, using the formula below.

$$RL = \exp \left( \frac{(AIC_{\text{lowest}} - AIC_{\text{competing}})}{2} \right)$$  (1)

Finally, I divided the RL of every model by the sum of all RLs which provided me with the probability that each model fits the data the best given the set of competing models (for an overview see Burnham & Anderson, 2004; see also Wagenmakers & Farrell, 2004). I used these probabilities to select a set of candidate models. First I created a minimum threshold that models needed to achieve, which included all models whose probability of fitting the data well is greater than 10% of the most probable model. I excluded all models whose probability is less than 10% of the most probable model.
As seen in Table 3 (Appendix C), the model comparisons showed that models which included IMS were consistently the best-fitting models that warranted further investigation. Additionally, models which included the participants’ openness to interracial dating, general prejudice towards minorities, and level of sexism were also good-fitting models worth exploring, but only for participants’ descriptions of the couple. Finally, the model which included a measure of participants’ SDO was a good-fitting model, but only for participants’ perceptions of the quality of the relationship (see Tables 4-7 in Appendix C for detailed tables).

Next, I conducted hierarchical multiple regression analyses of all of the good-fitting models for every dependent measure. Specifically, I conducted a single regression analysis for affect towards the couple that included IMS as a moderator. I conducted regression analyses for descriptions of the couple that included IMS, openness to interracial dating, general prejudice towards minorities, and level of sexism as moderators. I conducted regression analyses for perceptions of the quality of the relationship that included IMS and SDO as moderators. Finally, I conducted a single regression analysis for intended social support towards the couple that included IMS as a moderator. For every analysis listed above, I regressed sibling gender (0 = brother, 1 = sister), partner race (1 = White, 0 = Asian/Black) and the potential moderator onto the dependent variable. Because I found no effects of partner race in the MANOVA, and because the individual difference variables were all modified to refer to minorities, I collapsed partner race into a same (White) versus other (Asian/Black) categorical variable. I then performed simple effects tests (Aiken & West, 1991) to further analyse significant interactions.

### 3.3 Affect towards the Couple

#### 3.3.1 Model with IMS as Potential Moderator

The results from the multiple regression revealed that overall, there were significant main effects, two-way, and three-way interactions ($R^2_{\text{changes}} > .015, F_s > 5.8, ps < .015$). Specifically, there was a main effect of IMS, $\beta = .303, p < .001$, and of sibling gender, $\beta = -.185, p < .001$, however these main effects were qualified by two- and three-way interactions. A significant two-way interaction between the gender of the sibling and IMS, $\beta = .177, p = .008$, and between the race of the partner and IMS, $\beta = -.193, p = .002$, emerged. However, these interactions were also qualified by a three-way interaction between gender of the sibling, the race of the partner, and IMS, $\beta = -.192, p = .013$. 
In order to break down the three-way interaction, I conducted simple effects tests for brothers and sisters separately (Aiken & West, 1991). Only a significant main effect emerged for brothers, such that higher levels of IMS were associated with more positive affect towards a brother in a dating relationship, $\beta = .226, p = .003$. A significant main effect of IMS also emerged for a sister in a dating relationship, $\beta = .401, p < .001$, however this effect was qualified by an interaction between partner race and IMS, $\beta = -.321, p < .001$. Specifically, greater IMS was associated with more positive affect towards target couples involving a sister dating an Asian or a Black man, $\beta = .554, p < .001$, however this effect was not found for sisters dating a White man, $\beta = -.032, p = .826$ (see Figure 1).

![Figure 1](image)

Figure 1. Three-way Race of Partner x Gender of Sibling x IMS interaction predicting affect towards the target couple.

