ABSTRACT

Title of dissertation: SOCIAL INVALIDATION: AN INSTRUMENT DEVELOPMENT STUDY

Marisa G. Franco, Doctorate of Philosophy, 2015

Dissertation directed by: Professor Karen O'Brien
Department of Psychology

Social invalidation, the denial of an individual's racial identity, is a pervasive racial stressor with harmful effects on the mental health and well-being of Multiracial individuals; however, a sufficient measure of this construct has yet to developed. The purpose of this study was to create a psychometrically sound measure to assess social invalidation for use with Multiracial individuals. Four studies were conducted to assess the measure's psychometric properties with a total of 497 Multiracial adults. Exploratory factor analysis revealed four Social Invalidation factors: Identity Rejection, Phenotype Invalidation, Behavior Invalidation, and Identity Incongruent Discrimination. A confirmatory factor analysis provided support for the initial factor structure. The validity and reliability of the measure, along with its limitations, suggestions for future research, and implications are discussed.

SOCIAL INVALIDATION: AN INSTRUMENT DEVELOPMENT STUDY

by

Marisa G. Franco

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the
University of Maryland, College Park in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
2015

Advisory Committee:
Professor Karen O'Brien, Chair
Professor Matthew Miller
Professor Lea Dougherty
Dr. Nazish Salahuddin
Professor Patricia Alexander

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction

Social Invalidation: An Instrument Development Study

Existing conceptualizations of racial groups as hierarchical and exclusive have rendered Multiracial people invisible (Shih & Sanchez, 2005; Townsend, Markus & Bergsieker, 2009). Indeed, it was only in the year 2000 that the U.S. Census first permitted Multiracial individuals to identify with both of their races (Townsend et al., 2009; U.S. Census Bureau, 2000). The denial of racial identity—termed social invalidation—persists at the societal and interpersonal level, despite the negative consequences of this stressor on identity development and health (Rockquemore, 2002; Root, 1998). Yet, while social invalidation has been found to be one of the most potent stressors for Multiracial individuals, the measurement of this construct in the literature has been problematic, calling into question the validity of past social invalidation research. For research on this construct to progress so that the stress of social invalidation can be mitigated, a reliable and valid measure of social invalidation for use with Multiracial individuals must be constructed. Thus, the purpose of the present study was to develop an instrument to assess social invalidation and test its psychometric properties for use with Multiracial individuals.

Defining Social Invalidation

Social invalidation has been defined differently across various studies. Some studies define invalidation tautologically as the invalidation of racial identity (Nishimura, 2004; Rockquemore & Brunsma, 2002), while other definitions highlight pressure to identify as Monoracial (Buckley & Carter, 2004; Gillem & Thompson, 2004; Kerwin, Jackson, Ponterotto, & Harris, 1993), the questioning of one's identity (Rockquemore, 2002), tension between ascribed and internal identities (Khanna, 2010; Lou, Lalonde, & Wilson, 2011; Tashiro 2002;

Salahuddin & O'Brien, 2011), forced-choice racial identity situations (Shih & Sanchez, 2005; Sanchez, 2010), lack of support in identity choice (Coleman & Carter, 2007), racial inauthenticity accusations (Romo, 2011; Root, 1998) and identity denial (Townsend et al., 2009).

While there are clear commonalities across these definitions, a cohesive, all-encompassing definition of social invalidation is needed to tie together research on this topic: social invalidation occurs when an individual feels that others have misperceived (passive) or denied (active) their self-defined race. Invalidation may take many forms, including other's lack of acceptance of an individual's racial identity (e.g., you're not actually Biracial) or an implied or blatant imposition of a racial identity (e.g., "even though you think are Biracial, you are actually Black").

Some previous definitions of invalidation have narrowly construed the construct as relating only to Multiracial-identifying individuals. Yet, studies reveal that Multiracial individuals who identify as Monoracial also experience social invalidation (e.g., Rockquemore, 2002; Root, 1998; Tashiro, 2002). Further, social invalidation may be an issue for people of Monoracial heritage as well, as various studies on Black people highlight the harmful effects of "acting White" accusations (e.g., Archer, 2012; Spencer, Noll, Stoltzfus, & Harpalani, 2001). Still, many Multiracial individuals' pervasive experience of incongruence between phenotype and racial identity, and the historical invisibility of Multiracial identity, make social invalidation particularly salient for this group.

In defining social invalidation, it is also important to describe what does not constitute invalidation. Constructs similar to, but distinct from, invalidation within the literature include cultural homelessness (Vivero & Jenkins, 1999), and challenges with racial identity (Salahuddin & O'Brien, 2011). Cultural homelessness is defined as feelings of not belonging to any group

(Navarrete & Jenkins, 2011; Vivero & Jenkins, 1999), and challenges with racial identity is defined as the degree to which individuals feel that they do not belong within a racial group (Salahuddin & O'Brien, 2011). Certainly, social invalidation can incite these feelings, yet invalidation is distinct, because social invalidation is not an internal feeling, but more so a gauge of how the external world is responding to one's racial identity. Further, certain mediating factors, such as coping mechanisms, can disrupt the relationship between social invalidation and feelings of not belonging, so that these feelings do not necessarily appear in tandem with invalidation.

Vulnerability to Social Invalidation for Multiracial Individuals

Invalidation has historical antecedents that contribute to its contemporary prevalence. The origins of invalidation date back to the era of slavery, when Black/White Biracial children, called Mulattoes, were the product of exploitive sexual relationships between White male slave masters and Black female slaves (Nakashima, 1992**).** The "one-drop" rule of hypodescent cast these Mulatto children as Black (Nakashima, 1992) to allow slave owners to maintain hegemony, increase economic resources, and fulfill exploitative sexual desires. The one-drop rule remained unquestioned until the civil rights era; before then, Black was thought to be the only appropriate racial identity option for Biracial individuals of African-descended heritage (Rockquemore & Laszloffy, 2003). Today, there remains evidence of hypodescent categorization for Multiracial individuals (Peery & Bodenhausen, 2008; Ho, Sidanius, Levin, & Banaji, 2011).

This rule of hypodescent has been applied broadly to individuals of various minority heritages to maintain White dominance, though there is evidence to suggest that the rule is more stringent for African descended Multiracial individuals than for other types of racial mixes (Gullickson & Morning, 2011; Herman, 2004; Herman, 2010; Ho et al., 2011; Roth, 2005). In

support of this, non-Black Multiracial individuals have been more likely to be perceived as White or Multiracial (Gullickson & Morning, 2011; Herman, 2010), and more likely to identify as such (Harris & Sim, 2002; Lee & Bean, 2004). One reason why non-Black Multiracial individuals may be less confined to America's strict racial categories is because members of these groups (i.e, Asian and Latin American individuals) have immigrated to the United States more recently (Gullickson & Morning, 2011; Herman, 2010; Lee & Bean, 2004). Furthermore, non-Black Multiracials may possess a social status that is closer to that of Whites, which may leave them more leeway in identifying with their Whiteness, or choosing a Multiracial identity (Ho et al., 2011; Lee & Bean, 2004). Indeed, research evidence illustrates that Black Multiracial individuals are more likely to be defined by their minority race than individuals of other racial ancestries (Herman, 2010; Ho et al., 2010).

Although rates of social invalidation may differ across Multiracial denominations, research has found that the experience of social invalidation is relevant for all Multiracial individuals (e.g., Root, 1998; Salahuddin & O'Brien, 2011; Shih & Sanchez, 2005; Storrs, 1999; Tashiro, 2002; Townsend et al., 2009). Multiracial people are uniquely vulnerable to this stressor because of the historical invisibility of this group within America's racial system. Indeed, it was only in the year 2000 that Multiracial individuals were allowed to identity as such (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000). This Monoracist system was founded on the premise that race is a biological reality, rather than a form of personal identity, leaving no room for discrepancies between identity and phenotype, thus, leading to the delegitimizing of racial identities that do not align with appearance (Shih & Sanchez, 2005). Discrepancies between phenotype and identity are particularly salient for Multiracial individuals, since many factors, aside from appearance, contribute to racial identity choice, including socio-economic status, racial composition of social

networks, and level of closeness with members of particular racial groups (Rockquemore & Brunsma, 2002). Because of these unique invalidation pressures faced by members of this group, at the societal level, social invalidation is an important construct to investigate for this group. Specifically, it may be important to investigate invalidation for individuals who explicitly identify as Multiracial (as opposed to individuals of multiple racial heritages who identify otherwise) since, in contrast to Monoracial-identifying individuals, they may face the distinct burden of group level invalidation, whereby others do not affirm their racial identity because they do not see "Multiracial" as a legitimate racial category (Lou et al., 2011).

It is important to note that a Multiracial identity does not imply a lack of identification with Monoracial groups (Rockquemore, Brunsma, & Delgado, 2009; Romo, 2011). Multiracial individuals may perceive themselves as identifying simultaneously as Multiracial, and as a member of each of their component racial groups. Thus, Multiracial individuals are also vulnerable to invalidation of their Monoracial identity. Resentment towards privilege that Biracial individuals are afforded because of their dual heritages, and perhaps their more European phenotype, can lead darker-skinned minority group members to question the legitimacy of a Biracial individual's minority group membership (Khanna, 2010; Khanna, 2011). Assumptions of exclusivity and homogeneity of racial groups may lead to invalidation of Monoracially-identified Multiracial individuals because of their out-group racial heritage. Further, Multiracial individuals may have to earn Monoracial-legitimacy through a difficult hazing process, where they have to fulfill negative racial stereotypes (Root, 1998).

In sum, social invalidation is perpetrated by majority and minority group members onto Multiracial individuals of various mixed-racial heritages. Social invalidation is rooted in America's historical racial landscape, defined by inflexible rules in determining racial group

membership. These inflexible rules may be more strictly applied to Multiracial individuals with Black ancestry, who are judged against the legacy of slavery.

Impact of Social Invalidation

Social invalidation has a negative impact on a variety of health outcomes. It detrimentally affects perception of self, self-esteem, motivation, psychological, and physical health **(**Coleman & Carter, 2007; Nishimura, 2004; Rockquemore, 2002; Rockquemore & Brunsma, 2002; Rockquemore & Laszloffy, 2003; Townsend et al., 2009**).** Social invalidation is related to increased suicidal thoughts and rates of suicide attempts (Campbell & Troyer, 2007). Overall, invalidation is threatening to the self, group-identification, and social status (Campbell & Troyer, 2007; Romo, 2011).

Social invalidation also may engender feelings of loneliness (Root, 1998; Khanna, 2010; Miville, Constantine, Baysden, & So-Lloyd, 2005), or cultural homelessness—characterized by alienation and rejection from multiple groups, internalized feelings of not belonging to any one group, and a desire for group belongingness (Navarrete & Jenkins, 2011; Vivero & Jenkins, 1999). Cultural homelessness is related to decreased self-esteem, and lower affirmation and belonging (Hoersting & Jenkins, 2011; Navarrete & Jenkins, 2011). The crux of cultural homelessness is not having a community with which to identify (Vivero & Jenkins, 1999). The denial of one's identity may promote these feelings of non- belongingness and rejection. Social invalidation directly implies the stripping of one's standing in a group that one wishes to belong to, leaving one with no identity at all—culturally homeless.

Minority Stress Theory and Social Invalidation

Minority stress theory posits that stigma, discrimination, and marginalization create a hostile environment for minority group members that contributes to negative health outcomes

(Meyer, 2003). Minority stressors are unique, meaning they extend beyond stress faced by all people, chronic, because they reflect underlying social structures, and socially based, stemming from interactions among individuals, institutions, and structures. Meyer (2003) suggested that stressors arise because of the discrepancy between the perspective of the minority individual and larger society.

Based on the characteristics of minority stress, social invalidation can be conceptualized as a type of minority stress. In line with minority stressors, the root of invalidation lies in the discrepancy between self and societal understandings, and in the case of social invalidation this discrepancy is in regards to legitimate racial identity categorizations. Societal assumptions about racial categories, fueled by years of historical exclusion of Multiraciality in public discourse (Khanna, 2010), are internalized by members of society rendering Multiracial people vulnerable to social invalidation via interpersonal interactions. There is much evidence that discriminatory experiences, which might include social invalidation, are a prevalent issue for Multiracial individuals (Brackett et al., 2006; Buckley & Carter, 2004; Herman, 2004); discrimination is perpetrated by both majority and minority group members (Brackett et al., 2006; Rockquemore & Brunsma, 2002) and relates to psychological distress (Jackson, Yoo, Guevarra & Harrington, 2012; Salahuddin & O'Brien, 2011).

Although there is evidence linking discrimination and health for Multiracial individuals, no studies have explicitly applied the minority stress framework to Multiracial individuals' experience. Thus, the current study will further expand on the use of minority stress theory with the Multiracial population. According to this theory, and in line with past research (Coleman & Carter, 2007; Nishimura, 2004; Rockquemore, 2002; Rockquemore & Brunsma, 2002;

Rockquemore & Laszloffy, 2003; Townsend et al., 2009), social invalidation should relate to negative outcomes for this group.

Specifically, social invalidation, a form of minority stress, would be expected to affect racial identity, depression, self-esteem, cultural homelessness, loneliness, and life satisfaction (Meyer, 2003). As a form of minority stress, social invalidation may induce challenges to racial identity because invalidation experiences activate two types of identity threats—categorization threat and distinctiveness threat, which are defined as the imposition of an unwanted identity and the denial of a desired identity, respectively. Both threats may induce racial identity challenges because the development of a stable identity requires that it is reflected by others (Branscombe, Ellemers, Spears, & Doosje, 1999; Meyer, 2003; Rockquemore & Brunsma, 2002). For example, a Biracial person of Asian/White racial heritage may feel that an Asian identity is being imposed on them (e.g., categorization threat), and that others do not acknowledge their Biracial identity (e.g., distinctiveness threat), which may lead them to feel less secure in their Biracial identity.

According to minority stress theory, social invalidation also may relate to depression and self-esteem because stress-related stigma may be internalized by the individual, provoking negative feelings and compromised self-views. Multiracial people who experience social invalidation perceive that society has a poor evaluation of their racial group (Sanchez, 2010), which might explain why their ability to identify as Multiracial is constrained. These public perceptions can become internalized and produce negative outcomes, such as decreased self-esteem and increased depressive symptoms (Coleman & Carter, 2007; Townsend et al., 2009).

In line with minority stress theory, social invalidation also may induce loneliness and feelings of cultural homelessness because underlying these feelings are discrepancies in perspective between minority and mainstream individuals, leaving minority group members

vulnerable to loneliness and isolation because their experiences do not fit in with existing mainstream values. The invalidation of a Multiracial person's racial identity may make them feel as if their perspectives and experiences in regards to their race are invalid, resulting in feelings of racial alienation. Because invalidation negates racial identity, invalidation also may exclude Multiracial people from finding a racial community, making them feel culturally homeless.

Because minority stress detrimentally affects mental health, and mental health issues diminish life satisfaction (Diener, Emmons, Larsen & Griffin, 1985; Rissanen et al., 2013), minority stress also may relate to decreased life satisfaction (Meyer, 2003). Accordingly, links between the stress experience of social invalidation and each of the above mentioned outcomes will be examined in this study.

Measurement of Social Invalidation in the Multiracial Literature

Despite the impact of social invalidation on Multiracial individuals, this construct has been measured inadequately within the Multiracial research literature. Prior research has used a single item scale to assess social invalidation. In this scale, the item denoting invalidation is: "I consider myself Biracial, but I experience the world as a Black person" (Brunsma & Rockquemore, 2001; Coleman & Carter, 2007; Rockquemore & Brunsma, 2002). This scale is especially limiting, as it does not account for social invalidation experienced by all Monoracially-identifying Multiracial individuals. Furthermore, it assumes that one is either always invalidated or never invalidated, while invalidation is contextually bound and may occur on a spectrum (Rockquemore et al., 2009).

Other studies also have measured social invalidation in insufficient ways. One study employed a three-item measure to assess invalidation, with no mention of an instrument development process or validity testing (Sanchez, 2010). Another study compared an

interviewer's assessment of a Biracial individuals race with self-report (Campbell & Troyer, 2007), despite the fact that interviewer's racial perceptions are biased by their racial backgrounds (Hill, 2002). The use of these assessments calls the validity of invalidation research into question and inhibits the progress of research on this topic.

