

WHITES' FEELINGS OF CLOSENESS TO BLACKS:  
A STUDY USING DATA FROM THE NATIONAL SURVEY OF AMERICAN LIFE

By

Paula K. Miller

A THESIS

Submitted to  
Michigan State University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Sociology

2012

## ABSTRACT

### WHITES' FEELINGS OF CLOSENESS TO BLACKS: A STUDY USING DATA FROM THE NATIONAL SURVEY OF AMERICAN LIFE

By

Paula K. Miller

Group identifications are influenced by a number of social positions, including race. For example, whites are likely to feel close to other whites and to identify with them racially. However, other identifications, such as class and gender also influence what group of people an individual identifies with. Using data from the National Survey of American Life, this paper analyzes whether white respondent's education, sex, income, and political views effect how closely they identify with blacks. Findings indicate that sex and income did not have a statistically significant impact on whites feelings of closeness to blacks, whereas education and political views did. These findings indicate that other social demographic and cultural factors, besides race, class and gender work together to influence whites feelings of closeness to blacks.

Copyright by  
PAULA K. MILLER  
2012

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	1
STATEMENT OF RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND HYPOTHESIS.....	2
DATA AND SAMPLE.....	3
LITERATURE REVIEW.....	5
Racial Formation.....	5
Hegemonic Whiteness.....	6
Whiteness.....	8
Mediated vs. Direct Class Locations.....	10
Intersections.....	11
Whites' Feelings of Closeness Toward Blacks and Local Space.....	13
Whites' Feelings of Closeness Toward Blacks and Income.....	14
Whites' Feelings of Closeness Toward Blacks and Education.....	15
Whites' Feelings of Closeness Toward Blacks and Political Views.....	15
Whites' Feelings of Closeness Toward Blacks and Gender.....	
MEASURES.....	18
Independent Variables.....	18
Employment Status.....	18
Job Satisfaction.....	19
Worried About Losing Job.....	19
Region.....	19
Church Attendance.....	20
Personal Income.....	20
Political Views.....	21
Age.....	21
Sex.....	22
Education.....	22
How Close Whites Feel to Other Whites.....	22
Dependent Variable (How Close Whites Feel to Blacks.....	23
METHODS.....	23
Multivariate OLS Regression.....	23
RESULTS.....	24
Effect of Whites' Feelings of Closeness Toward Other Whites.....	24
Effect of Conservative Political Views.....	25
Effect of Living in the South.....	25

Effect of Age.....	25
Effect of Gender.....	26
Effect of Education.....	26
Effect of Income.....	26
Constant.....	26
 FINDINGS.....	 27
 FUTURE RESEARCH/IMPORTANCE OF COMMUNITY.....	 28
 LIMITATIONS.....	 30
 CONCLUSIONS.....	 30
 REFERENCES.....	 33

## Introduction

Public perceptions of race and racial attitudes are too often based on dichotomies that place “whites” and “blacks” in two diametrically opposed groups. Unfortunately, white or black are too often seen as categories that one either is or isn’t. These distinctions are guided by processes of racial formation (Omi and Winant, 1994; 2005), characterize much of what we see in mainstream media (Enteman and Rojecki, 2001) and also serve as analytical categories used by many scholars. Seeing white and black as two distinct categories is helpful for the purpose of analyzing overall trends that occur, especially at the level of macro power structures but is not always representative of the lived experiences of people in local communities.

Hegemonic notions of whiteness are contingent upon this black/white binary, as the construction of this ideal type of whiteness is dependent upon the subjugation of blackness and other non-ideal forms of whiteness. As a consequence, performances and preferences of hegemonic whiteness create a space where blackness is devalued. Additionally, hegemonic whiteness fosters intra-group conflict between whites and blacks by constructing oppositional categories.

Not all whites can achieve hegemonic whiteness. This is especially true for whites that live in communities dominated by racial minorities. These whites may exhibit unique cultural and behavioral forms that do not fit within the bounds of hegemonic whiteness. As a consequence of this deviation, whites may be more likely to cultivate intra-racial relationships and to feel more close to blacks. In particular, unique combinations of gender, education, income, and political may facilitate whites feelings of closeness to blacks and the construction of types of whiteness that are divergent from hegemonic forms.

Although unique class, gender, educational and political positionings may be related to whites feelings of closeness to blacks, they are not the only significant predictors. I propose that feelings of community and closeness can be cultivated through shared social positioning or shared physical space, but is often cultivated by the creation of other ideological and symbolic bonds that I would like to measure in a future study. Resisting hegemonic whiteness can facilitate the creation of intra-racial physical and ideological bonds outside the power relationships inherent in hegemonic whiteness. However, it also forces whites to give up privileges associated with hegemonic whiteness, which may be material or ideological.

Although focusing on only black and white excludes a number of other racial and ethnic groups that may not fit into these two racial categories, it is necessary for me to analyze these categories in an attempt to examine and interrogate this existing racial paradigm. Additionally, I hope to show that even the relationships between blacks and whites are more complex than they seem.

### **Statement of Research Questions and Hypothesis:**

The National Survey of American Life (NSAL) surveyed African American and Caribbean Blacks throughout highly populated regions in the United States on a number of demographic and psychological issues. A unique piece of this study is that in the process of surveying blacks, researchers also found a significant number of whites that lived in these black occupied communities. Whites who live in areas surrounded by people of color are highly unusual. In fact, most whites live in highly segregated areas where whites compose at least 90% of the local population (United States Census, 2010). For this reason, this study posed an interesting opportunity to examine how whites feel about blacks in non-normative contexts. In

particular, I am interested in testing what factors contribute to whites in these communities level of closeness to blacks. Though there is no other national study that asks about whites feelings of closeness to blacks, it is likely that the conclusions drawn from this sample are not applicable to whites as a whole. For this hypothesis, I will be testing the following 4 research hypotheses:

*H1: Education affects the level of closeness whites in these communities feel toward blacks.*

*H2: Sex affects the level of closeness whites in these communities feel toward blacks.*

*H3: Whites political views affect the level of closeness whites in these communities feel toward blacks.*

*H4: Whites income levels affect the level of closeness whites in these communities feel toward blacks.*

### **Data and Sample:**

Using data from the National Survey of American Life (NSAL), I will be examining the attitudes of whites living in communities of color. Particularly, I will examine how a number of variables influence their reported responses on how closely they identify with black Americans. The National Survey of American Life (NSAL) was a survey completed between 2001-2003. The purpose of this study was to survey mental health, identity, and other demographics of blacks living in America. Researchers surveyed respondents in areas that were highly populated by Black Americans. In the process, they also found a small segment of whites that populated these areas. Out of the 6,082 respondents surveyed, 3,570 (58.7%) were African American, 1,621 (26.65%) were Caribbean and the remaining 891 (14.65%) were white. Since I am interested in whites that live in communities populated by blacks, I will only be analyzing the 891 whites in



the survey for my analysis. Also, the respondents in the survey were randomly selected, but only within the neighborhoods researchers identified as being highly populated by Blacks. To control for this factor, I inputted the data as a stratum.