### 3.4 Descriptions of the Couple

#### 3.4.1 Model with IMS as Potential Moderator

Results of the regression revealed a main effect of IMS $\beta = .168, p = .004$ (overall model: $R^2_{\text{change}} = .033, F(3,298) = 3.364, p = .019$), which was qualified by a two-way interaction between the race of the partner and IMS, $\beta = -.171, p = .012$ (overall model: $R^2_{\text{change}} = .025, F(3,295) = 2.654, p = .049$). To deconstruct the two-way interaction, I conducted post-hoc tests by running simple slope analyses for White and Asian/Black partners separately (Aiken & West, 1991). As expected, greater IMS was associated with more positive overall descriptions of siblings dating an Asian or a Black partner, $\beta = .258, p < .001$, but were not associated with descriptions of siblings dating a White partner, $\beta = -.049, p = .616$ (see Figure 2). Thus,
descriptions of interracial couples involving a White sibling and a minority partner were moderated by IMS, however, intraracial White-White couples were not affected by IMS.

![Intra versus Interracial Couples](image)

*Figure 2.* Two-way Race of Partner x IMS interaction predicting descriptions of the target couple.

### 3.4.2 Model with Openness to Interracial Dating as Potential Moderator

Results indicated a main effect of openness to interracial dating, $\beta = .147, p = .01$ (overall model: $R^2_{\text{change}} = .028, F(3,300) = 2.834, p = .038$), however this effect was qualified by a three-way interaction between the race of the partner, the gender of the sibling, and openness to interracial dating, $\beta = -.238, p = .006$ (overall model: $R^2_{\text{change}} = .024, F(1,296) = 7.593, p = .006$). Once again, I conducted simple effects tests for brothers and sisters separately to deconstruct the interaction. Results revealed only an overall trend in main effects for brothers in a dating relationship, $R^2_{\text{change}} = .033, F(2,159) = 2.677, p = .072$, such that more openness to interracial dating was associated with more positive descriptions of brothers in a dating relationship, $\beta = .178, p = .025$. However for sisters, an interaction between partner race and openness to interracial dating emerged, $\beta = -.321, p < .001$. As expected, greater openness to interracial dating was associated with more positive descriptions of a target couple that involved a sister with an Asian or a Black partner, $\beta = .287, p = .006$, but not a sister with a White partner, $\beta = -.226, p = .11$ (see Figure 3).
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Figure 3. Three-way Race of Partner x Gender of Sibling x Openness to Interracial Dating interaction predicting descriptions of the target couple.

3.4.3 Model with General Prejudice as Potential Moderator

The omnibus regression test revealed no significant main effects or two-way interactions, $R^2_{\text{changes}} < .026$, $Fs < 2.6$, $ps > .05$, however a significant three-way interaction between the race of the partner, the gender of the sibling, and general prejudice emerged, $\beta = -.289$, $p = .001$ (overall model: $R^2_{\text{change}} = .033$, $F(1,296) = 10.535$, $p = .001$). As in previous analyses, I used simple effects tests on brothers and sisters separately in order to breakdown the interaction. Results showed no main effects or interactions for brothers, $R^2_{\text{changes}} < .004$, $Fs < .3$, $ps > .8$. However, an interaction between the race of the partner and general prejudice towards minorities emerged for sisters in a dating relationship, $\beta = -.409$, $p < .001$. As predicted, positive attitudes towards minorities (and thus lower levels of prejudice towards minorities) were associated with positive descriptions of couples involving a sister with an Asian or a Black partner, $\beta = .324$, $p = .002$. Surprisingly, positive attitudes towards minorities (and thus lower levels of prejudice towards minorities) were inversely related to positive descriptions of couples involving a sister with a White partner, $\beta = -.381$, $p = .006$. As expected, general prejudice towards minorities was unrelated to descriptions participants gave of relationships involving a brother, $\beta s < .04$, $ps > .69$ (see Figure 4).
Figure 4. Three-way Race of Partner x Gender of Sibling x General Prejudice interaction predicting descriptions of the target couple.