More recently, Salahuddin and O'Brien (2011) developed items assessing social invalidation as part of a larger instrument measuring Multiracial individual's challenges and resiliencies. However, the items on this scale did not load as hypothesized. A similar subscale emerged from the factor analyses that measured others' surprise and disbelief regarding the participant's racial heritage. This subscale may comprise one aspect of social invalidation, but does not capture the concept in its entirety. Furthermore, two out of five of the items on this scale measure others' surprise over a Multiracial individual's relation to a family member; this differs from social invalidation because the Multiracial individual may indeed feel that their race is different from their family member, and thus, this surprise does not necessarily indicate invalidation.

Thus, the purpose of the present study was to create an instrument to assess social invalidation and to test the psychometric properties of the instrument. For additional information regarding the constructs of interest in this study, see Appendix A. Grounded in minority stress theory, this research will assess the validity of the instrument through an examination of its expected association with theoretically related constructs, including racial identity challenges, depression, self-esteem, cultural homelessness, loneliness, and life satisfaction. This scale can be used to advance research on one of the most salient stressors for Multiracial individuals.

Research Question and Hypotheses

In the past, the construct of social invalidation has been assumed to be unidimensional (Salahuddin & O'Brien, 2011), yet the current measure incorporated different aspects of invalidation (e.g., appearance and behavior-related invalidation, negation of identity and imposition of identity), so the instrument could include multiple factors. An exploratory analysis was used to determine the number of factors that comprise the instrument.

The instrument was hypothesized to have adequate reliability and test-retest reliability for a racially diverse pool of participants. Second, according to theoretical work on invalidation and identity (Rockquemore et al., 2009; Navarrete & Jenkins, 2011; Salahuddin & O'Brien, 2011), it was predicted that invalidation would be associated with challenges with racial identity, increased depression, lower self-esteem, increased cultural homelessness, increased loneliness, and less satisfaction with life. Third, as a measure of criterion-related evidence, the correlation between social invalidation and challenges with racial identity/cultural homelessness was hypothesized to be below .7, which is an established threshold used to assess whether constructs are adequately discrete (Dormann et al., 2013). Last, based on research examining differences in identity and perception across Multiracial combinations (Gullickson & Morning, 2011; Ho et al., 2011; Lee & Bean, 2004), rates of social invalidation were hypothesized to be higher for Multiracial individuals with any degree of Black ancestry than for those with non-Black ancestries.

Chapter 2:

Method

Definition and Item Development

Before creating items, the first author read through the literature addressing social invalidation to create a definition that could be used as a framework for guiding item development. Feedback on this definition was solicited from three doctoral students, two assessment experts, and three experts on Multiracial research. The final definition was "social invalidation occurs when an individual feels that others have misperceived (passive) or denied (active) their self-defined race. Invalidation may take many forms, including other's lack of acceptance of an individual's racial identity (e.g., you're not actually Biracial) or an implied or blatant imposition of a racial identity (e.g., even though you think are Biracial, you are actually Black)."

Items were developed by the primary investigator based on the literature and on the definition of the construct that was developed. Fifty-seven items were presented to four doctoral students in counseling psychology and one professor who specializes in assessment. Feedback from this group was incorporated into revisions of the items to increase clarity. The revised 57 items were then presented to an expert on Biracial research and measurement. The expert reviewed the items for clarity, readability, and adherence to the definition of social invalidation. Following this consultation, some items were added, and some were deleted because of poor adherence to the definition, or issues with clarity or redundancy. The revised instrument was comprised of 35 items.

Thirty-five items were administered to a group of 15 individuals for feedback. General feedback for each item was solicited*:* "Please provide feedback to the item above. What might

you change about it (if anything)?" At the end of the instrument, participants were asked: "What is your feedback to the overall scale? Is there anything you would change? Are there any items you would add? Do you have any experiences of racial invalidation that you would like to see represented in this scale? Please provide a detailed response." Comments indicated that items were redundant, so the instrument was reduced to 29 items. The shortened instrument was presented to two professors and one doctoral student; all do research on Multiracial individuals. They were invited to comment on items and the degree to which items adhered to the definition of the construct. Multiracial scholars feedback led to changes in items to increase clarity, the deletion of items to further decrease redundancy, and the addition of items that addressed "stereotype-based" invalidation—invalidation that occurs when behaviors are misaligned with racial stereotypes.

Additional items were added based on 10 videos of Black/White Multiracial individuals discussing their most hurtful experiences of social invalidation. The final instrument was comprised of 30 items, each with a frequency and distress component. Specifically, participants rated the items on how often they occurred on a scale from 1 (*never*) to 6 (*almost always*). They then were asked how distressed they were by this experience on a scale from 1 (*not at all distressed*) to 6 (*extremely distressed*). These rating scales were selected based on Salahuddin and O'Brien's (2011) original instrument, which measured challenges and resiliencies in the lives of Multiracial individuals. These items then were administered to another group of 10 Multiracial individuals, who were asked the same feedback questions as the prior pilot group. After feedback, some items were altered, resulting in a final instrument of 30 items (see Appendix B). Items in the instrument were determined to be suitable for an 8th grade reading level and above (Flesch, 1948).

Overview of Study 1, 2, 3, and 4

Sample overview. A total of 922 people started the study, with 542 completing the entire survey (there was no missing data; 58.8% response rate). A manipulation check was included wherein participants were told to click agree. Forty-five participants failed the manipulation check, leaving a sample of 497 participants who had completed all measures within the survey and passed the manipulation check. This sample was used for studies 1, 2, and 3.

Method overview. For study 1, 200 participants were randomly selected out of the larger pool. Study 1 involved an initial exploratory factor analysis of the instrument and assessed reliability of each factor, and correlations among subscales and to theoretically related variables. In study 2, the remaining 297 participants were used for a confirmatory factor analysis. Internal consistencies and correlations among subscales and with theoretically related variables were assessed. Study 3 included the larger pool of participants and involved a comparison of scores on each subscale for Black and non-Black participants. Study 4 involved assessing test-retest reliability of the instrument. Thirty-nine participants took the measure a second time, at least two weeks, but no more than two months, after their initial participation, to assess test-retest reliability. Analyses were constructed based on the frequency, and not the distress portion, of subscales, as individuals who reported that an aspect of invalidation never occurred did not complete the corresponding distress item.

Procedure for Study 1, 2, and 3

The recruitment email and advertisements directed participants to the Qualtrics website, an online survey platform through which measures are administered. The initial page displayed the informed consent. After, participants were presented with the measures listed below. The

Social Invalidation instrument was administered first, followed by the scales used to assess validity.

Recruitment. To recruit participants, the researcher sent emails to personal contacts who are adults of various Multiracial denominations. The study was also advertised through online groups catering to Multiracial individuals, including SWIRL and MAViN. An email was sent out to all Multiracial-identifying individuals at a large mid-eastern university using the university registrar database. As an incentive to participate, participants were offered the option of being entered into a raffle for one of two $25 gift cards.

Measures

Demographic questionnaire. The demographic questionnaire assessed age, gender, racial identification, importance of racial identity, primary racial group, skin tone, externally perceived race, ethnic identification, race of biological parents, adoption status, race of adopted parents (if applicable), city and state, occupation, student year (if applicable), education level, income, sexual orientation, and neighborhood racial composition (see Appendix C).

Social invalidation. See the item development section.

Challenges with racial identity. The 5-item Challenges with Racial Identity subscale of the Multiracial Challenges and Resiliencies scale was used to assess lack of a sense of belongingness or affiliation with any racial group (see Appendix D; Salahuddin & O'Brien, 2011). A sample item is "I feel the need to prove my racial identity to others." Items were measured on a Likert scale ranging from 0 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). A score was calculated by averaging all items, with high scores indicating challenges with racial identity. The alpha coefficient for this scale for a Multiracial sample was .68 (Salahuddin & O'Brien, 2011). This scale was originally tested with a Multiracial sample and was related positively to

depression and degree of frequency and stress associated with racist encounters, and negatively to social connectedness (Salahuddin & O'Brien, 2011). Reliability values across study 1 and study 2 of the present research were .70 and .73 respectively.

Depression. The 20-item Center for Epidemiological Studies Depression Scale was used to assess depression and included six scales that measured various dimensions of depression: depressed mood, feelings of guilt and worthlessness, feelings of helplessness and hopelessness, psychomotor retardation, loss of appetite, and sleep disturbance (see Appendix E; Radloff, 1977). Sample items included "I did not feel like eating; my appetite was poor" and "I felt depressed." Participants marked the frequency that they experience various depressive symptoms ranging from 1 (*rarely or none of the day; less than 1 day*) to 4 (*most or all of the time; 5-7 days*). To calculate a score, negative items were reverse-coded and ratings of items were summed, with high scores indicating significant depression. Internal consistency ratings were high for Multiracial samples, ranging from .84 to .93 (Brittian, Umaña-Taylor, & Derlan, 2013; Sanchez, 2010; Sanchez, Shih & Garcia, 2009). The measure correlated negatively with well-being (Sanchez et al., 2009) and self-esteem, and positively with anxiety (Brittian et al., 2013) for Multiracial samples. Reliability values in study 1 and study 2 of the present research were both .92.

Self-esteem. Self-esteem was measured using the 10-item Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (see Appendix F; Rosenberg, 1979). An example item is "On the whole, I am satisfied with myself." Items were measured on a Likert scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 4 (*strongly agree*). Scoring involved reverse-scoring negative items and summing all items, with high scores indicating higher self-esteem. Internal consistency ratings for Multiracial samples have ranged from .82 to .92 (Binning, Unzueta, Huo, & Molina, 2009; Brittian et al., 2013; Herman, 2004;

Suzuki-Crumly & Hyers, 2004). The measure correlated positively with self-acceptance, and negatively with depression for a Multiracial sample (Brittian et al., 2013). Reliability values across study 1 and study 2 of the present research were .90 and .91 respectively.

Cultural homelessness. The 14 item Cultural Homelessness scale includes three components: (a) Lack of cultural home (e.g., "I am an ethnic or cultural minority everywhere I go"), (b). Lack of attachment to any one racial group (e.g., "I feel that I don't belong to any ethnic or cultural group."), and (c) Desire for a racial group (i.e., "Finding a cultural home is important to me"; see Appendix G; Navarrete & Jenkins, 2011). Subscales can be combined to form one scale score (Navarrete & Jenkins, 2011). For the present study, "culture" was be replaced by "race." Items were measured on a Likert scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). Scores on all items were averaged into one mean score, with higher scores representing more experiences of cultural homelessness. Alpha rates of .71 and .84 were reported for a Multiracial sample (Navarrete & Jenkins, 2011). The construct was developed originally to apply to Multiracial individuals' experiences (Vivero & Jenkins, 1999), and being Multiracial was found to be a risk factor for cultural homelessness (Navarrete & Jenkins, 2011). Using a sample composed of approximately 25% Multiracial participants, cultural homelessness negatively related to affirmation, belonging, and self-esteem (Navarrete & Jenkins, 2011). Reliability values across study 1 and study 2 of the present research were .84 and .86 respectively.

Loneliness. The UCLA loneliness scale, a 20-item measure, was used to assess subjective feelings of loneliness (see Appendix H; Russell, 1996). An example item is "I have nobody to talk to." Answer choices range from 1 (*I often feel this way*) to 4 (*I never feel this way*). To score, values were summed with high scores indicating high levels of loneliness. Alpha

levels range from .89 to .94 (Russell, 1996). Although limited information is available on the psychometric properties of the scale with a Multiracial sample, it is one of the most commonly used loneliness scales for both researchers and practitioners, and has been found to have good test-retest reliability (Cramer & Barry, 1999). When first constructed, it correlated with other measures of loneliness, interpersonal relationships, health, and well-being (Russell, 1996). With a diverse sample, including 38.4% African-Americans, and 28.3% Latino American, the scale predicted depressive symptoms (VanderWeele, Hawkley, Thisted, & Cacioppo, 2011). Reliability values for study 1 and study 2 of the present research were both .96.

Life satisfaction. Global life satisfaction was measured using a 5-item Satisfaction with Life scale (see Appendix I; Diener et al., 1985). Sample items included "In most ways, my life is close to ideal," and "I am satisfied with my life." Items were measured on a Likert scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). Items were summed to calculate a score with high scores indicating greater life satisfaction. The alpha rate for a Multiracial sample ranged from .82 to .92 (Giamo, Schmitt, & Outten, 2012; Suzuki-Crumly & Hyers, 2004), and the scale demonstrated negative relations with discrimination and positive relations with racial identity satisfaction for a Multiracial sample (Giamo et al., 2012). Reliability values across study 1 and study 2 of the present research were .91 and .90 respectively.

Chapter 3

Results

Study 1 Results

Demographic information for study 1. Participants included 200 (143 female, 53 male, 1 transgender, 3 other) participants. Participants ranged in age from 18 to 60 years old, with a mean age of 26.53 (*SD* = 9.76 years). Approximately 39.0% of participants reported their family income as greater than $80,000 per year, while 35.5% earned between $40 and 79,000 and 25.5% averaged a family income below $40,000. Most (67%) reported being "completely heterosexual", while a few (4%) reported being "completely gay" and the remainder (29%) rated themselves as somewhere between the poles. Approximately 13% of the sample finished high school, while 29% finished some college, 8.5% finished an associate's degree, 26.5% finished a bachelor's degree, and 19% reported a graduate degree. The most common racial backgrounds represented were Asian/White (33.0%), Black/White (23.5%), Black/Asian (5.5%), and Hispanic/White (4.5%).

Factor analysis for study 1. Prior to running the factor analyses, the factorability of the data set was deemed appropriate using the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy (KMO) and Bartlett's test of sphericity. The KMO score for this sample was .88 and the Bartlett's test yielded a significant result, χ^2 (120, N = 200) = 1686.64 , p < .001.

A principal factor analysis with the direct oblimin rotation was computed on all 30 items. The scree plot was examined which suggested a two, three, four, or five, factor solution, accounting for 49.84%, 56.23%, 61.05% and 64.49% of the variance, respectively.

Next, four principal factor analyses with direct oblimin rotations were computed, with two, three, four, and five factors extracted. Each factor solution was considered to identify the

solution with the highest loading items with fewest cross-loadings, robust variance explained, conceptual clarity, and each factor containing at least 4 items (to increase the likelihood of factor reliability). Based upon these criteria, the researcher and her advisor independently selected the four-factor solution.

To retain only the most robust items on the measure, only the 4 highest loading items on each factor were retained. A final exploratory factor analysis was conducted with these 16 items. Each of these items loaded above .55 on a single factor, and did not load above .35 on more than one factor. These items collectively accounted for 70.31% of the variance. Factor loadings can be found in Table 1. Overall, participants reported low-moderate levels of identity rejection (M = 2.53; SD = 1.19), and identity incongruent discrimination (M =2.47; SD = 1.13), and moderate levels of phenotype invalidation (M = 3.65; SD = 1.13) and behavior invalidation (M = 3.17; SD = 1.15). Correlations among the subscales and conceptually related variables, along with means, standard deviations, and reliabilities can be found in Table 2.

Factor 1: Identity rejection. The first factor assessed general experiences of racial identity rejection by others (α = .89). Items included: 1) Others have an issue with the way I racially identify myself, 2) Others imply that I should not racially identify in the way that I do, 3) The way I racially identify is not accepted by others, and 4) When people hear my opinions, they make me feel like I do not belong in my racial group(s). Identity Rejection rated positively to each of the other invalidation subscales and with challenges with racial identity, depression, cultural homelessness, and loneliness. It related negatively with self-esteem. It did not relate to satisfaction with life.

Factor 2: Phenotype invalidation. The second factor assessed experiences of invalidation prompted by phenotype (α = .81). In these cases, racial phenotype did not match a

perceived racial prototype for appearance, provoking racial identity invalidation. Items included: 1) Others would not guess the race(s) that I identify with, 2) My physical features (e.g., skin color, hair texture, eye shape, eye color) lead people to assume that I am not the race(s) that I perceive myself, 3) People have reacted with surprise when I tell them the race(s) that I identify with, and 4) People assume I am not a member of the racial group(s) that I identify with. Phenotype Invalidation related positively to challenges with racial identity, and cultural homelessness. It did not relate to depression, self-esteem, loneliness, or satisfaction with life.