There have been few studies done examining the attitudes of whites that live in communities of color. The studies that do exist typically exhibit one of two different sets of conclusions; Whites either adapt to these surroundings by rejecting normative manifestations of whiteness (Morris, 2006; Hartigan, 2009) or by cleaving to these manifestations (Hartigan, 1999; Wray, 1997). Whites who hold on to their whiteness, do so because they feel it is in their material (Bobo and Hutchings, 1996) or ideological (Tarman and Sears, 2005) best interests. Often, these beliefs foster increased inequalities across black and white communities, promoting whites feelings of distance from blacks created by the perception that blacks are to blame for ruining their communities, taking their jobs, and contributing to the overall decline of the American politic (Steinberg; 2000). Scapegoating blacks in this way obscures the reality that class based inequalities are to blame for their social position and limits blacks and whites abilities to rally together from a similar class position (Lipsitz, 1998). In this study, I will be examining how income, sex, political views and educational levels affect these identifications and how they influence whites feelings of closeness toward blacks.

Whites in this sample had average incomes of \$29,158. In this way, they were largely poor or working class. It is likely whites in these communities had similar incomes as the blacks in their community, although there is no measure in the data to determine if this is true. The studies that do exist that examine whites that live in black communities bolster this assumption (Hartigan, 1999).

## **Literature Review:**

### *Racial Formation*

The historical legacy of racism in the United States cultivates racial binaries and indoctrinates Americans with the assumption that black and white are two distinctly racial categories, each possessing unique cultural and behavioral forms. Omi and Winant's racial formation model explains the processes by which race became integral to American society. They define racial formation as "the process by which social, economic, and political forces determine the content and importance of racial categories, and by which they are in turn shaped by racial meanings" (Omi and Winant, 2005:17).

Racial formation processes in the United States are distinct in that they grow out of the one drop rule that created a black/white racial binary in the United States (Fredrickson, 2002; Omi and Winant, 2005; Jordan, 1968). These historical processes created a space where white and black exist as ideal types in opposition to each other (Fredrickson, 2002; Jordan, 1968; Mills, 1997; Ross, 1997). This fosters feelings of difference across racial groups and makes blacks and whites seem like two extremely divergent groups who exist in opposition to each other. Although other racial types are important in the racial formation model (Foner and Fredrickson 2004), focusing on black and white highlights these extremities. These legal and social precedents not only categorize people into white and black but also create idealized, stereotypical and normative forms of what it means to be white or black (Mills, 1997; Wright, 1997; Rumbaut, 2009). Blacks and whites who does not fit into these normative racial categories exist at the margins of their racial group. Although this resistance comes with certain consequences (eg. loss

of privilege for whites), it also creates a space where whites may feel closer to blacks on some levels.

### *Hegemonic Whiteness*

Unfortunately, too often, social positions are seen as dichotomous categories that one fits into or doesn't. In this way, social positions are immersed in particular sets of norms that become controlling images (Hill-Collins, 2000) for how individuals within these groups are expected to interact. These controlling images are hegemonic, as they often go unquestioned within our society (see Connell, 1987 for a discussion of hegemonic masculinity; see Morris, 2005 for a discussion of hegemonic whiteness).

Whiteness is a social positioning that is not exempt from these rules. Hegemonic notions of whiteness are shaped by middle and upper class patriarchal norms that may not be representative of the cultural and behavioral patterns of whites living in communities of color. In particular, unique gendered and class based experiences in these communities guide the formation of unique and diverse forms of whiteness (see Frankenburg, 1993 for a discussion on how whiteness is feminized; and Morris, 2006; Hartigan, 1999; Wray, 2006; Roediger, 1999; Foley, 1997 on how whiteness manifests itself differently according to class).

Borrowing from Connell's theories about hegemonic masculinity (Connell, 1995), in *An Unexpected Minority: White Kids in an Urban School*, Morris argues that hegemonic whiteness is based on idealized, stereotypical norms of whiteness that set forth certain standards of behavior, speech and dress that excludes all people of color, along with many people who are phenotypically deemed "white." Whites such as these exist at the margins of whiteness, where they occupy a space that is "not quite white" (Wray, 2006), yet not quite black.

These non-normative manifestations of whiteness create spaces for types of whiteness to be created that are non-hegemonic and may have the ability to foster feelings of intra-racial closeness. On a structural level, hegemonic whiteness is “a concept that reveals and explains the racial interests of white people, linking them collectively to a position of social dominance (Hartigan, 1999:16).” Unfortunately, this definition presupposes that “the racial interests of white people” are uniform and does not account for particular groups of whites that may not have access to “a position of social dominance” because of their marginalization in other areas of their life.

Both Morris (2006) and Hartigan (1999) detail a number of cases in their books where whites are unable or unwilling to pursue the cultural expectations associated with this form of whiteness. Their lack of affiliation with white culture and a white identity in these localized spaces suggest they do not wish to utilize the white privilege they are given. In fact, they may not even be conscious of the privileges associated with whiteness as it is not explicitly valued in most of their everyday interactions. This may decrease whites feelings of closeness to other whites and allows for a space where whites may feel closer to blacks. Despite their attempts to extricate themselves from the benefits and costs of whiteness in these spaces, whites in these neighborhoods still reap privileges that are largely due to associations between whiteness and positive attributes. The continuing significance of these affiliations of white/good and black/bad even in minority dominated spaces highlight their pervasive nature. The white privilege that does operate in these spaces is also unique because it consists of an interesting interplay of privileged racial social positions alongside underprivileged class positions. Although whites at the margins may not reap the same benefits as other whites that are more adept at negotiating the terrains of hegemonic whiteness, whites at the margins still often subscribe to oppressive forms

of whiteness that perceive whites as superior on some levels to people of color (Morris, 2006:25). This may largely be due to a “white racial frame” that contends that whites are inherently better and more hard working than black Americans, and therefore deserve to be privileged (Feagin, 2009).