3.4.4 Model with Sexism as Potential Moderator

The regression results revealed only a main effect of sexism, $\beta = -.189$, $p = .001$ ($R^2_{change} = .041$, $F(3,298) = 4.216$, $p = .006$), such that greater sexism was associated with more negative descriptions of the target couple. No other effects emerged, $R^2_{changes} < .008$, $Fs < 2.3$, $ps > .1$.

3.5 Perceptions of the Quality of the Relationship

3.5.1 Model with IMS as Potential Moderator

The results of the omnibus test revealed significant main effects, $R^2_{change} = .077$, $F(3,323) = 8.971$, $p < .001$, and two-way interactions, $R^2_{change} = .035$, $F(3,320) = 4.224$, $p = .006$, but no three-way interactions, $R^2_{change} = .006$, $F(1,319) = 2.322$, $p = .129$. A main effect of the gender of the sibling emerged, $\beta = -.135$, $p = .012$, such that participants perceived couples involving a brother to have better relationship quality compared to couples involving a sister. There was also a main effect of IMS, $\beta = .252$, $p < .001$, however this effect was qualified by a two-way interaction between the race of the partner and IMS, $\beta = -.196$, $p = .002$.

Once again, I conducted simple slope analyses for White and non-White (i.e., Asian or Black) partners separately to breakdown the two-way interaction. Similar to the results of descriptions of target couples, greater IMS was associated with perceptions of greater relationship quality between siblings dating an Asian or a Black partner, $\beta = .344$, $p < .001$, but was not associated with perceptions of relationship quality between siblings dating a White partner, $\beta = -.016$, $p =$
.865 (see Figure 5). Thus, perceptions of the relationship quality between a White sibling and a minority partner were moderated by IMS, however, perceptions of intraracial White-White couples were not affected by IMS.
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*Figure 5.* Two-way Race of Partner x IMS interaction predicting perceptions of the quality of the target couple’s relationship.

### 3.5.2 Model with SDO as Potential Moderator

The results from the multiple regression demonstrated a main effect of SDO, $\beta = -0.268$, $p < 0.001$, and of the gender of the sibling, $\beta = -0.128$, $p = 0.017$ (overall model: $R^2_{\text{change}} = 0.085$, $F(3,325) = 10.065$, $p < 0.001$), however these effects were qualified by a three-way interaction between the race of the partner, the gender of the sibling, and SDO, $R^2_{\text{change}} = 0.015$, $F(1,321) = 5.339$, $p = 0.021$. As above, I conducted simple effects tests for brothers and sisters separately to breakdown the interaction. Results revealed only a main effect of SDO for brothers, such that participants high in SDO perceived the quality of a relationship involving a brother to be low, $\beta = -0.227$, $p = 0.003$. For sisters, a main effect of SDO also emerged, $\beta = -0.327$, $p < 0.001$, however this effect was qualified by an interaction between the race of the partner and SDO, $\beta = 0.269$, $p = 0.004$.

Specifically, high SDO was associated with perceptions of low relationship quality for couples involving a sister with an Asian or a Black partner, $\beta = -0.48$, $p < 0.001$. This relationship was not present for couples involving a sister with a White partner, $\beta = -0.015$, $p = 0.917$ (see Figure 6).
3.6 Intended Social Support towards the Couples

3.6.1 Model with IMS as Potential Moderator

The regression revealed that overall significant main effects, two-way, and three-way interactions emerged ($R^2_{\text{changes}} > .02$, $Fs > 5.5$, $ps < .003$). The main effects of IMS, $\beta = .349$, $p < .001$, and gender of the sibling, $\beta = -.107$, $p = .041$, were once again qualified by two-way interactions between the race of the partner and IMS, $\beta = -.151$, $p = .013$, and between the gender of the sibling and IMS, $\beta = .191$, $p = .004$, respectively. Just as with analyses with overall affect towards the couple, these two-way interactions were qualified by a three-way interaction between the race of the partner, the gender of the sibling, and IMS, $\beta = -.234$, $p = .002$.