Factor 3: Behavior invalidation. The third factor assessed experiences of invalidation that occurred because participants' behaviors lied outside of perceived racial norms in behaving ($\alpha = .81$). Items included: 1) People think I behave differently than a "typical" member of my racial group(s), 2) Others think that my interests are different than those of a typical member of my racial group(s), 3) I am excluded from a racial group that I feel connected to because I do not "behave" like a typical member of that racial group(s), and 4) I have been accused of "acting" like a member of a racial group (s) that's different from my own. Behavior Invalidation related positively to challenges with racial identity, cultural homelessness, and loneliness. It did not relate to depression, self-esteem, or satisfaction with life.

Factor 4: Identity incongruent discrimination. The last factor assessed discriminatory experiences that were based on a perceived identity that did not match self-identity ($\alpha = .85$). Items included: 1) Others call me racially-derogatory words that do not apply to the racial group(s) that I identify with, 2) I am discriminated against based on a race that I do not identify with, 3) People expect me to associate with members of a racial group that I do not identify with, and 4) Others apply racial stereotypes to me that do not apply to the racial group(s) that I identify with. Identity Incongruent Discrimination related positively to challenges with racial identity,

depression, cultural homelessness, and loneliness. It did not relate to self-esteem or satisfaction with life.

Criterion-related evidence. As shown in Table 2, the correlation between each of the Social Invalidation subscales and the Challenges with Racial Identity scale, and the Cultural Homelessness scale did not exceed .7, suggesting that the measures assessed distinct constructs (Dormann et al., 2013).

Study 2 Results

Participants. Participants included 297 adults (229 women, 66 men, 1 transgender, and 1 other), ranging in age from 18 to 63 years old, with a mean age of 26.52 (*SD* = 9.52). Approximately 42.0% of participants reported their family income as greater than $80,000 per year, while 25.2% earned between $40 and 79,000 and 33.0% averaged a family income below $40,000. Most (63.3%) reported being "completely heterosexual", while a few (3.0%) reported being "completely gay" and the remainder (33.7%) rated themselves as somewhere between the poles. Approximately 7.1% of the sample finished high school, while 34.0% finished some college, 6.7% finished an associate's degree, 27.9% finished a bachelor's degree, and 21.6% reported a graduate degree. The most common racial groups represented were Asian/White (33.7%), Black/White (23.9%), Black/Asian (4.7%), and Hispanic/White (4.7%).

Factor analysis. To test the 4-factor model of the Social Invalidation instrument, a confirmatory factor analysis using maximum likelihood estimation was conducted using Mplus. Model fit was evaluated using the root-mean-square error of approximation (RMSEA), Comparative Fit Index (CFI) and Tucker–Lewis Index (TLI). According to Hu and Bentler (1999), model fit is indicated by RMSEA values less than .10 and CFI/TLI values greater than or

equal to .90. After running the CFA with the 16-item measure, composed of 4 subscales, the fit indices were adequate: RMSEA = .08, CFI = .92, and TLI =.90.

All items had factors loadings above .6 for each of their respective factors and were significant (see Table 1). The four hypothesized factors were allowed to correlate and exhibited moderate to high correlations within the model; these correlations, along with correlations with theoretically related variables, means, standard deviations and reliability estimates are presented in Table 3. Overall, participants reported low-moderate levels of identity rejection (M = 2.47; SD = 1.06), and identity incongruent discrimination (M =2.40; SD = 1.02), and moderate levels of phenotype invalidation (M = 3.58; SD = 1.25) and behavior invalidation (M = 3.20; SD = 1.18). Model modification indices for all items were under 100, indicating non-overlapping factor loadings for all items.

Factor 1: Identity rejection. Identity rejection (α = .82) related positively to each of the other invalidation subscales and with challenges with racial identity, depression, cultural homelessness, and loneliness. It related negatively to self-esteem and life satisfaction.

Factor 2: Phenotype invalidation. Phenotype invalidation (α = .87) related positively to challenges with racial identity, depression, cultural homelessness, and loneliness. It did not relate to self-esteem or satisfaction with life.

Factor 3: Behavior invalidation. Behavior invalidation (α = .81) related positively to challenges with racial identity, depression, cultural homelessness, and loneliness. It did not relate to self-esteem or satisfaction with life.

Factor 4: Identity incongruent discrimination. Identity incongruent discrimination (α = .79) related positively to challenges with racial identity, depression, cultural homelessness, and loneliness. It did not relate to self-esteem or satisfaction with life.

Criterion-related evidence. As shown in Table 3, the correlation between each of the Social Invalidation subscales and the Challenges with Racial Identity scale, and the Cultural Homelessness scale did not exceed .7, suggesting that the measures assessed distinct constructs (Dormann et al., 2013).

Study 3: Comparing Invalidation Across Groups

The purpose of the third study was to compare levels of invalidation between Black and non-Black Multiracial individuals.

Participants. The entire sample was used in study 3, however individuals who identified themselves as "Biracial" or "Multiracial" and did not give any indication of their specific racial composition were excluded because they could not be categorized as "Black" or "Non-Black." Participants included 440 Multiracial individuals (332 females, 102 males, 2 transgender, and 4 Other): 221 identified as Black, while 219 identified as non-Black. Participants ranged in age from 18 to 62 years old, with a mean age of 26.15 (*SD* = 9.25 years). Approximately 41.0% of participants reported their family income as greater than $80,000 per year, while 28.2% earned between $40 and 79,000 and 30.9% averaged a family income below $40,000. Most (64.5%) reported being "completely heterosexual", while a few (3.6%) reported being "completely gay" and the remainder (31.8%) rated themselves as somewhere between the poles. Approximately 10.7% of the sample finished high school, while 31.8% finished some college, 7.7% finished an associate's degree, 26.6% finished a bachelor's degree, and 20.0% reported a graduate degree. The most common racial backgrounds reported were Asian/White (37.5%), Black/White (26.8%), Black/Asian (5.7%), and Hispanic/White (5.0%).

Results. Two independent samples t-tests were run to compare levels of invalidation across Black and non-Black Multiracial individuals. Levels of identity rejection were higher for

Black (M = 2.68; SD = 1.09) than for non-Black (M = 2.37; SD = 1.11) Multiracial individuals, $t(428) = -2.95$, $p < .01$. Levels of phenotype invalidation were not higher for Black (M = 3.62; SD = 1.09) than for non-Black (M = 3.74; SD = 1.21) Multiracial individuals, $t(428) = 1.05$, $p > .05$. Levels of behavior invalidation were higher for Black (M = 3.61; SD = 1.10) than for non-Black (M = 2.85; SD = 1.09) Multiracial individuals, $t(428) = -7.24$, $p < .001$. Levels of identity incongruent discrimination were not higher for Black (M = 2.54; SD = 1.08) than for non-Black (M = 2.38; SD = 1. 08) Multiracial individuals, $t(428) = -2.95$, $p < .01$. Results are reported in Table 4. Correlations, reliabilities and ranges for subscales across Black and non-Black racial groups are reported in Table 5 and Table 6.

Study 4: Additional Reliability Estimates

The purpose of the fourth study was to obtain additional internal consistency reliability estimates and to compute test-retest reliability.

Study 4 Method

Procedure. Seventy-nine individuals who participated in either study 1 or study 2, and who submitted their contact information to the researchers to enter the lottery to win a gift certificate were invited to complete the Social Invalidation measure for a second time, anywhere from two weeks to two months after their initial participation. Participants were offered an additional chance at winning a $25 gift certificate; 39 individuals completed the survey at Time 2, resulting in a 49.4% response rate.

Participants. Participants were 39 Multiracial adults (74.5% female, 20.5% male). Respondents ranged from 18 to 48 years in age, with a mean age of 24.0 (SD = 6.98). Approximately 41.0% of participants reported their family income as greater than $80,000 per year, while 31.0% earned between $40 and 79,000 and 25.5% averaged a family income below

$40,000. Most (56.4%) reported being "completely heterosexual", while a few (2.6%) reported being "completely gay" and the remainder (38.5%) rated themselves as somewhere between the poles. Approximately 7.7% of the sample finished high school, while 38.5% completed some college, 35.9% finished a bachelor's degree, and 19% reported a graduate degree. The most common racial combinations were Black/White (38.5%), White/Asian (25.6%), and Black/Asian (7.7%).

Measures.

Social invalidation. The original 30-item Social Invalidation measure was administered.

Study 4 Results. Means, standard deviations, ranges, internal consistencies, and test-retest estimates are reported in Table 7. Reliabilities were as follows: Identity Rejection (α = .87), Phenotype Invalidation (α = .88), Behavioral Invalidation (α = .76) and Identity Incongruent Discrimination (α = .84). The two-month test-retest reliability estimates for all of the subscales were significant at the .01 level.

Chapter 4:

Discussion

The purpose of the current study was to create a psychometrically sound measure of social invalidation for use with Multiracial individuals. The results indicated that the Social Invalidation instrument demonstrated adequate psychometric properties when used with two samples of Multiracial adults of diverse racial backgrounds. Exploratory factor analyses indicated a four factor structure, including Identity Rejection, Invalidation Phenotype, Behavioral Invalidation, and Identity Incongruent Discrimination and this model was supported by a confirmatory factor analysis. Generally, participants reported low-moderate amounts of identity rejection and identity incongruent discrimination and moderate amounts of phenotype invalidation and behavior invalidation. Internal consistency estimates for the subscales of the Social Invalidation instrument were moderate to high and the test-retest reliability scores over a two-week to two-month period were adequate.

No hypotheses were proposed regarding how many factors would be found in the measure. The four-factor model that arose promoted new conceptual understandings of social invalidation. The identity rejection factor included general experiences of invalidation (e.g., Others have an issue with the way I racially identify myself). Out of all the factors, it correlated most highly with the remaining factors. The overlap with the remaining factors, along with the item content and factor theme suggest that it may encapsulate a general overview of invalidation, of which the other factors provide further specificity. In addition to consistently relating to challenges with racial identity, cultural homelessness, and loneliness, and satisfaction with life in study 2, this factor accounted best for negative mental health outcomes and self-esteem: it was the only factor to relate to depression in study 1, and the only to relate to self-esteem in both

study 1 and study 2. This might suggest that an accumulation of general experiences of invalidation, rather than any particular type, are related strongly to Multiracial people's mental health and self-esteem. Based on this factor's high correlation with the others, the inclusiveness of the items, and its relationship with theoretically related constructs, researchers seeking to include a shortened measure of identity invalidation within their studies might consider using the identity rejection scale.

The second factor, phenotype invalidation, assessed invalidating experiences solely based on appearance. This occurs when a Multiracial person's phenotype leads others to assume that they are a different race, or else not a member of a race, to which they personally identify. When phenotype invalidation occurs, others may not intend to invalidate the Multiracial person's identity, but may, instead, be making automatic assumptions based on the Multiracial person's appearance. Although related to challenges with racial identity and cultural homelessness across studies 1 and 2, and loneliness and depression, as well, in study 2, this factor, compared to the other factors, tended to exhibit the weakest correlations with negative outcomes, such as depression, challenges with racial identity, and loneliness. While still harmful for a Multiracial person's sense of belonging and mental health, this form of invalidation may be easier to manage than others, perhaps because of a perceived lack of intentionality on the part of the invalidation perpetrator.

The third factor, behavior invalidation, highlights experiences where the Multiracial person's actions or behaviors led to the invalidation of their racial identity. This factor is consistent with forms of invalidation arising in past research (Khanna, 2004; Khanna, 2010; Romo, 2011), which has found that because others inaccurately conflate behaviors with racial group membership, those not fulfilling certain behavioral stereotypes are subject to the

invalidation of their racial identity. This factor consistently related to cultural homelessness, loneliness, and challenges with racial identity, and related to depression in study 2.

The fourth factor, Identity Incongruent Discrimination, included experiences where Multiracial individuals were discriminated against for a race that they did not identify as (e.g., others call me racially derogatory words that do not apply to the racial group that I identify as). While research has highlighted the negative impact of discrimination for Multiracial individuals (e.g., Brackett et al., 2006; Jackson et al., 2012; Salahuddin & O'Brien, 2011; Shih & Sanchez, 2005), it has not yet accounted for the identity incongruent experiences of prejudice that Multiracial people may experience. This may be a new important avenue to investigate among this group. This factor consistently related to challenges with racial identity, cultural homelessness, depression, and loneliness.

Generally, the convergent validity of the factors on the Social Invalidation instrument were supported by their relations with other variables with which they were expected to relate. All subscales related to challenges with racial identity, depression, cultural homelessness, and loneliness, in either study 1 or 2, while the identity rejection and identity incongruent discrimination consistently related to depression, and the identity rejection factor consistently related to self-esteem. Moreover, criterion validity was supported as all of the Social Invalidation factors relationships with cultural homelessness or challenges with racial identity were below .7 (Dormann et al., 2013).

The lack of relationships between a number of invalidation factors and mental health outcomes and self-esteem may be explained by the healthiness of the sample. Depression scores for the sample were low, and self-esteem and satisfaction with life scores were high, restricting the range of the mental health and well-being variables. Furthermore, the sample was recruited

from online groups catering to Multiracial individuals, and from a university with a prominent Multiracial organization. Overall, participants from the sample may be more likely to access resources and find a sense of community to help them cope with invalidating experiences.

Consistent with our hypotheses, Black Multiracial people exhibited higher rates of social invalidation. Specifically, Black Multiracial individuals had higher rates of identity rejection and behavior invalidation than Non-Black Multiracial individuals. Rates of identity rejection may have been higher because the one-drop rule was created for use within the Black community (Khanna, 2010; Rockquemore & Laszloffy, 2003), and the Black community has upheld this rule (Gullickson & Morning, 2011; Rockquemore & Laszloffy, 2003; Tashiro, 2002), making Black Multiracial people particularly vulnerable to having an identity imposed. Hispanic and Asian groups may have immigrated to America more recently and, thus, may be less impacted by the historical legacy of the one-drop rule; they also may be considered closer to Whiteness, allowing them more latitude in their identity choice (Gullickson & Morning, 2011; Herman, 2010; Lee & Bean, 2004; Sanchez et al., 2009).

Black Multiracial individuals also exhibited strikingly higher rates of behavior invalidation than Non-Black Multiracial individuals. Since social stereotypes have not been developed regarding what it means to act Multiracial, behavior invalidation may center around the Multiracial person's Monoracial background more so than their Multiracial one. For Black Multiracial individuals, these types of invalidating experiences may be informed by literature on "Acting White" accusations prevalent amidst the Black community (Durkee & Williams, 2015; Ogbu, 2004), wherein if a Black person's behaviors do not fit perceived Black behavioral norms, they are accused of being White. This type of behavior invalidation may be more prevalent among Black people because of the history of enslavement that has led to suspicion and distrust

towards Whiteness, and anything perceived to be associated with it (Ogbu, 2004).

It was surprising that Black Multiracial individuals did not report higher rates of phenotype invalidation, as past research suggests that Black Multiracial individuals are more constrained in how they are perceived (as Black) than Multiracial individuals of different racial compositions (e.g., Herman, 2010; Ho et al., 2011; Peery & Bodenhausen, 2008). It may be that non-Black Multiracial people experience phenotype invalidation in different ways; for example, Herman (2010) found that in general, perceivers tended to guess Multiracial people's race incorrectly, such that part-Blacks were viewed as solely Black while non-Black Multiracial people were viewed as ambiguous. To the extent that racial misperception may catalyze identity incongruent discrimination, in having similar rates of racial misperception (albeit in different forms), both groups may be equally vulnerable to identity incongruent discrimination; this may be why no differences in rates of this factor arose between Black and non-Black Multiracial people.

Limitations

The present study possesses a number of limitations. The generalizability of the data is limited by characteristics of the sample. Specifically, the sample was mostly female, young, educated, healthy, and wealthy. The strategic recruitment of participants from websites catering to Multiracial individuals, and from a diverse mid-Atlantic university, and participants willingness to engage in a study on Multiracial individuals, may suggest that participants' racial identity was particularly salient and that individuals from the sample had access to a Multiracial community. Thus, the findings are not generalizable to all Multiracial people and factors that might emerge with a sample of Multiracial individuals that is older, of lower socioeconomic status, or evinces poorer mental health might differ from those arising in this study.