Hegemonic forms of whiteness perpetuate power relationships that by their nature emphasize particular oppressive types of whiteness as the ideal and propagate global systems of white supremacy. In this way, hegemonic whiteness is relational and hegemonic whiteness is created in relation to other marginalized forms of whiteness and emphasized forms of blackness (Connell, 1992). Deconstructing hegemonic whiteness allows for a space where whites are allowed to have divergent identities that are more likely to foster feelings of closeness to blacks.

These dynamics create a space where individuals often have to contend with multiple identities, that often have conflicting interests. Whites who live in communities of color are likely to live in these communities for economic reasons (Hartigan, 1999). Their shared class identity with the people of color in their community and their shared racial identity with whites who may be middle or upper class are often at odds. Historically, poor and working class whites have often dismissed their class identity in favor of cleaving to a white racial identity garner status not given to them by their lowly class status (Roediger, 1999, Wellman, 1977). However, these whites differ from the whites in the NSAL data in that they often lived in white enclaves, where community ties with other whites strengthened their white racial identity.

### *Whiteness*

These unique forms of whiteness indicate that whiteness is not biological, nor is it determined solely by skin color or other physical attributes. Instead, whiteness is socially

constructed, a product of micro and macro social forces and interactions across time and space. Whiteness is multifaceted; created through the interplay of class, gender, sexuality and place. What it means to be white is contingent upon these factors. Therefore, articulations and understandings of whiteness are different in Texas than in Michigan, for men than women, and for the poor than the middle class. This is important because these unique manifestations of whiteness create a space of resistance where hegemonic notions of whiteness can be challenged.

All of these theories point to the fact that there is not one way to be white. Whiteness encompasses a variety of standpoints and epistemologies that may influence whites feelings of closeness to blacks. Therefore, our understanding of whiteness as a uniform category that one either is or isn't is inadequate in explaining the intricate nature of how race is constructed and enacted in local spaces. There are infinite possibilities for divergent white identities and white cultures to arise out of these spaces. Individual and collective constructions and manifestations of whiteness are largely dependent on the interaction of other social positions, such as class, gender and place. The social positioning unique to the individual that exists at the matrix of particularized webs of history and biography creates a space for distinct cultural, behavioral and performative ways of being white.

Hegemonic whiteness obfuscates the complexity inherent in whiteness by reifying the polarized racial binary. Hegemonic whiteness is a structurally privileged position and is difficult to access. To varying degrees people of particular phenotypes can mobilize and perform hegemonic whiteness to access privilege. Yet, by virtue of privileged social positionings it may be easier for some whites to perform hegemonic whiteness than others.

### *Mediated vs. Direct Class Locations*

In *Social Class in America*, W. Lloyd Wright discusses the complexities of social positioning, analyzing individuals who occupy “contradictory locations within class relations (Levine, 148).” These contradictions occur when individuals are invested in multiple class or status groups for one reason or the other. Class locations are also complex in that they can be direct or mediated (Levine, 153). Direct class locations are determined by the relationship individuals have to things such as jobs, wealth, and income. Family ties and community embeddedness work to determine the mediated class location an individual occupies (Levine, 153). Whites spend more time around people of color may become part of symbolic or imagined communities alongside of their black neighbors (Anderson, 1991).

Simultaneously existing in these symbolic communities with people of color while still having the opportunity to capitalize on privileges accrued by their whiteness places these whites in two different communities that may have contending interests. Therefore, whites that live in these communities may have direct class locations dictated by their whiteness, that provides them with all the benefits of white privilege. On the other hand, these whites physical location within the neighborhood and the similar class positioning they share with their black neighborhoods may create mediated class positions that may place more emphasis on relationships and non-material rewards than material rewards. This dynamic provides insight into why whites in communities of color may reject hegemonic manifestations of whiteness, even when it may go against their material self-interest to do so.

## *Intersections*

In “The Conceptual Practices of Power”, Smith argues that one’s experience determines their way of knowing. If we acknowledge that an individual’s experience does not only grow out of raced experiences but classed, gendered and sexualized experiences we must also acknowledge that whiteness alone does not determine the shape of one’s lived experiences. Smith posits that individual experiences are determined by physical and conceptual place. These experiences and access to resources then determine an individual’s access to knowledge and power. Therefore individuals who may share the privileged racialized identity of whiteness may not have the same access to knowledge and power claims if their deracialized social identities do not grant them similar levels of privilege. Hill-Collins’ develops this ideology through what she calls the matrix of domination and then builds on this conceptual framework to construct a method of social action. She argues that giving voice to diverse ways of knowing not only challenges normative truth claims, but also presents an alternative where multiple voices can be pieced together to provide a more complete picture of reality.

In *Black Feminist Thought* Hill-Collins builds on Smith’s points to develop her own argument for the recognition of multiple epistemologies. In addition, Hill-Collins strengthens Smith’s theories by attempting to overcome many of the binaries that are implicit within Smith’s work. Hill-Collins argues that creating new epistemologies (and validating old epistemologies that have previously been discarded) is a necessary step to accurately representing historically oppressed groups. Hill-Collins begins her argument by defining an epistemology as an “overarching theory of knowledge... [that] investigates the standard used to assess knowledge or *why* we believe what we believe to be true” (Hill-Collins, 328). These overarching theories of knowledge are constructed and maintained by those in power in such a strong fashion that the



norms and values embedded within them often go unquestioned. Ultimately, this progression provides members of the dominant epistemology even more power by forcing those whose existence is not explained by the dominant epistemology to internalize its “truths” or be perceived as an outsider.

In today’s world, increasing connectivity and interactions between groups across time and space contribute to the existence of nuanced and multi-layered identities. Race, income, gender are stratification systems that operate on micro and macro levels to situate individuals and groups socially, economically and politically (Hill-Collins 2000; Zinn and Dill 1996). Political views, education and local space also serves to situate individuals socially (for literature on political views see Bonilla Silva, 2010, for literature on education see Jackman 1984; Thorne 1994, for literature on local space see Hartigan 1999) These social positionings interact with each other to create new social positionings that often manifest ways of being and interacting that are different from normative expectations (Hartigan 1999). All of these theories point to the fact that systems of social stratification such as race, income, gender and education shape our lived experiences in ways that structure our lives in restrictive, yet fluid ways. Examining relationships between whites and blacks through the lens of local interactions is helpful because it allows for a space where macro social processes are still at play (eg. hegemonic forms of what it means to be white) but these interactions also allow for a space where unique forms of whiteness, created at the intersections of unique class, gendered locations can interact with blackness in ways that may go against these larger dichotomous relationships.