Once again, I employed simple effects tests on brothers and sisters separately in order to deconstruct the interaction. As in analyses with affect towards the couple, results revealed only a significant main effect for brothers, such that higher levels of IMS were associated with more positive affect towards a brother engaging in a dating relationship, $\beta = .255$, $p = .001$. A significant main effect of IMS also emerged for a sister in a dating relationship, $\beta = .471$, $p < .001$, however, this effect was once again qualified by an interaction between the race of the partner and IMS, $\beta = -.331$, $p < .00$. Specifically, the greater participants’ IMS, the more social support they intended to offer sisters dating an Asian or a Black man, $\beta = .638$, $p < .001$, but not sisters dating a White man, $\beta = .028$, $p = .843$ (see Figure 7).
Figure 7. Three-way Race of Partner x Gender of Sibling x IMS interaction predicting intended social support.
Chapter 4
Discussion

4 Summary of Findings

The present study sought to examine and compare family members’ perceptions of different types of interracial dating relationships. In the current study I asked participants to imagine that their brother or sister is in either an interracial or an intraracial dating relationship. The results revealed that, contrary to previous findings on family members’ perceptions of interracial marriage (Golebiowska, 2007), participants did not feel more negatively and provide more negative descriptions about interracial couples involving their sibling compared to intraracial couples involving their sibling. Participants also did not perceive that interracial couples would experience a lower quality of relationship and did not intend to offer less social support to these couples compared to intraracial couples. This may be the case because dating tends to be perceived as more temporary than marriage and thus a dating couple may be viewed as not being in a serious commitment (Firmin & Firebaugh, 2008; Fujino, 1997; Yancey, 2002). Furthermore, dating interracially may be regarded as a way to experiment sexually (Gaines & Ickes, 1997; Lalonde, Giguère, Fontaine & Smith, 2007) or to “sow wild oats” (Yancey, 2002, p. 3). If participants find interracial relationships to be based on a physical rather than a deep personal connection and if participants do not regard a dating relationship as permanent, they may then be more accepting of a family member dating a person outside of their race. For example, Fujino (1997) found that individuals preferred to date rather than marry interracially but they preferred to marry rather than date intraracially.

Participants also did not feel significantly more negatively, provide significantly more negative descriptions, perceive significantly lower levels of relationship quality, or offer significantly less social support to interracial relationships in which a sister was dating an Asian or a Black man compared to a brother dating an Asian or a Black woman. Thus, contrary to previous findings that White females feel more pressure than White males to date intraracially and experience greater disapproval from parents when dating interracially (Miller et al., 2004), my results showed that siblings may not necessarily disapprove of sisters dating interracially. Although not
significant, the pattern of findings demonstrates, however, that sisters dating interracially consistently received lower scores on all dependent measures. This suggests that siblings’ affect, beliefs, and behaviours may still be slightly biased against White sisters compared to White brothers dating interracially. However this effect would need to be further examined.

A second goal of the current study was to compare the effect of nine individual difference variables on participants’ affect, beliefs, and behaviours towards couples of various race and gender combinations and to extract a set of best-fitting models containing the most predictive variables. Model comparisons showed that models containing the moderator IMS were the most consistent predictors of the dependent measures. This finding makes sense given that people high in IMS are driven to be unprejudiced towards minorities because it is personally valuable to them (Plant & Devine, 1998).

Regressions were run on overall affect, descriptions, perceptions of relationship quality, and intended social support in order to test how IMS affects perceptions of different target couples. As expected, regression results indicated that the effects of sibling gender and partner race on all four dependent variables were moderated by participants’ levels of IMS. Specifically, participants felt more positively and offered more social support towards an interracial couple involving a White sister only when participants were more internally motivated to control prejudice. Additionally, as expected, IMS was unrelated to feelings and behaviours towards a White sister dating intraracially. Contrary to findings involving a sister, IMS did not moderate the effects of partner race on participants’ feelings and intended social support towards a brother’s dating relationships. These findings suggest that personal prejudice may be linked to participants’ affect and behaviours towards an interracial couple that involves a sister but not couples that involve a brother.