The measure also is limited in its capacity to uncover experiences distinct to particular Multiracial racial denominations. While social invalidation has been found to apply to Multiracial people of various compositions (e.g., Shih & Sanchez, 2005; Townsend et al. 2009), there may be particularities to racial experiences based on distinct racial backgrounds. For example, research on Asian and Hispanic Multiracial individuals has focused more on cultural backgrounds and practices, while research on Multiracial individuals tends to focus on themes like appearance and interracial comfort (Charmaraman, Woo, Quash, & Erkut, 2014); these group specific factors only were investigated insofar as comparing Black and non-Black backgrounds.

Another limitation of the measure is that it does not allow for the particular direction of the invalidation to be identified. Multiracial individuals may be reporting invalidation of their Monoracial identities, or Multiracial identity, or may have either experience in mind as they complete the measure. The direction of the invalidation may be important for determining its impact.

Future Directions

The social invalidation measure allows for improved assessment of a pervasive discriminatory experience for Multiracial people. With the construction of this measure, future research might investigate protective factors that reduce the impact of social invalidation on mental health outcomes. Past research has characterized social invalidation as a form of discrimination (Nadal et al., 2011; Nadal, Sriken, Davidoff, Wong, & McLean, 2013). It may be worthwhile to determine whether social invalidation predicts outcomes for Multiracial people above and beyond discrimination, and also to examine if similar factors that prevent against general discrimination for Multiracial individuals might protect against invalidation as well, such

as having an integrated sense of identity, and parental racial socialization (Franco, Katz, & O'Brien, 2015; Jackson et al., 2012). This research will inform interventions seeking to improve well-being among Multiracial individuals.

For the full effects of invalidation to be understood, future research should incorporate the direction of the invalidation: whether a more privileged or stigmatized identity is being imposed on the Multiracial individual. For example, if a Multiracial person is perceived as White, while they may experience cultural isolation, they also may receive social benefits from this misperception. However, they also may be vulnerable to uncensored discriminatory comments to the extent that their identity as a person of color is concealable. In being perceived as a racial minority, they may have a difficult time being accepted within mainstream White society, and also may be more likely to be the target of racial discrimination.

It may be particularly important to examine invalidation among certain age groups. Adolescence is a time when individuals are forming an identity, and when issues of belongingness are particularly important (Erikson, 1968), and thus, social invalidation may be particularly threatening during adolescence to the extent that it destabilizes identity and contributes to isolation. Furthermore, examining social invalidation among older populations may be meaningful, as these individuals faced even more pressure to conform to Monoracial categories and also were unable to identify as Multiracial on institutional forms (Rockquemore et al., 2009).

Past literature on invalidation has linked the concept to symbolic interactionism theory, which posits that identities are negotiated through social interaction, and the theory of reflected appraisal, which indicates that other's perceptions of self influence self-perceptions (Chito Childs, 2002; Herman, 2004; Khanna, 2010; Lou et al., 2011). According to these theories,

experiences of social invalidation may influence subsequent racial identity. Thus, it may be meaningful to investigate how socially invalidating experiences affect racial identity choices over time. A daily diary study would provide a useful way to examine invalidation and identity over time, as it could allow for an exploration of how experiences of invalidation directly affect feelings about identity in the moment.

Implications for Counselors

The social invalidation measure may allow counselors to better assess Multiracial people's experiences of discrimination. Counselors might consider using the measure in therapy, and incorporating it as a starting point to explore Multiracial individual's identity invalidating experiences, and their effects on self-esteem or mental health outcomes. Also, the harmful effects exhibited by social invalidation within the present study should lead counselors to ensure that they are not indirectly perpetuating invalidation against their Multiracial clients. To ensure affirming identity experiences of Multiracial clients, counselors should allow clients open-ended responses for their race on demographic forms, and explore their racial countertransference, including underlying assumptions they may have about the Multiracial client based on their phenotype or behaviors.

Counselors may act as advocates for Multiracial individuals who experience social invalidation and educate others on the importance of affirming a Multiracial person's racial identity. Counselors might work with Multiracial people to determine thoughtful responses to invalidating comments, and also may promote an understanding of the harmfulness of invalidating experiences among those who perpetrate invalidation. Because invalidation engenders a sense of loneliness and isolation, counselors might also promote group therapy with Multiracial clients, where they may understand that they are not isolated in their invalidating

experiences. Also to offset the isolation that invalidation engenders, counselors should encourage and facilitate Multiracial people building positive social networks with others who affirm their identity.

Conclusion

The current study established a psychometrically valid measure of social invalidation for use with Multiracial individuals that assesses four types of invalidation: identity rejection, phenotype invalidation, behavior invalidation, and identity incongruent discrimination. The instrument demonstrated adequate psychometric properties when used with two independent samples of Multiracial adults. It is hoped that this measure can lay the foundation for future research seeking to examine socially invalidating experiences and mitigate their effects, ultimately promoting healthy racial identity and mental health for Multiracial individuals.

Table 1

Principal Axis Factor Loadings, and Confirmatory Factor Analysis Factor Loadings for Retained Social Invalidation Scales

Item Content by Factor	PAF	CFA
Factor 1: Identity Rejection		
The way I racially identify is not accepted by others	.88	.76
Others imply that I should not racially identify in the way that I do	.86	.79
Others have an issue with the way that I racially identify myself	.84	.76
When people hear my opinions, they make me feel like I do not belong in my racial group(s)	.68	.65
Factor 2: Phenotype Invalidation		
Others would not guess the race(s) that I identify with	.88	.77
My physical features (e.g., skin color, hair texture, eye shape, eye color) lead people to assume that I am not the race(s) that I perceive myself	.78	.78
People have reacted with surprise when I tell them the race(s) that I identify with	.75	.81
People assume I am not a member of the racial group(s) that I identify with	.69	.81
Factor 3: Behavioral Invalidation		
People think I behave differently than a "typical" member of my racial group(s).	.91	.69
Others think that my interests are different than those of a typical member of my racial	.77	.81
I am excluded from a racial group that I feel connected to because I do not "behave" like a typical member of that racial group(s)	.60	.72
I have been accused of “acting” like a member of a racial group (s) that’s different from my own.	.55	.65
Factor 4: Identity Incongruent Discrimination		
Others call me racially-derogatory words that do not apply to the racial group(s) that I identify with	.86	.62
I am discriminated against based on a race that I do not identify with.	.82	.76
Others apply racial stereotypes to me that do not apply to the racial group(s) that I identify with	.75	.75
People expect me to associate with members of a racial group that I do not identify with	.69	.70

Table 2

Study 1: Correlations Among Scales, Reliabilities, Means, Standard Deviations, Actual Ranges, and Possible Ranges of Variables

Measures	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Identity Rejection	1									
2. Phenotype Invalidation	.42**	1								
3. Behavioral Invalidation	.58**	.25**	1							
4. Identity Incongruent Discrimination	.50**	.36**	.51**	1						
5. Challenges With Racial Identity	.45**	.18*	.36**	.25**	1					
6. Depression	.14*	.01	.12	.18*	.37**	1				
7. Self-Esteem	-.18*	-.04	-.04	-.07	-.44**	-.67**	1			
8. Cultural Homelessness	.43**	.27**	.32**	.31**	.63**	.18**	-.21**	1		
9. Loneliness	.19**	.09	.20**	.15*	.34**	.64**	-.62**	.30**	1	
10. Satisfaction With Life	-.06	-.01	-.05	-.07	-.19**	-.59**	.67**	-.13	-.61**	1
Mean	2.53	3.65	3.17	2.47	2.96	35.61	32.09	2.45	44.79	4.61
Standard Deviation	1.19	1.13	1.15	1.13	1.08	11.12	5.75	.52	14.70	1.51
Actual Range	1-6	1-6	1-6	1-6	1-5.8	20-73	19-40	1-3.88	20-80	1-7
Possible Range	1-6	1-6	1-6	1-6	1-6	20-80	10-40	1-4	20-80	1-7
Alpha	.89	.81	.81	.85	.70	.92	.90	.84	.96	.91

Note. *p <.05, **p < .01

Table 3

Study 2: Correlations Among Scales, Reliabilities, Means, Standard Deviations, Actual Ranges, and Possible Ranges of Variables

Measures	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Identity Rejection	1									
2. Phenotype Invalidation	.46**	1								
3. Behavioral Invalidation	.61**	.32**	1							
4. Identity Incongruent Discrimination	.64**	.38**	.50**	1						
5. Challenges With Racial Identity	.43**	.37**	.42**	.31**	1					
6. Depression	.27**	.13*	.26**	.23*	.37**	1				
7. Self-Esteem	-.12*	-.09	-.06	-.05	-.34**	-.64**	1			
8. Cultural Homelessness	.47**	.38**	.44**	.41**	.66**	.24**	-.15*	1		
9. Loneliness	.32**	.19**	.32**	.26**	.51**	.73**	-.57**	.35**	1	
10. Satisfaction With Life	-.15**	-.04	-.09	-.13	-.21**	-.61**	.55**	-.08	-.58**	1
Mean	2.47	3.58	3.20	2.40	3.08	34.89	31.38	2.47	43.66	4.68
Standard Deviation	1.06	1.25	1.18	1.02	1.17	10.62	6.39	.58	14.90	1.46
Actual Range	1-6	1-6	1-6	1-5.75	1-5.8	20-71	10-40	1-3.93	20-79	1-7
Possible Range	1-6	1-6	1-6	1-6	1-6	20-80	10-40	1-4	20-80	1-7
Alpha	.82	.87	.81	.79	.73	.92	.91	.86	.96	.90

*Note: *p <.05, **p < .01*

Table 4

Independent Sample T-test Outcomes by Invalidation Measure by Race

	Race of Participant						95% CI for Mean Difference		
	Black			Non-Black					
	M	SD	n	M	SD	n		t	df
Rejection	2.68	1.09	221	2.37	1.11	219	-.52, -.10	-2.95*	438
Phenotype	3.62	1.09	221	3.74	1.21	219	-.10, .33	1.05	438
Behavior	3.61	1.10	221	2.85	1.09	219	-.96, -.55	-7.24**	438
Incongruent Discrimination	2.54	1.08	221	2.38	1.08	219	-.36, .04	-1.56	438

Note. * $p < .01$, * $p < .001$

Table 5

Correlations, Range, and Reliability of Invalidation Measure Subscales by Racial Background: Black Multiracial

Measures	1	2	3	4
1. Identity Rejection	1			
2. Phenotype Invalidation	.39*	1		
3. Behavioral Invalidation	.54*	.18*	1	
4. Incongruent Discrimination	.60*	.35*	.42*	1
Actual Range	1-6	1-6	1.25-6	1-5.75
Possible Range	1-6	1-6	1-6	1-6
Alpha	.84	.79	.76	.83

Note. $*p < .01$

Table 6

Correlation, Range, and Reliability of Invalidation Measure Subscales by Racial Background: Non- Black Multiracial

Measures	1	2	3	4
1. Identity Rejection	1			
2. Phenotype Invalidation	.47*	1		
3. Behavioral Invalidation	.61*	.41*	1	
4. Incongruent Discrimination	.53*	.37*	.56*	1
Actual Range	1-5.25	1-6	1.25-6	1-5.75
Possible Range	1-6	1-6	1-6	1-6
Alpha	.84	.87	.80	.82

Note. $*p < .01$

Table 7

Test-Retest Reliability Estimates for the Social Invalidation Subscales and Means, Standard Deviations, Actual Range, Possible Range, and Alpha Coefficients at Time 2

	Identity Rejection	Phenotype Invalidation	Behavioral Invalidation	Identity Incongruent Discrimination
Test Re-test Reliability	.90*	.85*	.86*	.81*
Time 2 Mean	2.41	3.95	3.08	2.38
Time 2 Standard deviation	.97	1.09	1.07	.99
Time 2 Actual Range	1-5.25	1.75-6	1-6	1-5.5
Time 2 Possible Range	1-6	1-6	1-6	1-6
Time 2 Alpha	.87	.88	.76	.84

*Note: *p<.01*

Appendix A

Literature Review

The purpose of this study was to develop an instrument to measure experiences of social invalidation in the lives of Multiracial individuals. This review first reviews definitions of social invalidation and methods for measuring this construct. After, the minority stress theory is used to frame the experience of social invalidation and its outcomes. Then, current empirical research on social invalidation for Multiracial individuals is outlined, followed by research on racial categorizations of various denominations of Multiracial individuals. Also examined is research on constructs thought to be theoretically related to social invalidation, which inform the nomological network for invalidation. The hypotheses for this study are stated at the end of this chapter.

Several inclusion and exclusion criteria were used in the selection of empirical articles for this review. This review includes articles that examine the effects of Multiracial individuals' social invalidation experiences. Studies that focused exclusively on identity invalidation of other Monoracial groups, or for other identities (e.g., gender, sexual orientation) were excluded.

The review was limited to research within the last 20 years on people in the continental United States because the meaning and significance of race differs across time and location. All studies were identified from computer searches on PsycINFO and JSTOR, which are comprehensive electronic databases including article in the fields of psychology and sociology.

Defining Social Invalidation

Social invalidation was originally conceptualized by a sociologist named Kerry Ann Rockquemore, based on her interviews with 14 Black/White Biracial people and quantitative data from 177 Black/White Biracial individuals (Rockquemore, 2002; Rockquemore & Brunsma, 2001). Rockquemore (2002) referred to social invalidation experiences as the tension that Biracial

people experience between the ascribed definition of self supplied by out-group members and personal definitions of self. She points to institutional discrimination and racism as the culprit in constraining Black/White Biracial individuals to identify as Black. Rockquemore and Brunsma (2002) posited that negative consequences as a result of invalidation are provoked by America's exclusionary racial categorizations rather than any inherent flaw within the Biracial individual.

Rockquemore and Brunsma (2002) theorize on the intimate relationship between invalidation and identity, conceptualizing identity as interactionally-validated self understandings. Thus, the authors posit that it is crucial to receive interactional validation for any identity one holds, although Rockquemore (2002) also recognizes the agency of individuals in negotiating their identities with the external world.

Yet, even before Rockquemore (2002) coined the term social invalidation, related experiences arose across qualitative studies. Preceding Rockquemore, Root (1998) conceptualized Biracial identity by differentiating between public and private identities. Root (1998) argued that validation of private identity occurs via interpersonal interaction, and these interactions are informed by the larger political, gendered, and socioeconomic context in which identity is negotiated. In a later qualitative study, Tashiro (2002) found that a theme for participants was a disconnect between personal perception of identity and culturally ascribed identity; identities they aligned themselves with were called into question. Participants in one study reported pressures to identify monoracially, in spite of personal attachment to a Multiracial identity (Buckley & Carter, 2004). In another study, participants felt that their Multiracial identity was invisible**,** as they faced constant inquiries related to their racial background and were unable to chose Multiracial categories on forms (Miville et al., 2005). Underscoring all of these stressors is the denial of identity expression.

Qualitative studies on Multiracial individuals also highlighted expectations of "racial authenticity," which, when unfulfilled, prompted invalidation. In contrast to studies that frame social invalidation as pressure to identify Monoracially, research on authenticity within the Multiracial community has highlighted invalidation of Multiracial individual's Monoracial identities. For example, Harris and Khanna (2010) found it important to understand causes of alienation or disenfranchisement from the Black community, one of the most important being notions of "authenticity" that lead to the exclusion of all those who do not fit in with behaviors or phenotype determined to be authentic to Blackness, including Black/White Biracial individuals and middle class Black people. Additionally, Romo's (2011) qualitative study inquired about how notions of authenticity in Black and Mexican communities affects the development of the Blaxican (Biracial Black/Mexican) identity. The conceptual frameworks for both studies highlight how racial authenticity is accomplished through a socially-situated performance of prescribed behaviors (Harris & Khanna, 2010; Romo, 2011).