Spaces dominated by racial minorities provide an excellent social milieu in which subordinate white identities are developed. Edward Morris provides such an analysis in *An Unexpected Minority: White Kids in an Urban School*, as does John Hartigan Jr. in *Racial*

*Situations: Class Predicaments of Whiteness in Detroit.* Both authors argue that in these spaces they studied, manifestations of whiteness differ from normative expectations about what it means to be white. Often, whiteness is disparaged and those in possession of it do not value it. Even so, structural racial inequalities and stereotypes still exist in this space, despite the community's disregard for them. Whites are often privileged and "white" behavior is still held in high regard. An examination of these spaces is integral in deconstructing hegemonic forms of whiteness and white supremacy.

*Whites Feelings of Closeness Toward Blacks and Local Space*

Though the ways racial definitions are maintained and structured is clearly guided by larger social structures and institutions, both Hartigan and Morris focus their studies on racialization processes that occur at the local and micro level. Using an intersectional approach that combines race, class, gender and place, Morris posits that it is important not only to look at the matrix where these intersecting social positions cross, but to look at "how these concepts combine to alter one another (Morris, 2006:21)". Building on this conceptual framework, he argues that "these positions of intersection represent not only where one might be simultaneously advantaged and disadvantaged, but where we might suspect the existence of an entirely unique position whose status could not necessarily be inferred from knowledge of the particular intersecting modes of inequality (Morris, 2006:21)".

Detailed ethnographic studies, such as Hartigan's and Morris' allow us more complex understandings of how race is enacted and defined in everyday life. In these spaces, local definitions of race are still influenced by larger systems of meaning but also take on manifestations that are unique to the particular social dynamics that exist in the areas they study.

Key to Hartigan's study is his belief that "instead of relying upon composite views of "race" in a national perspective, we need to dwell more attentively on the disparate and unstable interpretations of racial matters that people develop in the course of their daily lives (Hartigan, 1999:4)". These particularized articulations of race are influenced by the social contexts in which Hartigan and Morris conduct their studies, where racial minorities are the numerical majority.

Central to both Hartigan's and Morris' arguments is the notion that race is fluid. Both of the sites they study are unique, not because whites within these contexts no longer exhibit racist ideologies or attitudes or because there are no longer any racialized incidents. Instead, these case studies are important in that they highlight situations where black and white were not made into absolute and exclusive categories and race was instead perceived to exist on a spectrum. In this way, local spaces create a unique social milieu that may influence whites feelings of closeness toward blacks. In addition, on a practical level, whites who interact with blacks in the same communities may also see racism toward blacks and be more likely to attribute blacks lack of success to structural factors.

#### *Whites Feelings of Closeness Toward Blacks and Income*

Literature about the affects of income on whites racial attitudes is inconclusive. Some studies show that whites who are poor and working class are more likely to feel an increased sense of competition with blacks (group position model- Blumer and Bobo (wk 4 ch 5 summary, Olzak; 1993). These models propose that groups see themselves as competing for scarce resources and see others as people who might take away resources they need to survive

(Steinberg, 2000). Increased feelings of competition can increase intra-racial tensions and inhibit feelings of closeness between blacks and whites.

David Roediger's *Wages of Whiteness: Race and the Making of the American Working Class* (1991) is a great example of how white working class men, although not having access to the privileges of the upper class, capitalized on white hegemony to the best of their ability in order to garner the privileges of whiteness. In this work, Roediger argues that constructions of whiteness were at the heart of the establishment of the working class. White workers used race to separate themselves from workers of color and to rally other white workers, including white ethnics. This gave them enough power to receive certain benefits as a group including higher wages and better jobs that were not accessible to other workers.

#### *Whites Feelings of Closeness Toward Blacks and Education*

Whites who are uneducated are more likely to be politically conservative and also likely to exhibit racist attitudes (Sidanius, et. al., 2000). This combination allows for a space where education seems to decrease racist attitudes and to allow for a space where whites could feel close to blacks. Non-racist attitudes do not necessarily denote feelings of closeness to blacks, but they are an indicator. The effect of education on whites feelings of closeness to blacks is also complicated by the fact that educated whites are more likely to be aware of normative expectations of political correctness and be fluent in neutral language in which they can couch their feelings of distance from blacks.

#### *Whites Feelings of Closeness to Blacks and Political Views*

There have been a number of studies showing that conservatives are more likely to report feeling racial animosity toward blacks (Bonilla Silva, 2010). From this, we can deduce that these

same conservatives probably feel less close to blacks than liberals. Conservatism also fosters ideologies of symbolic racism, whereby racial inequalities are attributed to blacks inability to work hard, not participate in crime, and to become a generally sound American citizen (Tarman and Sears, 2005). Although Bonilla-Silva makes these claims about conservative and liberal reports about feelings of closeness toward blacks, he is skeptical that these reports are accurate. He posits that these responses are coded in colorblind vernacular and do not necessarily mean whites who are conservative feel any more disdain for blacks than liberal whites (Bonilla-Silva, 2010). Color-blind racism is powerful in that it consists of three components; it is “subtle, institutional and apparently nonracial (Bonilla-Silva, 2010: 3)”.

Another perspective suggests that political attitudes are contingent on the framing of political leaders and institutions and are therefore very limited. In particular, they argue that political parties shape American’s attitudes about race as opposed to individual attitudes shaping the agenda of political parties. (Sniderman et al., 2000)

They disagree with approaches that place individual actors and their decisions at the center of racial politics. Specifically, they disregard theories that argue racism or racial positioning itself determines white racial politics. Instead, they posit that individual ideas about race are ascertained through ideological continuity and issue pluralism. Both methods take the individual out of the equation and explain white racial attitudes and politics through other means. (Sniderman et al., 2000)

### *Whites Feelings of Closeness Toward Blacks and Gender*

One of the key texts that examines how whiteness manifests itself differently based on the subject’s gender is Ruth Frankenburg’s *White Women, Race Matters: The Social*

*Construction of Whiteness* (1993). The primary focus of this book is to show how whiteness is constructed via gender and sexuality. Frankenburg provides numerous examples to detail how white women's experience of race differs from white men's, especially within sexual relationships. For example, she shows how white women who were in relationships with men of color were often seen as "supersexual" beings in ways they would not have been if they were a white man choosing to date a woman of color. Although white women have to overcome barriers created by their gender and sexuality, Frankenburg notes it is still important to recognize the fact that they are at the same time able to maintain their racial privilege.