Participants’ descriptions of the couple and their perceptions of the quality of the relationship are both measures that attempt to gauge participants’ beliefs about the different target couples. Participants were first able to provide and rate a list of words that they believed describe the target couple and then assessed whether they believed the quality of the target couple’s relationship would be high or low. Results revealed that IMS moderated the effects of partner race on participants’ beliefs about the couples. Specifically, participants provided more positive descriptions of an interracial target couple and perceived the quality of such a relationship to be
higher only when participants were high on IMS. These findings fall in line with previous results that individuals who are internally motivated to control prejudice are able to inhibit and suppress stereotypes (Amodio, Devine & Harmon-Jones, 2008; Fehr, Sassenberg & Jonas, 2012).

These findings extend previous research showing that individual differences in IMS may result in different outcomes during interracial interactions. For instance, Plant (2004) found that non-Black participants who were high in IMS expected future interactions with Black individuals to be more positive, were less anxious to engage in interactions with Black people, and did not intend on avoiding interactions with Black individuals compared to participants low in IMS. Unlike previous work, the current study examined the relationship between IMS and evaluations of interracial romantic relationships. Specifically, IMS was differentially related to affective and behavioural outcomes for male and female siblings dating interracially. However, regardless of the gender of the sibling, participants high in IMS expressed more positive beliefs towards siblings engaging in an interracial dating relationship.

Model comparisons also revealed that models that include individual difference variables other than IMS were also good candidates for predicting participants’ beliefs about the target couples. Specifically, models containing the variables openness to interracial dating, participants’ general prejudice towards minorities, and level of sexism were good predictors of descriptions of a target couple and a model containing a measure of participants’ SDO was a good predictor of perceptions of the quality of a target couple’s relationship. Given that good models predicting participants’ beliefs about a target couple include IMS as well as other individual difference variables, beliefs about a target couple may involve some of the same mechanisms that affect and behaviour do (such as IMS) however may involve other mechanisms as well and may thus be more complex to understand.

Results of regression analyses showed that openness to interracial dating and general prejudice moderated descriptions participants gave of couples involving a sister but not a brother. As expected, greater openness towards interracial dating was associated with more positive descriptions of couples involving a sister dating an Asian or a Black man but not a White man. Similarly, more positive attitudes towards minorities was associated with more positive descriptions of couples involving a sister dating an Asian or a Black man. These findings parallel the results of Miller and colleagues (2004) who found that people expected their family members
to disapprove of their involvement in interracial dating if they perceived their parents to be prejudiced. However, contrary to my predictions, positive attitudes towards minorities was associated with more negative descriptions of couples involving a sister dating a White man. This finding is harder to explain because there is no reason for a relationship to exist between descriptions participants provide of an intraracial White-White couple and participants’ general prejudice towards minorities because the target couple does not include a member of a minority race.

Although greater sexism was associated with more negative descriptions of the target couples overall, participants’ level of sexism did not moderate descriptions of different couples. It is difficult to understand why sexist participants describe target couples in a more negative light in general because couples may involve either a brother or a sister. Thus, one would predict that sexism may affect descriptions of couples involving a sister differently than descriptions of couples involving a brother. One possible explanation for this is that, contrary to the results of the AIC-based model comparisons used in this study, perhaps the model that includes sexism is not truly a good predictor of descriptions participants gave of target couples. Some researchers have suggested that AIC-based model comparisons may be liberal estimators of the model fit (e.g., Kass & Raftery, 1995). It may be possible that this is the case here because the probability that the model containing a measure of sexism predicts descriptions of target couples was very close to the minimum threshold required to be considered a good-fitting model (see Table 5, Appendix B). Thus, perhaps the model predicting descriptions of couples that includes the individual difference variable sexism was erroneously chosen as a good-fitting model.