While research on "racial authenticity" for Multiracial individuals allows for this stressor to occur for Monoracially-identified individuals of Multiracial heritage, other theorists on this phenomena limit the experience of social invalidation to Multiracial-identifying individuals because of the unique pressures this group faces to adhere to Monoracial categories. For example, Coleman and Carter (2007) defined a validated identity as one in which a Biracial person felt supported by their identity choice or else able to successfully disregard any pressures that push for monoracial classification. An unvalidated Biracial identity is one in which the individual internally identifies as Biracial but recognizes and incorporates pressures to identify as monoracial, to the point that they identify as a Biracial person who is perceived as Black by others. Optimal identity development for Biracial individuals involves resolving external pressure to identify in certain

ways, and feeling validated in one's racial identity categorization. Similar to Coleman and Carter (2007), Townsend et al. (2009) define identity denial as occurring when Multiracial individuals are not permitted to identify as Multiracial. They posit that identity denial is perpetrated by structures and institutions (e.g., on forms) and by others individuals within social interactions. In line with the Multiracial identity focus upheld by Coleman and Carter (2007) and Townsend et al. (2009), Sanchez (2010) described the concept of "forced choice dilemmas" as instances where a Multiracial person is forced to chose between their multiple identities. Sanchez (2010) theorized that a Multiracial person's ambiguous appearance, and the variations in identity choices among the Multiracial group make racial misclassification for this group more likely. In sum, these studies all describe social invalidation, and related constructs, as those in which Multiracial individuals are forced to identify Monoracially.

Lou et al. (2011) extended the concept of social invalidation by proposing underlying mechanisms of invalidation. According to Lou et al. (2011), identity can be invalidated in two ways: other's can refuse to accept one's identity as Biracial, or they can refute "Biracial" as a general category; thus, invalidation can be based on the characteristics of the individual, or of racial categories, more generally.

Summary of definitions of social invalidation. Definitions of social invalidation across 13 studies were reviewed. Various studies define invalidation differently with some emphasizing that possessing a Multiracial identity is necessary for invalidation because the phenomena is characterized by pressure to identify as Monoracial and others acknowledging that Multiracial individuals are also vulnerable to invalidation of their Monoracial identities, particularly when they do not perform in ways that are perceived to be prototypical of their Monoracial identity. Theorists point to larger sociocultural environment that has contributed to Multiracial individuals'

invisibility and their subsequent invalidation. Multiracial individuals also might be particularly vulnerable to invalidation because of their ambiguous appearance and the variations in identity within this group. Many theorists outline the influence of social invalidation on racial identity, emphasizing how social invalidation may hinder racial identity development for this group.

With the variability of definitions of social invalidation across studies, there is a need for an all encompassing definition of this phenomena to streamline research. Thus, the current study defines social invalidation, more robustly, as a phenomena that occurs when others misperceived (passive) or deny (active) an individual's self-defined race. Invalidation may take may forms, including others' lack of acknowledgment or acceptance of an individual's racial identity (e.g., you're not actually Biracial) or an implied or blatant imposition of a racial identity (e.g., "even though you think are Biracial, you are actually Black").

Importantly, this definition allows for Multiracial individuals of all identities to experience social invalidation. Yet, in doing so, this definition neglects to include the role of institutional structures in contributing to instances of invalidation, because this type of invalidation is mostly relevant only for Multiracial individuals who identify as such.

To further clarify the definition of social invalidation, it is important to differentiate this construct from similar concepts within the literature. Two similar scales that currently exist are cultural homelessness (i.e., feelings of not belonging to any group; Vivero & Jenkins, 1999), and challenges with racial identity (i.e., feelings of not identifying and belonging within a particular racial group; Salahuddin & O'Brien, 2011). These concepts are different from invalidation because invalidation measures how others treat the Multiracial individual, rather than their internal feelings. Further, while invalidation may contribute to feelings of not belonging, mediating coping factors may prevent individuals experiencing invalidation from feeling like they do not belong;

thus social invalidation can appear without experiences of cultural homelessness, or challenges with racial identity.

Past Measurement of Social Invalidation

Past research on experiences of social invalidation for Multiracial people have insufficiently measured this construct. Most studies addressing social invalidation have not measured this phenomena at all; instead, experiences of invalidation have arisen in qualitative studies, when Multiracial participants discussed their racial identity development (Collins, 2000; Buckley & Carter, 2004; Harris & Khanna, 2010; Kerwin et al., 1993; Miville et al., 2005; Rockquemore, 2002; Root, 1998; Romo, 2011; Tashiro, 2002).

Rockquemore (1998) made the first attempt to quantify invalidation experiences. The author developed a one item measure that was constructed based on interviews with Black/White Biracial individuals: participants were asked which of the following stages best describes their racial identity: 1. I consider myself exclusively Black (or African American), 2. I sometimes consider myself Black, sometimes some other race, and sometimes Biracial depending on the circumstances, 3. I consider myself Biracial, but experience the world as a Black person, 4. I consider myself exclusively Biracial (neither Black nor White), 5. I consider myself exclusively as my other race (not Black or Biracial), 6. Race is meaningless. I do not believe in racial identities, and 7. Other. The third option represented an invalidated identity.

This measure is insufficient for measuring invalidation for many reasons. First, it conceptualized invalidation as categorical and chronic, while context plays a potent role in whether invalidation occurs (Collins, 2000; Rockquemore et al., 2009; Root, 1998); in other words, Multiracial individuals can experience invalidation in some contexts, but not in others. A measure is needed that accounts for a range in levels of social invalidation that Multiracial persons

experience. Furthermore, the measure assumes that invalidation occurs when Biracial-identifying people are perceived as Monoracial, while research has shown that Multiracial individuals also experience invalidation as the denial of their Monoracial identities (Rockquemore, 2002; Tashiro, 2002). Furthermore, the measures conflation of racial identity and invalidation is problematic, since it assumes that only Multiracial-identifying individuals experience invalidation, while this is not the case. Also, the measure was grounded in theory on Black/White Biracial identity, and although it has been applied to Multiracial individuals of varied backgrounds (Lou et al., 2011), it may have limited generalizability across Multiracial denominations. Last, using a one-item measure to tap into a construct is problematic because it cannot adequately account for the richness of the construct, and is more susceptible to measurement error caused by transient states. Despite the issues with the measure, it has been incorporated into other studies of Multiracial people's invalidation experiences (Coleman & Carter, 2007; Lou et al., 2011).

Others ways of measuring social invalidation include a one-item measure of pressure to identify as monoracial: rank the level of pressure from society, peers, and family to identify as monoracial from a 1 to a 10 (high pressure; Coleman & Carter, 2007); and a three-item measure of "forced choice in identity" constructed based on past theoretical research: a sample item is "people have told me that I should identify with one racial identity over another." None of these measures have undergone recommended procedures for instrument development, such as the establishment of items based off focus groups/interviews, validity testing, or factor analysis. Researchers have constructed these items based on the purposes of their studies, limiting the usefulness of these measures for future research.

One experimental study (Townsend et al., 2009) utilized a social invalidation manipulation, which involved requesting that Multiracial participants check a box to indicate their

race without allowing them to list more than one race. Importantly, this manipulation induces—and does not measure—social invalidation; thus, its purpose is not to capture Multiracial people's social invalidation experiences.

Although Salahuddin and O'Brien (2011) attempted to create a social invalidation scale as part of their larger instrument on Multiracial challenges and resilience, their items did not load as hypothesized. A similar subscale arose from their factor structure that measures other's surprise and disbelief regarding racial heritage, which may comprise one aspect of social invalidation, but does not capture the concept in its self. Furthermore, two out of five of the items on this scale measure others surprise over a Multiracial individual's relation to a family member; this is different from social invalidation because the Multiracial individual may indeed feel that their race is different from their family member, and thus, this surprise does not necessarily indicate invalidation.

Summary of research measuring social invalidation. In sum, four studies have independently generated measures of social invalidation and one experimental study has developed a way to induce social invalidation. Yet, the lack of empirically validated measures used within many of these studies calls into question the research findings. While qualitative studies clearly indicate that social invalidation is an important and influential experience for Multiracial individuals, quantitative research has yet to adequately quantify this experience, limiting the degree to which research on this stressor can move forward. Thus, the construction of an empirically valid social invalidation instrument for the current study absolves a significant impediment to progress in social invalidation research.

Minority Stress Theory and Social Invalidation

Minority stress theory posits that stigma faced by minority group members fosters an unwelcoming environment that contributes to negative health outcomes (Meyer, 2003). "Stress" occurs when adaptive mechanisms are exceeded. Minority stress experiences have the following features: (a) unique, because this form of stress occurs outside of normal stressors experienced by most people, (b) chronic, because this stress is caused by omnipresent social structures, and (c) socially based, meaning this stress is caused by social structures and social relationships rather than any inherent issue within the individual. The model also describes how distal stressors, which are external to the individual, such as prejudice, rejection, and discrimination, influence proximal processes, which are internal to the individual, such as anxiety, vigilance, and fear of rejection.

Based on the characteristics that define minority stressors, social invalidation can be understood as a form of minority stress. Minority stress theory posits that minority stress persists because of discrepancies of perception between the minority individual and the larger society (Meyer, 2003); in the case of invalidation, the discrepancy is in perception of the race of the Multiracial individual. Also in line with Meyer's (2003) description of minority stress, Multiracial scholars have argued that invalidation occurs because of a larger monoracist sociocultural environment that renders Multiracial people invisible (Rockquemore & Brunsma, 2002; Root, 1998). The hostile stress climate provoked by invalidation has proximal implications for Multiracial individuals' well-being (e.g., Coleman & Carter, 2007; Sanchez, 2010; Townsend et al., 2009; Lou et al., 2011). Furthermore, according to theory, minority stressors should be linked to health; the link between socially invalidating experiences and health has been illustrated within the Multiracial population (Coleman & Carter, 2007; Jackson et al., 2012; Salahuddin & O'Brien,

2011). In sum, social invalidation is a type of minority stressor, and accordingly, minority stress theory provides an apt framework for social invalidation experiences and their implications.

Implications of social invalidation according to minority stress theory. Minority stress theory (Meyer, 2003) suggests a variety of negative implications for minority stress experiences. For instance, minority stress theory highlights the role of minority stressors in evoking identity challenges. Accordingly, social invalidation, as a form of minority stress, may provoke racial identity challenges; specifically social invalidation may incite two types of threat: categorization threat—the threat that an individual will be categorized as a member of a group against their will—and distinctiveness threat—the denial of group membership (Branscombe et al., 1999; Meyer, 2003). These threats pose challenges to racial identity because the development of a healthy racial identity is, in part, contingent on others acknowledging and reflecting one's identity (Rockquemore & Brunsma, 2002). The relationship between social invalidation and challenges with racial identity will be examined in the current study.

As a form of minority stress, social invalidation may indicate to the individual that their identity is devalued, and the individual may internalize this perception and begin to feel negatively. In this way, social invalidation may contribute to depression and negative-self regard, through provoking internalized stigma (Coleman & Carter, 2007; Meyer, 2003; Townsend et al., 2009). Indeed, in Meyer (2003) seminal minority stress article, the author found that sexual minorities were over two times more likely to experience mood disorders than heterosexual individuals. In line with these findings, the current study will investigate links between social invalidation and depression.

While minority stress has been hypothesized to affect self-esteem, research has found mixed results for this link. While forms of discrimination, which might include social invalidation,

may affect self-esteem, they also may promote greater in-group identity and affiliation, which may elevate self-esteem (Giamo et al., 2012; Meyer, 2003; Sellers, Caldwell, Schmeelk-Cone, & Zimmerman, 2003; Sellers & Shelton, 2003). Yet, for Multiracial individuals these ameliorative factors may be less evident, as the lack of critical mass of Multiracial individuals may strain in-group identification and affiliation (Charmaraman & Grossman, 2010; Samuels, 2009). Thus, without these protective mechanisms, the self-esteem of Multiracial individuals may be depleted due to social invalidation (Meyer, 2003). The relationship between social invalidation and self-esteem will be examined in the current study.

Meyer (2003) argued that alienation provides one of the mediating links between forms of discrimination (e.g., social invalidation) and negative health outcomes. Specifically, social invalidation may indicate to Multiracial individuals that their perspectives and experiences regarding their race are invalid, fostering a subjective loneliness. Further, stripping Multiracial individuals of their racial identity may exclude them from finding a racial community, provoking feelings of cultural homelessness (Vivero & Jenkins, 1999). The current study will examine connections between the discriminatory process of social invalidation and cultural homelessness and loneliness.

Because minority stress influences mental health, and mental health issues impinge on satisfaction with life (Risannen et al., 2013), minority stress, and social invalidation as a form of minority stress, also may be associated with low levels of life satisfaction. One of the mediators of this relationship may be the wariness and vigilance that stigmatizing experiences promote (Meyer, 2003). After experiencing discrimination, the minority individual holds a chronic fear of negative events occurring, which could reduce life satisfaction. Associations between social invalidation and satisfaction with life will be investigated in the present study.

Research Examining Social Invalidation

A number of studies, both quantitative and qualitative, have illustrated the prevalence of social invalidation experiences in the lives of Multiracial individuals. The current section includes all studies that have addressed social invalidation, or related constructs, in some way. Subsections will differentiate between research that describes social invalidation, more generally, and research that suggests a link between social invalidation and factors that underlie health and well-being.

Empirical research examining social invalidation. Standen (1996) investigated how Korean/White individuals negotiate their racial identity within the larger political and racial macrosystem. Qualitative interviews were conducted with eight individuals, who all had a first-generation Korean immigrant mother and a White father. Four males and four females participated. Participants ranged in age from 19-23. Average yearly income of participants ranged from $0,000 to $9,999. Three participants were students. Six lived in suburban areas, and one in an urban area, and another lived in a city (nonurban). All participants resided in the Colorado area. One theme that arose was pressure to fit into Monoracial categories, which became particularly salient on institutional forms.

In a qualitative study, Rockquemore (1998) examined how invalidation influences racial identity for Black/White Biracial individuals. Participants included Black/White Biracial undergraduates in a Catholic University in the Midwest. Fourteen individuals participated, ranging in age from 18-22. All were Catholic and mid to upper class. No other demographic information was provided. Findings indicated that social status and appearance (characterized as language, physical appearance and clothing) determined who Biracial individual's interacted with and these interactions influenced Biracial individual's racial identity by the degree to which they provide validation or support of a Biracial individual's identity choice. Based on interviews, the

researchers proposed a model that indicated that validation contributes to successful racial identity, and invalidation leads to interactional ruptures, and compromised racial identity for the Biracial person.

Qualitative methodologies were employed to examine the experience of Multiracial woman who place stigma on Whiteness and identify with their minority race (Storrs, 1999). Participants included 27 women of White and non-White mixed race ancestry: nine were Asian/White, six were Native American/White, eight were African-American/White, three were Latina/White, and one was African-American/Asian. Age ranged from 18-50. No other demographic information was reported. Qualitative interviews illustrated that these women were vulnerable to accusations of racial inauthenticity within their minority group and that they employed strategies to garner minority-group acceptance: changing physical appearance (e.g., hair), displaying cultural symbols (e.g., hair, jewelry), and selectively disclosing their Biracial identity. Inauthenticity accusations were coupled with exclusion from racial minority communities. Interestingly, individuals who appeared to be monoracial minorities were still vulnerable to racial litmus tests.

In a qualitative study, Collins (2000) examined racial identity development in Biracial Japanese Americans. The study included 15 Japanese Biracial adults from ages 20-30 (Mean = 32.7; No *SD* reported) residing in the San Francisco Bay Area. Participants included 8 men and 7 women. Eleven participants were college educated and 4 were high school graduates. Race of parents was as follows: 13 had Japanese mothers and two had White mothers; 12 had White fathers, 2 had Japanese fathers, and 1 had an African-American father. Participants reported that their parents pressured them to identify as Monoracial (or as White for many participants) and assimilate into the mainstream. Participants faced similar pressures from peers. Because of these

pressures during adolescence, participants did not feel at liberty to identify as Biracial, and the lack of a Biracial reference group only compounded this sense of restriction. Participants felt pressure from others to adhere to the one-drop rule, which Collins (2000) identifies as compelling for Asian individuals because of the importance Asian cultures place on perspectives of the collective. Participants' unique racial backgrounds made them feel isolated from their peers.