Bonilla-Silva examines the make up of contemporary "white traitors". He found that young, working class women who interact or have interacted in interracial networks are the most likely group to be racially progressive (measured in terms of support for affirmative action, interracial marriages and recognition of the existence of racial discrimination). Bonilla-Silva's findings directly contradict Adorno's thesis in "The Authoritarian Personality" that suggests those who are poor are most likely to oppress others to give themselves a heightened sense of control.

After finding that these women were most likely to be racially progressive, Bonilla-Silva examined the reasons this might be so. The women in his study had likely experienced both gender and class based discrimination. Bonilla-Silva argues that their experience with discrimination along with their high likelihood to interact with people of color increases their capacity to understand the struggles of other oppressed groups, especially those who share similar class status. White men, on the other hand only have to deal with class discrimination and often reap benefits from supporting the racial status quo such as increased sense of control and access to material and symbolic resources.

In addition, all of the women profiled grew up in racially mixed neighborhoods and had a number of racially mixed relationships (platonic and romantic). These factors contributed to their ability to see racial groups other than their own as real human beings who deserved to be treated humanely. Their liberal, progressive and/or radical political orientations also allowed them a lens through which they were able to connect oppressions based on race, class and gender.

Though the white women profiled in the study showed significant tendencies toward racially progressive ideologies and policies, they were still influenced in part by color-blind ideologies. Therefore, in some areas these “racial progressives” had views that were similar to many other whites who held mainstream views. Ultimately, these works also indicate that it is hard to determine feelings of closeness toward blacks based on survey responses.

### **Measures:**

*Independent variables:* My main predicting independent variables are sex, personal income, education and political views. I controlled for employment status, job satisfaction, worried about losing job, region, church attendance, age, and feelings of closeness to other whites.

*Employment Status:* The variable employment status (wkstat3cat) is a categorical variable that describes respondents’ employment status. Out of the 891 whites in the survey, 887 provided answers to this question. Out of these responses 598 (67.42%) respondents reported being employed, 39 (4.4%) reported being unemployed, and the remaining 250 (28.18%) were not in the labor force. I recoded these responses into a new dummy variable that I labeled unemployed, with 0=employed and 1=unemployed or not in the labor force.

*Job Satisfaction:* The variable job satisfaction (d9) is a categorical variable that describes respondents' level of job satisfaction. Out of the 891 respondents in this survey, 594 provided answers to this question (respondents who were unemployed were not asked this question, for obvious reasons). 285 (47.98%) respondents reported being very satisfied with their jobs, 243 (40.91%) reported being somewhat satisfied with their job, 49 (8.25%) reported being somewhat dissatisfied with their job and the remaining respondents (2.86%) reported being very dissatisfied with their jobs. I recoded these responses into a new dummy variable that I labeled *notsatwithjob*, with 0=satisfied with job and 1=not satisfied with job.

*Worried About Losing Job:* The variable worried about losing job (d20) is a categorical variable that describes how worried respondents' are about losing their jobs. Out of the 891 respondents, 595 provided answers to this question (respondents who were unemployed were not asked this question, for obvious reasons). 29 (4.87%) respondents reported being worried about losing their jobs a lot, 99 (16.67%) reported being somewhat worried about losing their jobs, and the remaining 467 (78.49%) reported not being worried about losing their job at all. I recoded these responses into a new dummy variable, which I labeled *notwrrdabtlosingjob*. Responses that reported that respondents were worried about losing their job (either a lot or somewhat) were coded as 0 and responses that reported respondents were not at all worried about losing their job were coded as 1.

*Region:* The variable region is a categorical variable that describes what region of the United States the respondent currently resides in. All 891 respondents provided responses to this question. 107 (12.01%) respondents live in the northeast, 83 (9.32%) respondents live in the Midwest, 609 (68.35) respondents live in the south, and the remaining 92 (10.33%) live in the



west. I recoded these responses into a new dummy variable, which I labeled otherregion, with 0=south and all others=1.

*Church Attendance:* The variable church attendance (b2) is a categorical variable that describes whether the respondent has attended a religious service in the past year. All 891 respondents provided responses to this question. 807 (90.57%) reported attending a religious service in the past year. The remaining 84 (9.43%) reported that they had not attended a religious service in the past year. I recoded these responses into a new dummy variable, which I labeled churchattend, with 0=have not been to a religious service in the past year and 1=have been to a religious service in the past year.

*Personal Income:* The variable personal income (incper) is a continuous variable and describes the total of the respondent's personal income. Incomes ranged from \$0 to \$150000. The mean income was \$29,158 with a standard deviation of \$23,497. Income was an open-ended question and resulted in a variety of responses. Out of the 891 respondents surveyed, 816 provided their incomes in ways that were codeable. The other respondents either did not provide responses, or provided a response that was coded as missing data. I recoded these responses into a new variable, coding income together by 10,000 increments. 26 (3.19%) respondents had no income, which I coded as 0. 154 (18.89%) respondents had incomes between \$1-\$10,000 (=1), 182 (22.3%) respondents had incomes between \$10,001-20000 (=2), 150 (18.38%) respondents had incomes between 20001-30000 (=3), 108 (13.24%) respondents had incomes between 30001-40000 (=4), 80 (9.8%) respondents had incomes between 40001-50000 (=5), 48 (5.88%) respondents had incomes between 50001-60000 (=6), 22 (2.7%) respondents had incomes between 60001-70000 (=7), 20 (2.45%) respondents had incomes between 70001-80000 (=8), 10 (1.23%) respondents had incomes between 80001-90000 (=9), 6 (.74%) respondents had incomes

between 90001-100000 (=10), and the over 50,000 are so small, I also created another variable I labeled *incperrecode* with the codes of 0-5 being the same and 6=50,001 and above. 116

(14.22%) respondents gave answers that fit into this last category.