Regression results also indicated that SDO moderated perceptions of the quality of a relationship involving a sister but not a brother. Specifically, participants perceived an interracial couple involving a sister to have low relationship quality but only when participants were high in SDO. As expected, this relationship was not present for couples involving a sister dating a White man.

4.1 Limitations and Future Directions

Although enlightening, the results of the present study should be interpreted with some caution. One caveat of the current study was that almost 30% of the White participants tested did not pass the manipulation checks and about 90% of these participants did not pass because they were unable to identify the racial composition of the target couple. This suggests that they did not pick
up on the racial composition of the target couple they were asked to imagine. Although names have been used in previous studies to suggest the racial background of a target individual, including only a name may not be an explicit enough clue for participants. Future studies should try including more descriptions about target individuals (such as information about birth country) in order to provide participants with more indices with regards to the racial background of a target individual. Another form of stimuli that can also be used in future studies to specify the race of an individual and is oftentimes used for such purposes would be to provide participants with photos of individuals. By using photos, participants will have visual cues as to the racial background of an individual.

A second limitation of the current study is that participants were asked to imagine a situation in which their sibling is in a romantic relationship. Although participants can have initial reactions to the possibility of a family member engaging in a romantic relationship, this design lacks realism because participants are not necessarily experiencing and may have never experienced such a situation. Thus, participants in the present study are forecasting how they would feel if they were to find themselves in such a situation. Some previous research has shown that forecasting how one would feel or react in a hypothetical situation does not necessarily predict how one would indeed feel or act in the situation should it present itself in real life (Kawakami, Dunn, Karmali & Dovidio, 2009). Rather than asking participants to imagine a hypothetical scenario, asking families of interracial and intraracial romantic couples directly about their perceptions of the relationship their family member is engaged in could add authenticity to the study and could potentially yield different results.

The current results report on how individuals would perceive a couple involving a sibling. However, participants may feel differently towards couples involving a different family member, such as a son or daughter. For instance, Miller and colleagues (2004) found that parents’ level of prejudice against minorities affects perceptions of disapproval towards interracial dating. Perhaps participants would express more negativity towards couples involving their child because this may then have implications for their direct family lineage.

There are a number of interesting lines of research that can follow from the results of the current study. For instance, participants’ affective and behavioral responses were based on their level of IMS, the race of the partner, and the gender of the sibling. However, regardless of the gender of
the sibling, participants’ beliefs about the couple (i.e., descriptions of the couple and perceptions of the quality of the relationship) were solely based on their level of IMS and on the race of the partner. Thus, participants may feel and behave differently but have similar stereotypes for males and females dating interracially. This suggests that affect towards interracial dating may be more strongly linked to behavior towards interracial couples than cognition (i.e., beliefs about the target couple). Such findings would parallel the results by Cuddy, Fiske and Glick (2007) who found that affect towards a target group predict behavior towards that group better than stereotypes about a target group.

Another potential line of research could compare perceptions of interracial and intraracial couples to actual reports that couples provide themselves. Previous research has suggested that participants harbor a number of stereotypes about interracial couples, however, these stereotypes may be unprecedented. For instance, people may view interracial couples as being more prone to conflict (Gaines & Ickes, 1997; Garcia & Rivera, 1999), even though recent research has shown that interracial couples report similar levels of conflict and coping styles as those reported by intraracial couples (Troy, Lewis-Smith & Laurenceau, 2006). A direct comparison between experiences of target couples and perceptions of those same couples could be instrumental in unveiling discrepancies between perceivers and targets.