Another qualitative study investigated racial identity construction in Biracial adults (Tashiro, 2002). Participants included 20 Biracial adults from Northern California. Participants' families were working class or from midlevel professional backgrounds. Eleven participants were women and nine were men. Thirteen participants were mixed Asian/White and seven were African/White. Participants ranged in age from 45-94. Participants reported a disconnect between their personal perception of their cultural or racial identities and the racial identities that they were ascribed. For the Black/White participants, the effects of being perceived as Black were so potent that it led them to perceive themselves as such. Compared to the Asian/White participants, Black/White participants were more likely to be defined by their minority racial group. Black/White participants felt that they were constantly being reminded of their Blackness by Whites but also experienced having their Blackness called into question by other Blacks.

Rockquemore and Brunsma (2002) used quantitative methodologies to investigate their theory of racial identity development on a sample of Black/White Biracial individuals. Questionnaires were given to 177 students, 107 of which were women and 70 of which were men, who ranged in age from 18-58. All participants were recruited from educational institutions in the Midwest. Social invalidation was assessed with a one-item measure that simultaneously assessed racial identity (outlined in the measurement of social invalidation section). Of the participants who identified as Biracial, more reported being chronically racially invalidated (approximately 63%)

than validated in their racial identity choice. Invalidated Biracial-identifying participants were more likely to come from low SES environments, and report being closer to Blacks than validated Biracial-identified individuals. They were also four times more likely than validated Biracial individuals to describe themselves as looking Black. Participants reported experiencing invalidation of their Black identity by Blacks and negativity from Whites.

Mixed-methods were used to examine racial identity for Asian-White individuals (Khanna, 2004). Participants included 110 respondents: 37% Korean-White, 25% Chinese White, 25% Japanese White, 6% Indian-White, 2.5% Filipino-White, and 2.5% Thai-White, with the rest reporting being White and of mixed Asian heritage. Fifty-three percent were female, and the remaining were male. The mean age was 22 (range = 18-25; no *SD* reported). The Asian parent was the mother 71% of the time, and the father, 29% of the time. Most (approximately 60%) were second generation, while some (23%) were first-generation, and a few (18%) were third generation. Most reported a middle class background. Of relevance to the current study is the qualitative portion of the research, where participants were asked to comment on the fluidity of their racial identity, and the positive and negative aspects of being Multiracial. Participants reported experiences of being mistaken for being full Asian, or else fully White. They had their racial identity challenged by others (e.g., you don't seem Asian). Racial misclassification had implications for how participants were treated; having others treat them like a certain race pulled them towards identifying with that race. Their classification by others also had implications for whether they were accepted into a racial group. Racially invalidating experiences were provoked by both appearance and dearth of cultural knowledge.

Townsend et al. (2009) investigated the consequences of identity denial for Multiracial individuals. Fifty-nine mixed race undergraduates were recruited: 23 were Asian/White, 20 were

Latino/White and 16 were Black/White Biracial. Thirty-six participants were women and 23 were men. Participants were asked to describe experiences they had where their Biracial identity has caused tension and where they felt pressure to identify in a certain way. Of relevance to social invalidation, 28.7% of participants described experiences where others misperceived them; 23.7% of participants described experiences where demographic forms did not permit them to claim their racial identity, 22% indicated that their lack of cultural knowledge barred them from identifying with a certain race, 22% indicated that their lack of involvement with racial/ethnic activities pushed them to identify in certain ways, 16.9% described how being discriminated against for one of their races elicited pressure to identify Monoracially, and another 16.9% felt pressure to identify as Monoracial during racially charged conversations. Four participants (6.8%) could not recall an instance when they felt pressure to identify as Monoracial.

Romo (2011) conducted an investigation of racial authenticity for Blaxicans (Black and Mexican). Participants included five females and seven males (total N = 12) who identified as Blaxican. Six participants had Chicano or Mexican fathers, and African American mothers, while the remaining six had African American fathers and Mexican or Chicano mothers. Their ages ranged from 21-45, with most participants in their early 20s. Degree of education varied: seven participants have or were in the process of earning bachelor's degrees, 1 had a master's degree, 1 had an associate's degree, and 3 had high school diplomas. Eight participants identified as working class. Findings indicated that Blaxicans in this study were simultaneously invalidated in their identity as Biracial, as they experience much pressure to adhere to Monoracial groupings, and in their monoracial identities, as they fail to fit in with monoracial notions of "authenticity" which are grounded in a specified phenotype and stereotyped behaviors. Specifically, prescribed behaviors were known to be acceptable for members of the Black and Mexican group, and

Blaxicans were invalidated when they did not fit in with these norms. Although Blaxican participants did try to fit within monoracial norms, they were able to resist and still identify with their multiple groups, albeit this identity was invalidated by most people.

Empirical research on social invalidation and factors underlying health and well-being. Root (1998) set out to examine factors that influence identity development for Multiracial individuals. The author conducted a qualitative study on racial identity development in Biracial sibling pairs (Root, 1998). Participants included 20 sibling pairs. Pairs ranged in age from 18-40. Ten were same-sex pairs and ten were brother-sister pairs. Nine sibling pairs were Black/White Biracial, two were Black/Asian, six where Asian/White, and two were American Indian/White. Participants reported having to go through demeaning processes of racial authenticity testing to be accepted into monoracial groups. This "hazing" process often required "submission of the self" to avoid cruel rejection (p. 243). Biracial individuals had to prove their authenticity by conforming to exaggerated stereotypes about one of their racial groups. Sometimes, Biracial individuals had to commit deviant acts, like stealing, rejecting all Whites, or having sex to gain acceptance. This hazing process was most pronounced for African-descended Biracials. Root (1998) describes these hazing experiences as psychologically traumatic.

Another study employed semi-structured to investigate how gender influences racial identity construction among Black/White Biracial people (Rockquemore, 2002). Participants included 16 Black/White Biracial people recruited from educational institutions around the country. Twelve participants were women and four were men, ranging in age from 18-46. Biracial women in this study were asked about interactions with others (e.g., strangers, friends, significant others), and data were extracted that were relevant to experiences related to racial identity construction. Biracial women cited experiences of social invalidation and rejection from Black

women based on their physical appearance (lighter skin, lighter eyes, curly hair). Biracial woman interpreted any negative comments related to their appearance as rejection of their Blackness. From the perspective of the participants, Black women were envious of the advantage that their phenotype gave them with Black men and retaliated by calling their Blackness into question. This invalidation engendered feelings of discomfort and psychological distress in Biracial women. Contrastingly, Biracial men experienced validation from both Black men and women and gained status because of their more European features.

Buckley and Carter (2004) conducted a qualitative study of five Black/White Biracial women's attitudes and beliefs about their racial identity. All participants resided in New York City at the time of the study. Participants ranged in age from 18-28 with an average age of 25 years old. One theme that emerged was challenges with racial identity, with the most salient challenge being pressure to identify monoracially. All participants reported being coerced to choose a monoracial identity by external forces, as being a member of both groups did not seem like an option. One participant stated that her racial identity decision was more for other's comfort than her own. Participants asserted that their racial identification was often up for public consensus and based on their desire to fit in and their context. External pressure to identify with one race had a profound effect on the participants and resulted in confusion and distress.

Miville et al. (2005) employed qualitative methodologies to examine racial identity themes for a Multiracial sample (N =10). Racial backgrounds of participants varied greatly, and included one of each of the following: Black American/Asian; Black American/American Indian, Asian/American Indian, Latina/White, Latino/Middle Eastern, Native Hawaiian/White/Asian, along with two Asian/White and two and American Indian/White individuals. Five participants

were female and five were male. Average age was 28 (range = 20-54; No *SD* reported). Nine participants were enrolled as full-time students.

The theme of discrimination arose, which has some relevancy to invalidation (Miville et al., 2005). Multiracial-specific discrimination manifested as inquiries related to Multiracial individual's racial background, and the lack of Multiracial categories on forms. Underscoring this theme is the denial of identity expression for Multiracial individuals. Participants described feeling hurt and angry as a result of these experiences, but also developing some appreciation for their unique features that prompted identity questioning.

A quantitative study examined whether racial identity and social invalidation status (i.e., identifying as Biracial, but perceiving the world as Black) influenced anxiety and depression scores (Coleman & Carter, 2007). Participants included 61 Biracial individuals with one Black and one White parent, including 34 females, 16 males, and one participant who did not identify gender. Mean age was 28.47(*SD* = 8.66). Thirty-three participants were recruited from the community, while the remaining participants were recruited from three universities: Howard University, American University, and The University of Georgia. Fifty-four percent of the sample identified as Biracial and unvalidated, while 28% identified as Biracial and validated. As a whole, participants felt a low level of pressure from family, moderate pressure from peers, and high pressure from society to identify as Monoracial, with unvalidated Biracial individuals indicating higher levels of pressure from family than validated individuals. Family pressure and peer pressure to identify as Monoracial was related to social anxiety, and peer and societal pressure was related to expectations of negative evaluations from others. Unvalidated Biracial participants had higher depression and anxiety scores than validated Biracial individuals.

Binning, Unzueta, Huo and Molina's (2009) quantitative study examined how Multiracial individual's racial identification relates to well-being. Their sample was comprised of 182 Multiracial individuals from two high schools in California. The sample was 60% female with a mean age of 15.92 (*SD* = 1.15). Fifty-four individuals primarily identified with a single low-status group, 49 individuals who primarily identified with a single high-status group, and 79 individual identified with multiple groups. Group identifications varied, with participants identifying with Black, White, Native American, Asian, and Latino groups.

Participants racial identification was categorized using a tripartite Multiracial categorization system, in which individuals were categorized according to whether they identified with their high status (White) group, low-status (minority group), or both groups. Individuals who identified with both groups delineated enhanced well-being as compared to those individuals who identified with one of their racial groups. The authors speculated that individuals who identified with one group racial group might have faced increased external pressure to identify monoracially, which impacted stress levels.

In a two-party study, Townsend et al. (2009) examined the social invalidation and its consequences. The second part involved an investigation of the effects of social invalidation on self esteem and well-being. For this study, participants included 52 mixed race undergraduate students: 19 participants were mixed (East) Asian/White, 15 were mixed Latino/White, 10 were mixed American Indian/White, 3 were mixed South Asian/White, 2 were mixed American Indian/(East) Asian and 1 was mixed American Indian/Latino. Thirty-two participants were female and 20 were male. Participants were randomly assigned to an identity denial condition, in which they had to choose one race on an item, or a control condition, in which they could select multiple races. Participants in the identity denial condition were less likely to evince positive views of

themselves (i.e., less likely to see themselves as creative or good looking). Additionally, participants in the identity denial condition displayed decreased self-esteem and motivation and were more likely to report "being Biracial, but experiencing the world as Monoracial" than the control.

In a qualitative study, Harris and Khanna (2010) investigated the experiences of two groups that experience marginalization within the Black community: Black/White Biracial people and middle-class Blacks. Harris and Khanna (2010) examined the process of racial identity negation and challenges these group members face when identifying with their Blackness. Biracial participants included 40 individuals from Georgia, each with one self-identified Black and one self-identified White parent. Average age was 24 (range = 18-45). The sample was highly educated, with 67.5% enrolled in college, and 32.5% having graduated college, and most (87.5%) having at least one parent with some college. Findings revealed Biracial individuals, especially women, were prone to invalidation of their Black identity because of their appearance. They were considered elitist because of their Biracial heritage and more European phenotype. Participants internalized the rejection and began to believe that they did not meet criteria for Blackness. Participants reported that invalidation resulted in sadness, distress, loneliness, and alienation. It led some participants to actively distance themselves from the Black community. To reassert identity, some participants donned cultural symbols (e.g., clothing, earrings) and associated with more Black people.

Quantitative methodologies were employed to examine how forced choice dilemmas (instances where Multiracial individuals are forced to chose an identity) predict depressive symptoms (Sanchez, 2010). Participants included 317 Multiracial individuals: 30% indicated an Asian/White background, 22% indicated a Black/ White heritage, 11% indicated a

Black/American Indian/White background, 6% indicated a Latino/White background, and 5% indicated an American Indian/White background. The rest of the participants were of other Multiracial backgrounds. Two hundred and sixty participants were female and 57 were male. Mean age was 29.1(*SD* = 9.2). Black Multiracial individuals were more likely to encounter forced choice dilemmas than Asian Multiracial individuals. Forced choice dilemmas related to increased depressive symptoms. Additionally, forced choice dilemmas predicted lower identity autonomy, which was defined as the extent to which Multiracial people feel that they can chose their racial identity freely, and lower public regard, defined as perceptions of how others view Multiracial individuals. Further, the link between forced choice dilemmas and depressive symptoms was fully mediated by lower public regard and identity autonomy, such that forced choice dilemmas predicted decreased autonomy in defining one's racial identity, and perceptions of societal disapproval towards Multiracial people, which in turn predicted depressive symptoms.

Lou et al. (2011) examined how social invalidation influences identity integration—the degree to which one perceives one's racial groups as harmonious—and self-concept clarity—the extent to which perceptions of self are clearly defined and internally consistent. Participants included 122 Biracial individuals: Multiracial (i.e., at least one parent identified as Multiracial; n = 23), Asian/White (n = 40), Black/White (n = 38), Aboriginal/ White (n = 5), South Asian/White (n = 3) and Aboriginal/Asian (n = 1). Mean age was 26.1 (*SD* = 9.1). Eighty-six participants were women and 36 were men. Seventy-one participants were Canadian and 45 were American. Social invalidation was assessed using the taxonomy outlined by Rockquemore (2002). A validated Biracial identity comprised 29% of the sample, while an unvalidated one comprised 22%. Black/White Biracial individuals were more likely to report an unvalidated identity than Asian/White people. Validated individuals experienced less discrimination from Whites (96.3%)

than unvalidated individuals (62.9%). Validated Biracial individuals scored higher on identity integration: meaning that validated individuals experienced their racial groups as less conflicting, and more consistent.

Salahuddin and O'Brien (2011) created a scale to measure Multiracial resiliencies and challenges. The authors sought to create a subscale to measure social invalidation, which they defined as pressure to identify or not identify with certain groups. The study examined how the scale would relate to measures of psychological health, including self-esteem and depression scores. All participants were Multiracial individuals recruited from the internet. Wave 1 of participants included 317 individuals from metropolitan areas of the US, 71% of which were women, 28.4% of which were men, and .6% of which were transgendered. Participants ranged in age from 18 to 53, with a mean age of 22 (*SD* = 5.21). While the social invalidation scale did not emerge, a similar scale arose that evaluated others surprise and disbelief regarding racial identity. The scale related positively to depression and negatively to social connectedness. The stability of the factor structure was assessed with a second sample, which included 172 adults (75% women; 25% men) from 18-55(M = 26.6; *SD* = 8.08). Racial composition was as follows: Asian/White (28.5%), Black/White (25.6%), Latino/White (10%), Black/White/ Native American (5.5%), Black/Asian (3%), Native American/ White (3%), and other (24%). Family incomes ranged from less than $10,000 to over $100,000, with the mean income between $60,000 and $60,999. Most participants reported having a bachelors (36%) degree, but education ranged from some high school to doctoral or professional degree. The structure of the other's disbelief scale was held up, and was also found to relate to frequency of racist encounters.

Summary of empirical research on social invalidation. In total 21 articles (one which was two parts) were reviewed that addressed social invalidation experiences. Of those, ten studies

(8 qualitative, and 2 quantitative) included descriptions of social invalidation, while 11 studies (5 qualitative and 6 quantitative) linked social invalidation to factors that may underlie health outcomes. The research suggests that social invalidation is a pervasive experience for Multiracial individuals and may negatively influence health and well-being. Accordingly, the validity of the current measure was investigated via linkages between the instrument and health outcomes.