*Political Views:* The variable *political views* (h35) is a categorical variable that describes the respondent's overall political views. Out of the 891 respondents, 864 responded to this question. 41 (4.75%) respondents reported that they never really thought about their political views. For the purpose of my analysis, I dropped these responses from the data set, leaving 823 responses. 32 (3.89%) respondents reported extremely liberal overall political views, 97 (11.79%) respondents reported liberal overall political views, 114 (13.85%) respondents reported slightly liberal overall political views, 273 (33.17%) respondents reported moderate/middle overall political views, 165 (20.05%) respondents reported slightly conservative overall political views, 101 (12.27%) reported conservative political views, and the remaining 41 (4.98%) respondents reported extremely conservative political views. I recoded this data into a new dummy variable, which I labeled *notconservative*, with extremely conservative, conservative, and somewhat conservative=0, and all others=1. I originally coded this data extremely conservative and conservative as their own dummy variable, but extremely conservative did not have enough responses to stand on its own. Also, regressions with *notconservative* that included all three conservative categories resulted in lower p values than regressions ran with one of the conservative categories.

*Age:* The variable *age* is a continuous variable used to describe the respondent's age. Out of the 891 respondents, 850 provided responses to this question. The youngest respondents were 18 and the oldest respondent was 91 years old. The mean age was 47.52, with a standard deviation of 16.78. There were some outliers on the right side of the data, which gave the data a positive

skew. To normalize the distribution, I recoded the 60 respondents (7.06%) who were 75 and above into one category ( $\geq 75$ ). I labeled this new variable ageR. For ease of interpretation, I centered this data, creating a new variable ageRC which is the age recoded variable minus 47.52 (the mean age for white respondents).

*Sex:* The variable sex is a categorical variable used to describe the respondent's sex. Out of the 891 white respondents in the survey, 372 (41.75%) were male, 519 (58.25%) were female. These responses were already coded as Male=0 and Female=1 in the data set.

*Education:* The final independent variable, education is a continuous variable represented by the variable educ. The variable educ represents the years of schooling the respondent has completed. Out of the 891 respondents surveyed, 850 provided responses to this question. The original categories in the study were: 4 or less years of schooling (all respondents had at least 4 years of schooling), 5-16 years of schooling (individually) and 17 or more years of schooling. The mean years of schooling was 13.18, with a standard deviation of 2.57, which means most respondents at least had some college. For ease of interpretation, I centered this data, creating a new variable educC which is the educ recoded variable minus 13.18 (whites mean education, in years).

*How Close Whites Feel to Other Whites:* How close whites feel to other whites (g3b) is a categorical variable that measures closeness in ideas/feelings to other whites. Out of the 891 respondents surveyed, 852 provided responses to this question. It is measured on a four point likert-scale of very close, fairly close, not too close and not close at all. For the purposes of regression analysis, I will be treating this variable as a continuous variable, since the categories are ordered and there are more than 3 categories. 1=very close, 2=fairly close, 3=not too close, 4=not close at all. The mean of the variable before recoding was 1.79 meaning whites felt in

between “very close” and “fairly close” to other whites. For ease of interpretation, I recoded this variable to 1=not close at all, 2=not too close, 3=fairly close, 4=very close. I labeled this new variable g3bR.

*Dependent Variable (How Close Whites’ Feel to Blacks):* My dependent variable measures how closely white respondents in the NSAL survey feel to blacks. This question is measured in the data by the variable g3a. Out of the 891 respondents surveyed, 846 provided responses to this question. This variable is categorical, and measured by very close, fairly close, not too close and not close at all. For the purposes of regression analysis, I will be treating this variable as a continuous variable, since the categories are ordered and there are more than 3 categories. The mean of g3a is 2.02, with a standard deviation of .75. This means that on average, most whites responded that they felt “fairly close to blacks”. Out of the 891 whites surveyed, 194 (22.93%) claimed to feel “very close (=1)” to blacks. 467 (55.20%), felt “fairly close to blacks (=2)”. 152 (17.97%) felt “not too close (=3)” to blacks, and only 33 (3.9%) claimed to feel “not close at all (=4)” to blacks. For ease of interpretation, I recoded this variable to 1=not close at all, 2=not too close, 3=fairly close, 4=very close. I labeled this new variable g3aR. The distribution of g3a was positively skewed. Transforming g3a to the log power equalized this distribution. However, it did not make much of a difference in the regression results. Therefore, I keep g3aR, without using the transformed version in my findings. In the following sections, I will explore how much of this variance is due to my independent variables.

## **Methods:**

*Multivariate OLS Regression:* OLS regression is a method intended to determine whether an independent variable is associated with a dependent variable. OLS regression is helpful because

it provides insights into both the direction and strength of the relationships between my independent and dependent variables. A regression model creates a line through the data that is the “best fit” or has the least amount of difference between the actual and predicted y values. The coefficient and slope can be used to create a regression equation that provides evidence of the direction of the relationship. The r-squared value in regression determines the amount of variance in y (the dependent variable) can be attributed to x (the independent variable), or the strength of the relationship. This value can be between 0 and 1. A r-squared value of 1 means that the independent variable and the dependent variable have a perfect linear relationship, or that the independent variable explains all of the variance in the dependent variable. An r-squared value of 0 occurs when the variables are independent, but does not necessarily mean the variables are independent. The type of regression model we learned in class can only be used with a continuous dependent variable, but the independent variables can take on many different levels of measurement. Regression also utilizes p values for the slope and y-intercept that determine whether these values are significantly different than 0.

## **Results:**

Model 1: g3aR g3bR dummyconservativeR regionsouthdummy ageRC sexfemdummy educC incperR (# of observations=740, Adjusted r-squared=.2488)

### *Effect of Whites Feelings of Closeness Toward Other Whites:*

For each unit increase in whites feelings of closeness to other whites, the predicted value of whites feelings of closeness to other blacks increases by .5686122 with a standard error of .0370911, holding all other co-variants constant. In other words, there is a positive relationship between whites feelings of closeness to other whites and whites feelings of closeness to blacks.

Whites who reported feeling closer to whites were also likely to report feeling closer to blacks. The p value for this relationship was .00, which was less than the alpha value of .05 I set. This indicates that the relationship between whites feelings of closeness to other whites and whites feelings of closeness to blacks is significant.

*Effect of Conservative Political Views:*

Those with moderate or liberal political views had predicted feelings of closeness toward blacks that were .1132981 higher than those who had conservative political views with a standard error of .0506908, holding all other co-variants constant. This relationship was significant at a .026 level, indicating that political views are a determining factor in whites feelings of closeness to blacks.

*Effect of Living in the South:*

Respondents who did not live in the south had predicted feelings of closeness toward blacks that were .0549042 higher than respondents living in the south with a standard error of .0516111, holding all other co-variants constant. This relationship was not significant ( $p=.288$ ), meaning that the variance in responses to closeness of feelings to blacks could have been due to random sampling errors.