Finally, although models containing the moderator IMS were consistently considered to be good models to predict affect, beliefs, and behaviours towards interracial couples, I did not consider how the interaction between IMS and EMS would play a role in these outcomes. Previous research on motivations to control prejudice has tended to examine how individuals with different levels of both IMS and EMS affects perceptions towards target groups and interracial contact (Butz & Plant, 2009). For instance, the current study did not compare participants who are high in IMS but low in EMS versus those who are high in both IMS and EMS. Butz and Plant (2009) explained that individuals high in IMS but low in EMS are likely to employ behaviors that promote egalitarianism when interacting with outgroups which can lead to positive outcomes. However, individuals high in IMS and high in EMS may use behaviors that either promote egalitarianism or attempt to avoid being perceived as prejudiced during intergroup contact and that these behaviors may be cued by situational factors.
4.2 Conclusion

To the extent that family members can influence partner choice (e.g., Harris & Kalbfeisch, 2000), behaviours in a relationship (Wang et al., 2006), and the success or failure of a relationship (e.g., Wang et al., 2006), social support from close family members is vital for the health of the relationship. It is thus imperative to understand family members’ reactions to interracial dating in order to assess the degree and the types of bigotry that threaten interracial relationships as well as the mechanisms that drive these biases. The present study uncovered novel evidence about how people feel about, think about, and behave towards siblings dating people outside of their own race. Specifically, White participants’ levels of IMS impacted their affect, beliefs, and behaviours towards interracial couples involving a sibling. These results suggest that Whites’ perceptions of interracial dating may parallel how driven they are to be unprejudiced because it is personally valuable to them.
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## Appendices

### Appendix A

Table 1. Factor loadings of the items assessing intended social support towards the couples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Items</th>
<th>Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I would accept and express my support for this relationship.</td>
<td>0.825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would be relieved if the couple broke up.</td>
<td>0.718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the couple goes out of town for a few days, I would not offer to look after their house or apartment (plants, pets, garden, mail, etc.).</td>
<td>0.539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the couple throws a party, I would help get the supplies and invite guests.</td>
<td>0.598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would not offer helpful advice to the couple about handling problems.</td>
<td>0.454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When the couple needs suggestions on how to deal with a personal problem, they could turn to me.</td>
<td>0.622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would rarely invite the couple to do things.</td>
<td>0.779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would invite the couple to family events and gatherings.</td>
<td>0.814</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Reverse-scored items.
Table 2. Means and standard deviations for every dependent variable across each condition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Affect M(SD)</th>
<th>Descriptions M(SD)</th>
<th>Relationship Quality M(SD)</th>
<th>Intended Social Support M(SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brother with White partner</td>
<td>5.841(.893)</td>
<td>5.846(1.231)</td>
<td>5.562(0.97)</td>
<td>5.871(1.046)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sister with White partner</td>
<td>5.414(1.028)</td>
<td>5.784(1.417)</td>
<td>5.357(1.157)</td>
<td>5.914(1.059)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brother with Asian partner</td>
<td>5.599(.991)</td>
<td>5.791(1.257)</td>
<td>5.372(1.051)</td>
<td>5.913(1.127)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sister with Asian partner</td>
<td>5.291(1.319)</td>
<td>5.516(1.3)</td>
<td>5.055(1.297)</td>
<td>5.806(1.186)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brother with Black partner</td>
<td>5.649(1.11)</td>
<td>5.706(1.319)</td>
<td>5.652(1.285)</td>
<td>6.148(1.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sister with Black partner</td>
<td>5.326(1.292)</td>
<td>5.631(1.371)</td>
<td>5.472(1.015)</td>
<td>5.682(1.339)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 3. Summary of results of AIC-based model comparisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Moderator</th>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Affect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic ID</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race essentialism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness to interracial dating</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interracial dating stereotypes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Prejudice</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMS</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMS</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Models with a moderator that was above the minimum threshold necessary to qualify as a candidate model for each dependent variable are marked with an X.*

Table 4. AIC-based model comparisons for participants’ overall affect towards the target couple.