The research on social invalidation also suggests that it may pose a challenge for racial identity development, by restricting perceived identity choice (Buckley & Carter, 2004; Collins, 2000; Sanchez, 2010; Tashiro, 2002; Townsend et al., 2009) and forcing one to "prove" allegiances to a racial identity or relevant cultural knowledge before being accepted (Harris & Khanna, 2010; Khanna, 2004; Romo, 2011; Root, 1998; Storrs, 1999), and that social invalidation may be more prevalent for Multiracial Black individuals than Multiracial individuals from other racial backgrounds (Lou et al., 2011; Root, 1998; Sanchez, 2010; Tashiro, 2002). In alignment with the research, validity of the social invalidation instrument will be further assessed through the hypothesized link between social invalidation and challenges with racial identity. Also, rates of invalidation are hypothesized to be higher for Black Multiracial people than non-Black Multiracial people (Lou et al., 2011; Root, 1998; Sanchez, 2010; Tashiro, 2002).

The Relationship Between Social Invalidation and Cultural Homelessness and Loneliness

Finding a cultural home is important because it provides meaning, continuity, social support, and identity, and for members of stigmatized groups, a cultural home can help in coping with experiences of discrimination (Vivero & Jenkins, 1999). Yet, some individuals are excluded from cultural homes, making them culturally homeless. Vivero and Jenkins (1999) posit that cultural homelessness consists of three domains: (a) lack of group membership and attachment: the individual does not identify with any group, (b) lack of cultural home: the individual feels

rejected by all groups, and (c) need for a cultural home: the individual desires a group for which to belong. A cultural homeless individual may identify with multiple groups but feels rejected by all of them (Vivero & Jenkins, 1999).

Much of the qualitative research reviewed thus far (e.g., Collins, 2000; Harris & Khanna, 2010; Miville et al., 2005), along with related research on the Multiracial population (Navarrete & Jenkins, 2011; Shih & Sanchez, 2005; Urdy, Li & Hendrickson-Smith, 2003) has revealed that Multiracial people are prone to experience isolation. Related to isolation, Multiracial individuals are also at risk for loneliness and cultural homelessness, which is characterized by rejection, feelings of not belonging, and struggling to obtain membership with a group (Hoersting & Jenkins, 2011; Navarrete & Jenkins, 2011).

While the precursors to loneliness and cultural homelessness have not been clearly identified, research and theory seems to point to the role of social invalidation in promoting these outcomes. Vivero and Jenkins (1999) theorized that Multiracial individuals' pressure to identify with certain groups and lack of acknowledgement of their multiple identities may promote cultural homelessness, and Campbell and Troyer (2007) propound that feelings of disconnect from racial communities may be underscored by racial group misclassification. Miville et al.'s (2005) study illustrated that isolation stems from the rejection from Monoracial groups, and also not being able to find a visible Multiracial group to find community. Rejection from Monoracial groups often occurs because Multiracial people are not considered real or authentic members of any racial group because of their out-group racial heritage (Miville et al., 2005; Root, 1998; Romo, 2011; Vivero & Jenkins, 1999). Social invalidation also may provoke cultural homelessness and loneliness because invalidation of Multiracial identity may provoke Multiracial individuals to feel as if it is unacceptable for them to identify with the Multiracial group, barring them from finding

any sort of Multiracial community. In sum, invalidation—the stripping of one's racial identity—may exclude one from finding a racial community, leading to feelings of isolation, and cultural homelessness.

While no research has explicitly examined the relationship between social invalidation and cultural homelessness, past research has investigated this construct within Multiracial samples. The current section will review two studies, both quantitative, that assessed experiences of cultural homelessness with samples that included Multiracial participants

Summary of empirical research on cultural homelessness for Multiracial individuals. Navarrete and Jenkins (2011) recruited 448 participants to complete their measure of cultural homelessness, which was constructed based on the theoretical definition of cultural homelessness outlined by Vivero and Jenkins (1999). The sample consisted of 302 women and 145 men, with one participant not reporting gender. The average age was 22.09 (*SD* = 4.92; range = 17-52). The sample was predominately middle class (74.5%), with few participants in upper (2.2%) or lower (2.0%) SES strata. They purposely recruited a disproportionate amount of Multiracial individuals (26.7%; n = 120) of various backgrounds because they were interested in cultural homelessness experiences for this group. Cultural homelessness related to being Multiracial or Multicultural, having groups with discrepant norms, feeling less belonging within one's racial/ethnic groups, speaking multiple languages, and moving across countries.

Hoersting and Jenkins (2011) replicated much of Navarrete and Jenkins (2011) findings with a sample of participants (n = 475) who lived in two different countries throughout their lives; this sample was composed of 10% Multiracial individuals. The average age of the participants was 42.6 (*SD* = 14.7) and included 301 females and 174 males. The majority were married (59.9%; n = 428). Most spoke two languages before the age of 18 (93.9%; n = 446). Mean time spend abroad

during childhood was 9.5 years (*SD* = 5.2). This quantitative study indicated that cultural homelessness was related to low self-esteem, being Multiracial, spending more time abroad, experiencing a geographic move at a young age, speaking multiple languages, having multiple citizenships. Actively identifying as cross-cultural buffered the effects of cultural homelessness on self esteem.

Summary of empirical research on cultural homelessness for Multiracial individuals. In sum, two quantitative studies have shown that Multiracial people are vulnerable to isolation and cultural homelessness, and theorists have suggested that social invalidation may underlie these feelings (Campbell & Troyer, 2007; Vivero & Jenkins, 1999). Thus, to provide validity for the social invalidation instrument, its relation to cultural homelessness and the theoretically related construct of loneliness will be assessed (Navarrete & Jenkins, 2011)

Differences in Racial Categorizations Across Multiracial Groups

While most research investigates Biracial individuals' experiences with social invalidation, some studies have also examined how others categorize Biracial individuals, and the extent to which hypodescent plays into these categorizations. This type of research can inform discourse on social invalidation as it provides external evidence that may corroborate Biracial individuals claims of pressure from others to adhere to Monoracial categorizations.

The current section will review the history of Multiracial racial categorizations, along with contemporary research on differences in racial categorization across Multiracial denominations. Though social invalidation is conceptualized as an experience that all Multiracial people face, historical dynamics and contemporary research suggest that some denominations may be more vulnerable than others.

Historical antecedents of Multiracial miscategorization. Social invalidation is an important construct to examine for Multiracial individuals because in addition to this group being vastly understudied, they also are at unique risk for experiencing invalidation. In order to understand this risk, the history of the Multiracial group within America will be examined.

Historically, Multiracial individuals were restricted from identifying as Monoracial through the one drop rule. The one-drop rule, which defines anyone with part-minority ancestry by their minority group, was created to allow White slave masters to enter exploitive sexual relationships with their Black female slaves, and generate increased revenue from the Mulatto slaves these women birthed (Khanna, 2010; Rockquemore & Laszloffy, 2003). While time has passed since slavery, and the one-drop rule is no more a governmental dictum, remnants of it are still prevalent for many reasons. Centuries of racial mixing across monoracial communities (including Black and Native American, and Black and White) have made it difficult to determine the line between monoracial and Multiracial phenotypes (Khanna, 2010). While part-White Multiracial individuals are often labeled as such because of their European phenotypical characteristics, such as light eyes, blonde hair, or straight hair, Monoracial minority individuals may possess these same traits. Because of the overlap in phenotype, often people cannot differentiate between monoracial Black people and Biracial people with some Black heritage (Khanna, 2010); these similarities make it difficult for perceivers to recognize and validate a Multiracial person's identity.

Yet, for other Multiracial denominations, the one-drop rule may be less apparent. In Native American communities, blood quantum level laws, arbitrate that any individual with one quarter— rather than one-drop— Native American ancestry is Native American (Spruhan, 2007). Additionally, Asians are more likely to have immigrated recently, leaving them less likely to be

affected by the one-drop rule's historical legacy (Gullickson & Morning, 2011; Herman, 2010; Lee & Bean, 2004). Further, non-Black Multiracials may possess a social status that is closer to that of Whites, which may leave them more leeway in identifying with their Whiteness, or choosing a Multiracial identity (Herman, 2010; Ho et al., 2011; Lee & Bean, 2004). Still, research evidence supports that the one-drop rule remains prevalent at least to some degree for all Multiracial denominations (e.g., Collins, 2001; Ho et al., 2011), because existing essentialist notions of race do not allow for a Multiracial identity.

Still, the one drop rule has a particularly heightened potency for part Black-Multiracials. One reason the one-drop rule may be especially prevalent for part Black Multiracials is because the Black community has expressed support for the rule (Rockquemore & Laszloffy, 2003; Khanna, 2011). Minority groups, such as the NAACP, have realized that it may be in their best interest to force Biracial individuals with Black ancestry to identify as Black so that the political power of the Black community can be maintained (Rockquemore & Laszloffy, 2003). The belief that part-Black Biracial individuals should identify as Black has led to the accusation that non-Black-identifying Biracial people are betrayers, who contribute to the Black community's fragmentation (Brackett et al., 2006; Khanna, 2011; Rockquemore & Laszloffy, 2003). There is also a fear that monoracial Black people will begin to reclaim the White ancestry that they might have acquired through years of sexual exploitation during slavery, leading to the disintegration of the Black community (Khanna, 2011).

Historical dynamics seem to suggest that social invalidation is a salient issue for all Multiracial individuals because of the legacy of invisibility, yet the stressor may be differentially prevalent for Multiracial individuals with various backgrounds, with part Black-Multiracial people being most likely to undergo this experience; some research has also examined if this is the case.

The next section will review research that compares racial categorizations of various Multiracial denominations to discern the relative frequency of social invalidation for Multiracial-identifying individuals within these groups.

Empirical research on racial categorization across Multiracial groups. Herman (2010) examined whether observers' background affect their perception of Multiracial youth. There were 390 observers (or participants) who ranged in age from 18-25 (Mean = 21.22; *SD* = 1.36). Seventy seven percent of observers identified as Monoracial, and the rest, as Multiracial. When asked to identify with one race, 60% identified as White, 6.4% identified as Black, 5.9% identified as Hispanic, 14.4% as Asian, 3.6% as Native American, 2.6% as Southeast Asian, 0.5% as Pacific Islander, and another 0.5% as Middle Eastern. Each participant evaluated the race of 15 year book photos of individuals with Multiracial ancestry. Part Black-Multiracial people were more likely to be categorized by their minority identity than part Asian, Hispanic, and Native American Multiracial people. Yet, non-Black Multiracials often were miscategorized, but their imposed race was more diffuse.

In another quantitative study, Ho et al. (2010) examined whether Black/White or Asian/White Biracial individuals were more likely to be perceived as their minority race. The authors proposed that it is important to examine how Multiracial individuals are perceived to elucidate how socially entrenched categories influence perception. They conducted five studies, which all endeavored to test whether Biracial participants were judged by the rules of hypodescent (i.e., one drop of minority blood makes one a minority). In experiment one, 217 participants were recruited from a university in New England. The race participants were: 116 Whites, 43 Asian/Asian American/Pacific Islanders, six African American/Blacks, eight Latino/Hispanics, three Middle Eastern, one Native American, 25 biracial/mixed race, nine "other", and six who did

not report their ethnicity. One hundred and nineteen participants were female, while 91 were male and seven did not report their gender. The average age was 23.3 (*SD* = 9.86). Participants were asked whether a child of one minority parent (i.e., Black or Asian) and one non-minority parent should be judged by their minority or White race. Participants were more likely to classify individuals with a non-minority and minority parent by their minority parent, and this effect was stronger for Black/White Biracial individuals than Asian/White.

In experiment 2a, nineteen White participants (Mean age = 22.1; *SD* = 11.19), 14 of whom were female were recruited, and asked to quickly categorize a Biracial individual based on charts depicting their grandparents: grandparents were either all White, all minority (either Asian or Black) or mixed White and minority (either Asian or Black); Asian and Black grandparents were never mixed. Participants had 2,400 ms to answer three questions for each chart. For a chart with at least one Asian grandparent, participants were asked is the granddaughter/grandson Asian? Is the granddaughter/grandson White? Is the granddaughter/grandson mixed? For a chart with at least one Black grandparent, the same questions were asked, except "Asian" was replaced by "Black." Verbal labels, rather than pictures, were used to display race of the grandparents. Overall, for Biracial individuals with equal minority and White ancestry, participants were more likely to chose the minority than White label. Quarter-White, three-quarter Asian males were less likely to be labeled as minority than their quarter Black counterparts. Twenty-four White participants (Mean age = 28.04; *SD* = 13.69), 13 of whom were female, were recruited to replicate these findings in experiment 2b. Methods were similar to the initial experiment, except pictures of grandparents were used instead of verbal labels. Overall, half-minorities were more likely to be labeled as minority than White. Hypodescent labels were more prevalent for part-Black than part-Asian individuals and were more prevalent for males than females. Among quarter Asian/three-

quarter White individuals, the White label was chosen more than the Asian, but for quarter-Black/three quarter White individuals, there was no difference between frequency of minority or White categorizations.

In experiment 3a, 50 participants (31 White, 8 Black, 5 Latino/a, 3 Asian, 1 Native American, 1 Biracial, 1 "other") were asked to incrementally morph a minority face (either Asian or Black) until they considered it White (and vice-versa). Thirty-three participants were female and 17 were male. Average age was 28.52 (*SD* = 12.32). The target faces had to have a lower percentage minority to be perceived as minority (46.67), and a higher percentage White (65.20) to be perceived as White. Target images that started out as Black, compared to those that started as Asian, needed to have more White to be considered White. Thus, part- minority composition seems to disproportionately influence other categorization, an effect that is magnified for part-Black individuals. Experiment 3b was a replication of 3a. The sample included 86 participants (46 White, 16 Asian, 8 Black, 5 Latino/a, 8 Biracial, 3 unknown). Fifty were female, and 36 were male with an average age of 25.79 (*SD* = 11.03). Now, the morph task was confined to 2 seconds per image. All findings from experiment 3a were upheld. Then, participants were shown images of Asian/White and Black/White people and were given 2 seconds to indicate whether they were minority or White. Asian/White and Black/White individuals were more likely to be labeled as minority than White. Black/White individuals were more likely to be categorized as minority than Asian/White individuals. As a whole, this study indicates that hypodescent influences categorization of Biracial individuals, more so for part-Black Biracial individuals.

Summary. While rates of invalidation have been found to differ across groups, the research reviewed earlier examining Multiracial people's experiences of invalidation (e.g., Miville et al., 2005; Storrs, 1999; Tashiro, 2002; Townsend et al., 2009), and research examining racial

categorizations of Multiracial individuals (Herman, 2010; Ho et al., 2010) illustrates that invalidation of racial identity is prevalent for all Multiracial groups. This stressor is universal to Multiracial individuals across denominations because of the historical invisibility of Multiracial individuals within America's racial system (Rockquemore & Laszloffy, 2003; Shih & Sanchez, 2005).

Yet, there is some support for differences in hypodescent categorizations across Multiracial denominations. Two experimental studies have found that part-Black Multiracials are particularly vulnerable to rules of hypodescent, which may be suggestive of a more constrained identity choice and increased likelihood of experiencing invalidation. However, differences in hypodescent categorizations does not necessarily indicate differential levels of invalidation; for instance, part-Black Multiracial individuals may be more likely to be misclassified as Black, while part-Native American individuals may be more likely to be misclassified as White, leaving equal levels of invalidation across groups. Hypodescent studies indicate that part-Black Multiracial individuals may at least be more vulnerable to a particular type of invalidation.

In light of historical dynamics, research on social invalidation (Lou et al., 2011; Root, 1998; Sanchez, 2010; Tashiro, 2002), and on the categorization of Multiracial individuals from various groups, an exploratory hypothesis was proposed: part-Black Multiracial individuals will experience more invalidation than Multiracial individuals of other racial heritages.

Conclusion

In sum, social invalidation is an important construct to investigate because it is related to a host of negative psychological outcomes (e.g., Buckley & Carter, 2004, Rockquemore & Brunsma, 2002; Rockquemore & Laszloffy, 2003; Root, 1998; Shih & Sanchez, 2005; Townsend et al., 2009). Yet, despite the potent effects of this stressor, an empirically sound measure of social

invalidation has never before been developed. The current study sought to create a well-developed measure of social invalidation. Utilizing the framework of minority stress theory, and drawing from research on cultural homelessness, validity of the measure was assessed through its proposed relationship with racial identity challenges, depression, self-esteem, loneliness, cultural homelessness, and life satisfaction. Also examined were differences in levels of social invalidation across Multiracial denominations.