*Effect of Age:*

For every one year increase in age, whites feelings of closeness toward blacks increased by .0006751 with a standard error of .001529, holding all other co-variants constant. The relationship between age and feelings of closeness to blacks is not statistically significant in this model with a p value of .659.

#### *Effect of Gender:*

Men reported responses of feelings of closeness toward blacks that were .0297442 higher than women with a standard error of .0503588, holding all other co-variants constant. This relationship was not statistically significant with a p value of .555, indicating that gender does not have an effect on whites feelings of closeness toward blacks.

#### *Effect of Education:*

For every one year increase in education, whites' feelings of closeness toward blacks decreases by .0285863 with a standard error of .0104508, holding all other co-variants constant. This relationship is statistically significant and has a p value of .006.

#### *Effect of Income:*

For every unit increase in income, whites' feelings of closeness to blacks decreases by .003785 with a standard error of .0119519, holding all other co-variants constant. The relationship between personal income and whites' feelings of closeness toward blacks is not statistically significant at the alpha level I set (.05). The p value for this relationship is .752.

#### *Constant:*

47 year old female conservatives living in the south and have approximately 13 years of schooling and no personal income report feelings of closeness toward blacks at a 1.033541 level. In real terms, this means this group of respondents has predicted responses that indicate they do not feel close at all to blacks. The constant term has a p value of .00, which is less than the alpha value I set, indicating that the constant is statistically significant.

**Findings:**

Church attendance and employment status were dropped from the final model, as they had no predictive value on whites' feelings of closeness to blacks. This was done using manual backward deletion. Job satisfaction and worried about losing job were also dropped from the final model for the same reason, and because they deleted too many observations.

Although the variable of whites' feelings of closeness to other whites' is significant, I use it as a control, not a predicting variable in my model. The high level of significance attributed to this variable may be largely due to a number of factors that do not indicate any real predictive relationship between whites' feelings of closeness to whites' and whites' feelings of closeness to blacks. For one, these variable are statistical abstracts, meaning that they are both asked within the same series of questions and for that reason are likely to be correlated with each other. Also, people who feel close to one racial group are likely to feel close or not close to another racial group, indicating another reason for correlation. Finally, the mean of the entire grouping of closeness variables was 2.02, which means that the average response for white respondents in this survey was that they felt "fairly close" to blacks. Whites' also reported a mean of 1.79 for feelings of closeness to other whites, indicating that the average response was that whites felt somewhere in between "very close" and "fairly close" to other whites. In other words, there was not much variance in the responses to this clustering of variables. Much of this may have been influenced by contemporary expectations of political correctness and pressure to publicly like everyone, despite socio-demographic differences. These results may not reflect people's actual racial attitudes.



Ultimately, my findings showed that race, class and gender alone are not significant enough predictors to determine whites' feelings of closeness to blacks. This finding is supported by intersectional scholarship that points to the complexity of the categories of race, class, and gender. Social positions such as race, class and gender often converge in unique ways that are specific to the social context and local space of a community, while simultaneously being guided by the larger structures within society.

Although my research did find that education and political views were statistically significant in determining whites' feelings of closeness to blacks, the findings on the impact political views have on whites' feelings of closeness to blacks may be overstated. Although liberals reported feeling closer to blacks, they may have just framed their responses in politically correct, colorblind language (Bonilla-Silva, 2010). These responses may conceal more than they reveal about whites' feelings of closeness toward blacks.

Also, although whites in this study may share similar class positionings with people of color in their communities, they still have access to the privileges accorded to whiteness, including social and cultural capital blacks in their community may not have access to (Conley, 2000) which may limit their desires to perform class based solidarity with blacks in their communities. In the future, I would like to examine what factors contribute to whites and blacks feelings of closeness with each other and how this might be able to sustain more diverse communities.

### **Future Research/ Importance of Community**

Communities are often defined by a delineation of people who share the same physical space. The sharing of physical space can foster a sense of closeness, but is not a necessary

requirement for the cultivation of community. Communities are often created and maintained across boundaries of physical space (Anderson, 1991). The sharing and cultivation of non-physical bonds, such as ideology, foster these symbolic communities. Individuals who feel they are a part of community with each other are key building blocks for the creation of an egalitarian society (Putnam, 2000). This is especially true in relation to race relations in the United States. Whites who feel close to blacks are less likely to participate in racist behaviors and more likely to create racially integrated communities and networks. On a practical level, the creation of sustainable diverse communities is important because it has the potential to decrease the prevalence of social stratification between whites and blacks in terms of income, educational attainment, and overall life chances.

In addition, marginalized groups often feel a sense of community with each other due to their shared marginalized positioning. For example, there has been much literature on how African Americans share compose a symbolic community, and in this way exist within the same community space, although they may not live within the same geographic boundaries. The creation and maintenance of symbolic communities may serve as important vehicles to foster respect and well being for others in the community. They may, also serve as tools to decrease feelings of contention and practices that foster inequalities across the boundaries of race, class, and gender.

Unfortunately, the continuing existence of racism is a strong indicator that most blacks and whites still do not feel a sense of community with each other. This may be due, in part to the fact that blacks and whites still do not live in the same neighborhoods, attend the same schools, or participate in other types of consistent and meaningful interactions.

**Limitations:**

When trying to situate socially using quantitative data alone is always problematic. For starters, these variables are measured using distinct and separate categories (eg. men and women, black and white) that do not allow for variations between the different categories or different types of blackness/whiteness, etc. In addition, The NSAL data set did not provide variables to examine the effects symbolic communities may have on whites' feelings of closeness to blacks, but I would like to examine this in a future study.

Ultimately, this data supports the conclusion that there has yet to be a sound methodology of how to measure all socio-demographic variables at the macro and micro levels in tandem. Many recent studies point to the need for this, but for the purposes of research these studies often generalize life experiences using quantitative data or rely on ethnographic or life history data that interrogate the lived realities of their subjects, but lose the ability to be generalized to larger populations

**Conclusions:**

Understanding the relationship between these variables will be increasingly important in the future of American race relations. As the racial makeup of America continues to shift, whites that live and interact in spaces numerically dominated by racial minorities is likely to become the norm. These spaces provide an interesting social milieu in which whiteness can be examined. An analysis of how white racial identities and culture are created, maintained and contested in such spaces provides insight into the relationship between local and structural social forces. White identity, culture and performance in these spaces is unique and often does not fit normative and stereotypical understandings of what it means to be white. Showing divergent

forms of whiteness both decenters and deconstructs hegemonic notions of what it means to be white and oversimplified generalizations about the significance of race in this country (Ignatiev, 1996; Wise, 2008).