| Moderator                                | AIC     | RL       | P(Model|Data, Competing Models) |
|------------------------------------------|---------|----------|----------------------------------|
| Ethnic ID                                | 62.51729 | 1.74E-9  | 1.71E-09                          |
| Essentialism                             | 64.42386 | 6.72E-10 | 6.58E-10                          |
| SDO                                      | 31.30258 | 0.0104545| 0.01023529                        |
| Openness to interracial dating            | 31.29761 | 0.0104805| 0.01026076                        |
| Stereotyping of interracial dating        | 37.47796 | 0.0004768| 0.000466803                       |
| Minority Attitudes                       | 51.48637 | 4.33E-07 | 4.24E-07                          |
| External Motivation to Control Prejudice  | 71.02244 | 2.48E-11 | 2.43E-11                          |
| Internal Motivation to Control Prejudice  | 22.18113 | 1        | 0.9790346*                        |
| Sexism                                   | 48.30267 | 2.13E-06 | 2.08E-06                          |

*Note. Minimum threshold is 10% of the most probable model, .1 x .9790346 = .09790346. * Models whose probability is higher than the required minimum threshold.*

Table 5. AIC-based model comparisons for participants’ open-ended descriptions they provided of the target couple.

| Moderator                                | AIC     | RL       | P(Model|Data, Competing Models) |
|------------------------------------------|---------|----------|----------------------------------|

*Note. Minimum threshold is 10% of the most probable model, .1 x .9790346 = .09790346. * Models whose probability is higher than the required minimum threshold.*
Table 6. AIC-based model comparisons for participants’ beliefs of the target couples’ relationship quality.

| Moderator                                         | AIC       | RL        | \(P(\text{Model|Data, Competing Models})\) |
|---------------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-------------------------------------------|
| Ethnic ID                                         | 164.5006  | 0.0207917 | 0.00872384                                |
| Essentialism                                     | 169.5862  | 0.0016352 | 0.000686094                                |
| SDO                                               | 162.4744  | 0.057263  | 0.02402656                                |
| Openness to interracial dating                    | 159.9352  | 0.2038237 | 0.08552082*                               |
| Stereotyping of interracial dating                | 162.1115  | 0.0686558 | 0.02880676                                 |
| Minority Attitudes                                | 157.0173  | 0.8767354 | 0.3678628*                                |
| External Motivation to Control Prejudice          | 170.9558  | 0.0008244 | 0.000345923                                |
| Internal Motivation to Control Prejudice          | 156.7542  | 1         | 0.4195824*                                |
| Sexism                                            | 160.5011  | 0.1535929 | 0.06444486*                                |

* Models whose probability is higher than the required minimum threshold.

Note. Minimum threshold is 10% of the most probable model, \(.1 \times 0.4195824 = 0.04195824\).

Table 7. AIC-based model comparisons for the amount of social support participants intended to offer the target couple.

| Moderator                                         | AIC       | RL        | \(P(\text{Model|Data, Competing Models})\) |
|---------------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-------------------------------------------|
| Ethnic ID                                         | 70.67609  | 3.77E-10  | 3.76E-10                                  |
| Essentialism                                     | 81.12328  | 2.03E-12  | 2.03E-12                                  |
| SDO                                               | 41.47604  | 0.0008254 | 0.000824496                                |
| Openness to interracial dating                    | 46.7437   | 5.93E-05  | 5.92E-05                                  |

* Models whose probability is higher than the required minimum threshold.

Note. Minimum threshold is 10% of the most probable model, \(.1 \times 0.6376805 = 0.06376805\).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Value 1</th>
<th>Value 2</th>
<th>Value 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stereotyping of interracial dating</td>
<td>44.47127</td>
<td>0.0001846</td>
<td>0.000184409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Attitudes</td>
<td>75.58249</td>
<td>3.24E-11</td>
<td>3.24E-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Motivation to Control Prejudice</td>
<td>85.77194</td>
<td>1.99E-13</td>
<td>1.98E-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Motivation to Control Prejudice</td>
<td>27.2767</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9989319*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexism</td>
<td>64.71688</td>
<td>7.41E-09</td>
<td>7.40E-09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note*. Minimum threshold is 10% of the most probable model, .1 x 0.9989319 = 0.09989319.

*Models whose probability is higher than the required minimum threshold.*