## REFERENCES

## REFERENCES

- Anderson, Benedict R. O'G. 1991. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso Press.
- Bobo, Lawrence and Vincent L. Hutchings. "Perceptions of Racial Group Competition: Extending Blumer's Theory of Group Position to a Multiracial Social Context" *American Sociological Review*. 61, 6: 951-972.
- Bonilla-Silva. 2010. *Racism without Racists*. New York: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.
- Conley, Dalton. 2000. *Honky*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Connell, R.W. 1987. *Gender and Power: Society, the Person, and Sexual Politics*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Connell, R.W. 1992. "A Very Straight Gay: Masculinity, Homosexual Experience and the Dynamics of Gender". *American Sociological Review*. 57, 6: 735-751.
- DeNavas-Walt, Carmen, Robert Cleveland and Bruce H. Webster, Jr., U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Reports, P60-221, Table 4: Per Capita Money Income by Race and Hispanic Origin: 2001 and 2002, *Income in the United States: 2002*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC, 2003.
- Entman, Robert M. and Andrew Rojecki. 2001. *Black Image in the White Mind: Media and Race in America*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Feagin, Joe. 2009. *The White Racial Frame: Centuries of Racial Framing and Counter-Framing*. New York: Routledge Press.
- Foley, Neil. 1997. *The White Scourge: Mexican, Blacks, and Poor Whites in Texas Cotton Culture*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Foner, Nancy and George M. Fredrickson, eds. 2004. *Not Just Black and White: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives on Immigration, Race, and Ethnicity in the United States*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Frankenburg, Ruth. 1993. *White Women, Race Matters: The Social Construction of Whiteness*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Fredrickson, George M. 2002. *Racism: A Short History*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Hartigan, John. 1999. *Racial Situations: Class Predicaments of Whiteness in Detroit*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Hill-Collins, Patricia. 2000. *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness and the*

- Politics of Empowerment, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition*. New York: Routledge Press.
- Ignatiev, Noel and John Garvey, eds. 1996. *Race Traitor*. New York: Routledge Press.
- Jackman, Mary R and Michael J. Muha. 1984. "Education and Intergroup Attitudes: Moral Enlightenment, Superficial Democratic Commitment, or Ideological Refinement." *American Sociological Review*. 49, 6: 751-769.
- Jordan, Winthrop. 1968. *White Over Black: American Attitudes Toward the Negro, 1550-1812*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
- Lipsitz, George, 1998. *The Possessive Investment in Whiteness: How White People Profit from Identity Politics*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- McIntosh, Peggy. 1988. "White Privilege and Male Privilege: A Personal Account of Coming To See Correspondences through Work in Women's Studies". Working Paper 189. Wellesley College.
- Mills, Charles W. 1997. *The Racial Contract*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Morris, Edward. 2005. "From "Middle Class" to "Trailer Trash:" Teachers' Perceptions of White Students in a Predominately Minority School". *Sociology of Education*. 78, 2: 99-121. McGraw-Hill.
- Morris, Edward. 2006. *An Unexpected Minority: White Kids in an Urban School*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Omi, Michael and Howard Winant. 1994. *Racial Formation in the United States: From the 1960's to the 1990's*. New York: Routledge Press.
- Omi, Michael and Howard Winant. 2005. "Racial Formations". In Tracy E. Ore, ed., *The Social Construction of Difference and Inequality: Race, Class, Gender and Sexuality*. McGraw-Hill Humanities.
- Putnam, Robert D. 2000. *Bowling Alone*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Roediger, David. 1999. *The Wages of Whiteness*. New York: Verso Press.
- Ross, Thomas. 1997. "White Innocence, Black Abstraction" in *Critical Whiteness Studies, Looking Behind the Mirror*. Richard Delgado and Jean Stefancic, eds. Temple University Press, 263-266.
- Rumbaut, Ruben G. 2009. "Pigments of Our Imagination: On the Racialization and Racial Identities of "Hispanics" and "Latinos", in *How the U.S. Racializes Latinos: White Hegemony and Its Consequences*, Jose A. Cobas, Jorge Duany and Joe R. Feagin, eds. Paradigm Publishers, 15-36.
- Sidanius, Jim, Pam Singh, John J. Hetts, and Chris Federico. 2000. "It's Not Affirmative Action, It's the Blacks" in *Racialized Politics: The Debate About Racism in America*. David O. Sears, Jim Sidanius, and Lawrence Bobo, eds. 191-235.

- Smith, Dorothy. 1991. *The Conceptual Practices of Power: A Feminist Sociology of Knowledge*. Boston, MA: Northeastern University Press.
- Sniderman, Paul M., Gretchen C. Crosby and William G. Howell. 2000. "The Politics of Race" in *Racialized Politics: The Debate About Racism in America*. David O. Sears, Jim Sidanius, and Lawrence Bobo, eds. 236-279.
- Steinberg, Stephen. 2000. "Affirmative Action and Liberal Capitulation". In *Multiculturalism in the United States: Current Issues, Contemporary Voices*, Peter Kivisto and Georgeanne Rundblad, eds. 287-294.
- Tarman, Christopher and David O. Sears. 2005. "The Conceptualization and Measurement of Symbolic Racism." *The Journal of Politics*, 67:731-761.
- Thorne, Barrie. 1993. *Gender Play: Girls and Boys in School*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- U.S. Census Bureau. 2010. "2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File". Tables P1 and P2.
- Wellman, David. 1977. *Portraits of White Racism*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Wise, Tim. 2008. *White Like Me: Reflections on Race from a Privileged Son*. Brooklyn, NY: Soft Skull Press.
- Wray, Matt. 2006. *Not Quite White: White Trash and the Boundaries of Whiteness*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Wray, Matt and Annalee Newitz. 1997. *White Trash: Race and Class in America*. New York: Routledge Press.
- Wright, Luther. 1997. "Who's Black, Who's White, and Who Cares" in *Critical Whiteness Studies: Looking Behind the Mirror*, Richard Delgado and Jean Stefancic, eds. Temple University Press, 164-169.
- Zinn, Maxine Baca and Bonnie Thornton Dill. 1996. "Theorizing Difference from Multiracial Feminism." *Feminist Studies* 22, 2:321-31.