Purpose, Research Question, and Hypotheses

The purpose of the study was to create an empirically valid measure of social invalidation.

Characteristics of instrument.

Research Question 1. What factor structure will emerge for the instrument?

Reliability.

Hypothesis 1. The instrument was hypothesized to have adequate reliability with a diverse pool of Multiracial participants.

Hypothesis 2. The instrument was hypothesized to have adequate test-retest reliability.

Validity.

Hypothesis 3. The instrument was predicted to correlate positively with challenges with racial identity, depression, cultural homelessness, loneliness, and negatively with self-esteem and life satisfaction.

Hypothesis 4. The correlation between social invalidation and cultural homelessness/challenges with racial identity was hypothesized to be below .7.

Hypothesis 4. Rates of social invalidation were hypothesized to be higher for Multiracial individuals with any degree of Black ancestry than for those with non-Black ancestries.

Appendix B

Social Invalidation Instrument

Based on your experiences related to your racial identity (the race you identify yourself as, regardless of ancestry), please indicate how often each event has happened to you (FREQUENCY) and how distressed you felt as a result of the event (DISTRESS). Please use the following 6 point scales:

Frequency:	**Distress:**
1-Never	1-Not at all distressed
2-Rarely	2-Slightly distressed
3-Sometimes	3-Somewhat distressed
4-Often	4-Moderately distressed
5-Very often	5-Very distressed
6-Almost Always	6-Extremely distressed

---

1) People assume that I am not a member of the racial group(s) that I identify with
   F: 1 2 3 4 5 6 D: 1 2 3 4 5 6
2) Others imply that I do not appear to be the race(s) that that I identify with
   F: 1 2 3 4 5 6 D: 1 2 3 4 5 6
3) Others would not guess the race(s) that I identify with
   F: 1 2 3 4 5 6 D: 1 2 3 4 5 6
4) People label me as a different race than the race(s) that I identify with
   F: 1 2 3 4 5 6 D: 1 2 3 4 5 6
5) People have reacted with surprise when I tell them the race(s) that I identify with
   F: 1 2 3 4 5 6 D: 1 2 3 4 5 6
6) My physical features (e.g., skin color, hair texture, eye shape, eye color) lead people to assume that I am not the race(s) that I perceive myself
   F: 1 2 3 4 5 6 D: 1 2 3 4 5 6
7) People expect me to racially identify differently than the way I do
   F: 1 2 3 4 5 6 D: 1 2 3 4 5 6
8) People expect me to associate with members of a racial group that I do not identify with
   F: 1 2 3 4 5 6 D: 1 2 3 4 5 6
9) When people tell me that I look like someone, they are not of the same race(s) that I identify with
   F: 1 2 3 4 5 6 D: 1 2 3 4 5 6
10) Because of my appearance, other members of a racial group that I identify with do not accept me
   F: 1 2 3 4 5 6 D: 1 2 3 4 5 6
11) Even after I tell others my racial identity, they continue to label me as another race
   F: 1 2 3 4 5 6 D: 1 2 3 4 5 6
12) The way I racially identify is not accepted by others
   F: 1 2 3 4 5 6 D: 1 2 3 4 5 6
13) Others impose a racial group(s) onto me that I do not identify with
   F: 1 2 3 4 5 6 D: 1 2 3 4 5 6
14) Others imply that I should not racially identify in the way that I do
   F: 1 2 3 4 5 6 D: 1 2 3 4 5 6
15) Others tell me what my race(s) "actually" is/are
   F: 1 2 3 4 5 6 D: 1 2 3 4 5 6
16) I am excluded from a racial group that I feel connected to because I do not look like a typical member of that racial group
   F: 1 2 3 4 5 6 D: 1 2 3 4 5 6

17) Others have an issue with the way that I racially identify myself
F: 1 2 3 4 5 6 D: 1 2 3 4 5 6
18) Around some people, I feel like I cannot disclose the way that I racially identify myself
F: 1 2 3 4 5 6 D: 1 2 3 4 5 6
19) Others apply racial stereotypes to me that do not apply to the racial group(s) that I identify with
F: 1 2 3 4 5 6 D: 1 2 3 4 5 6
20) Others call me racially-derogatory words that do not apply to the racial group(s) that I identify with
F: 1 2 3 4 5 6 D: 1 2 3 4 5 6
21) I am discriminated against based on a race that I do not identify with
F: 1 2 3 4 5 6 D: 1 2 3 4 5 6
22) People talk negatively about my racial group(s) in front of me because they do not know that I identify with that group(s)
F: 1 2 3 4 5 6 D: 1 2 3 4 5 6
23) People think I behave differently than a typical member of my racial group
F: 1 2 3 4 5 6 D: 1 2 3 4 5 6
24) I have been accused of "acting" like a member of a racial group(s) that is different from my own
F: 1 2 3 4 5 6 D: 1 2 3 4 5 6
25) When people hear my opinions, they make me feel like I do not belong in my racial group(s)
F: 1 2 3 4 5 6 D: 1 2 3 4 5 6
26) Others think that my interests are different than those of a typical member of my racial group(s)
F: 1 2 3 4 5 6 D: 1 2 3 4 5 6
27) Because of the way I speak, others deny my racial group membership(s)
F: 1 2 3 4 5 6 D: 1 2 3 4 5 6
28) Because of the foods I eat, others deny my racial group membership(s)
F: 1 2 3 4 5 6 D: 1 2 3 4 5 6
29) Others pressure me to change my behaviors to be accepted as a legitimate member of my racial group(s)
F: 1 2 3 4 5 6 D: 1 2 3 4 5 6
30) I am excluded from a racial group that I feel connected to because I do not "behave" like a typical member of that racial group
F: 1 2 3 4 5 6 D: 1 2 3 4 5 6

Appendix C

Demographic Questionnaire

1) Age _____
2) City _____
3) State _____
4) Occupation _____
5) Ethnicity_____
6) What race do people tend to perceive you as? _____
7) What is your primary racial identification? _____

8) If you are a student, please indicate your year in school
   - ☐ Freshman
   - ☐ Sophomore
   - ☐ Junior
   - ☐ Senior
   - ☐ Graduate Student
   - ☐ Not a Student

9) Gender
   - ☐ Female
   - ☐ Male
   - ☐ Transgendered
   - ☐ Other _____

9) What is your primary racial identification? (Please check one)
   - ☐ Black or African-American
   - ☐ White
   - ☐ Hispanic/ Latina/Latino
   - ☐ American Indian or Alaska Native
   - ☐ Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
   - ☐ Asian
   - ☐ Biracial/Multiracial
   - ☐ Other _____

10)
To what extent do you identify with your racial group(s)?

Very Little Very Much

11) Race/ Ethnicity or Biological Mother
   - ☐ Black or African-American
   - ☐ White
   - ☐ Hispanic/ Latina/Latino
   - ☐ American Indian or Alaska Native
   - ☐ Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander

- ☐ Asian
- ☐ Biracial/Multiracial
- ☐ Other _____

12) Race/Ethnicity of Biological Father

- ☐ 1 Black or African-American
- ☐ 2 White
- ☐ 3 Hispanic/ Latina/Latino
- ☐ 4 American Indian or Alaska Native
- ☐ 5 Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
- ☐ 6 Asian
- ☐ 7 Biracial/Multiracial
- ☐ 8 Other _____

13) Were you adopted?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

If so, please indicate the race of your adopted parents:
Parent 1:

- ☐ Black or African-American
- ☐ White
- ☐ Hispanic/ Latina/Latino
- ☐ American Indian or Alaska Native
- ☐ Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
- ☐ Asian
- ☐ Biracial/Multiracial
- ☐ Other _____

Parent 2:

- ☐ Black or African-American
- ☐ White
- ☐ Hispanic/ Latina/Latino
- ☐ American Indian or Alaska Native
- ☐ Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
- ☐ Asian
- ☐ Biracial/Multiracial
- ☐ Other _____

14) Please select the box that corresponds to your (before tax) household income.

- ☐ Below $10,000
- ☐ $10,00-$19,999
- ☐ $20,000-$39,999
- ☐ $40,000-$59,999
- ☐ $60,000-$79,999
- ☐ $80,000-$99,999
- ☐ $100,000-$149,999
- ☐ More than $150,000

15) Highest level of education that you completed

- ☐ Middle School
- ☐ Some High School
- ☐ High School/ GED
- ☐ Trade/ Vocational
- ☐ Some College
- ☐ Associates
- ☐ Bachelors
- ☐ Masters
- ☐ Doctorate
- ☐ Other (if applicable)_____

16) Sexual Orientation

Completely Heterosexual — Completely Gay

17) What was the racial composition of your neighborhood while you were growing up?

- ☐ Mostly Black
- ☐ Mostly White
- ☐ Mostly some other race
  Please indicate_____
- ☐ Mixed

18) Skin Tone

- ☐ Light
- ☐ Fair
- ☐ Medium
- ☐ Olive
- ☐ Brown
- ☐ Black

19) Which of these options best describes the way that you racially identify?

- ☐ I consider myself exclusively one race
- ☐ I sometimes consider myself one race, and

sometimes another depending on the circumstances

- ☐ I consider myself one race but the world perceives me as another race
- ☐ I consider myself exclusively Biracial and cannot be described as one race
- ☐ Race is meaningless and I do not believe in racial identities
- ☐ Other_____

Appendix D

Challenges With Racial Identity

Based on your experiences related to your race, please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.

Please respond to Items 1-5 using the following 6 point scale, indicating how strongly you agree or disagree with each of the statements below.

Agreement:

0 = Strongly disagree
1 = Disagree
2 = Slightly disagree
3 = Slightly agree
4 = Agree
5 = Strongly agree

1.	I hide parts of myself when interacting with some friends	0 1 2 3 4 5
2.	I feel the need to prove my racial identity to others	0 1 2 3 4 5
3.	I feel as if I do NOT belong to any racial group	0 1 2 3 4 5
4.	I feel pressure to distance myself from a racial group to which I feel connected	0 1 2 3 4 5
5.	Because of my race, I do not have a strong sense of who I am	0 1 2 3 4 5

Appendix E

Center for Epidemiological Studies Depression Scale (CES-D)

Below is a list of the ways you might have felt or behaved. Please indicate how often you have felt this way during the past week.

During the Past Week:
1: Rarely or none of the time (less than 1 day)
2: Some or a little of the time (1-2 days)
3: Occasionally or a moderate amount of time (3-4 days)
4: Most or all of the time (5-7 days)

1. I was bothered by things that usually don't bother me. 1 2 3 4
2. I did not feel like eating; my appetite was poor. 1 2 3 4
3. I felt that I could not shake off the blues even with help from my family or friends. 1 2 3 4
4. I felt I was just as good as other people. * 1 2 3 4
5. I had trouble keeping my mind on what I was doing. 1 2 3 4
6. I felt depressed. 1 2 3 4
7. I felt that everything I did was an effort. 1 2 3 4
8. I felt hopeful about the future. * 1 2 3 4
9. I thought my life had been a failure. 1 2 3 4
10. I felt fearful. 1 2 3 4
11. My sleep was restless. 1 2 3 4
12. I was happy. * 1 2 3 4
13. I talked less than usual. 1 2 3 4
14. I felt lonely. 1 2 3 4
15. People were unfriendly. 1 2 3 4
16. I enjoyed life. * 1 2 3 4
17. I had crying spells. 1 2 3 4
18. I felt sad. 1 2 3 4
19. I felt that people dislike me. 1 2 3 4
20. I could not get "going." 1 2 3 4

Appendix F

Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale

Below is a list of statements dealing with your general feelings about yourself. Please indicate your level of agreement using the 4-point scale below.

Agreement

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

1. I feel that I am a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others **A:** 1 2 3 4
2. I feel that I have a number of good qualities **A:** 1 2 3 4
3. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure* **A:** 1 2 3 4
4. I am able to do things as well as most other people **A:** 1 2 3 4
5. I feel I do not have much to be proud of* **A:** 1 2 3 4
6. I take a positive attitude toward myself **A:** 1 2 3 4
7. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself **A:** 1 2 3 4
8. I wish I could have more respect for myself* **A:** 1 2 3 4
9. I certainly feel useless at times* **A:** 1 2 3 4
10. At times I think I am no good at all* **A:** 1 2 3 4

Appendix G

Cultural Homelessness Scale

Please respond to questions 1-14 using the following 4 point scale, indicating how strongly you agree or disagree with each of the statements below. Please be open and honest in your responding.

1-Strongly Disagree
2-Disagree
3-Agree
4-Strongly Agree

1) I feel that I don't belong to any racial group **A:** 1 2 3 4
2) There is no racial group with which I can identify **A:** 1 2 3 4
3) When I think which racial group I mostly act or think like, I cannot find one **A:** 1 2 3 4
4) I don't feel emotionally attached to any racial group **A:** 1 2 3 4
5) No one racial group label accurately describes me **A:** 1 2 3 4
6) I am a racial minority everywhere I go **A:** 1 2 3 4
7) I struggle to determine where I belong racially **A:** 1 2 3 4
8) I am often asked about my racial origins **A:** 1 2 3 4
9) I have more than one set of values related to my racial group(s) and these contradict each other **A:** 1 2 3 4
10) It is difficult for me to find others like me racially **A:** 1 2 3 4
11) I have felt discriminated against by all racial groups because of my race **A:** 1 2 3 4
12) I don't feel racially "at home" anywhere I go **A:** 1 2 3 4
13) There is no group anywhere that represents who I am racially **A:** 1 2 3 4
14) Finding a racial "home" is important to me. **A:** 1 2 3 4

Note. Items correspond to the following subscales: Lack of Ethnic/Cultural Group Membership and Attachment: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5; Lack of A Cultural Home: 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13; Need for a Cultural Home: 14

Appendix H

UCLA Loneliness Scale Version 3

INSTRUCTIONS: Indicate how often each of the statements below is descriptive of you.

1 = I never feel this way
2 = I rarely feel this way
3 = I sometimes feel this way
4 = I often feel this way

1. I am unhappy doing so many things alone	1 2 3 4
2. I have nobody to talk to	1 2 3 4
3. I cannot tolerate being so alone	1 2 3 4
4. I lack companionship	1 2 3 4
5. I feel as if nobody really understands me	1 2 3 4
6. I find myself waiting for people to call or write	1 2 3 4
7. There is no one I can turn to	1 2 3 4
8. I am no longer close to anyone	1 2 3 4
9. My interests and ideas are not shared by those around me	1 2 3 4
10. I feel left out	1 2 3 4
11. I feel completely alone	1 2 3 4
12. I am unable to reach out and communicate with those around me	1 2 3 4
13. My social relationships are superficial	1 2 3 4
14. I feel starved for company	1 2 3 4
15. No one really knows me well	1 2 3 4
16. I feel isolated from others	1 2 3 4
17. I am unhappy being so withdrawn	1 2 3 4
18. It is difficult for me to make friends	1 2 3 4
19. I feel shut out and excluded by others	1 2 3 4
20.People are around me but not with me	1 2 3 4

Appendix I

Satisfaction With Life Scale

Below are five statements that you may agree or disagree with. Using the 1-7 scale below, indicate your agreement with each statement. Please be open and honest in your responding.

Agreement

1=Strongly Disagree
2=Disagree
3=Slightly Disagree
4=Neither Agree nor Disagree
5=Slightly Agree
6=Agree
7=Strongly Agree

1. In most ways my life is close to my ideal **A:** 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
2. The conditions of my life are excellent **A:** 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
3. I am satisfied with my life **A:** 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
4. So far I have gotten the important things I want in life **A:** 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
5. If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing **A:** 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Appendix J

Recruitment Email

Greetings!

My name is Marisa Franco and I am a doctoral student in counseling psychology at the University of Maryland. I am conducting a survey examining the experiences of individuals with parents of different racial groups.

The purpose of this research study is to understand experiences of discrimination for individuals who have parents of different racial groups. This study will also examine factors that might protect against discriminatory experiences.

I would appreciate if you could participate and/or forward this study to potential participants.

Participants must have parents of two or more different races, and be over the age of 18.
To participate in the study, please click here: [Insert Link].

Prospective participants who meet these criteria can click on the link provided above and will be directed to two eligibility questions and then the informed consent, which includes additional information on study participation. Participation in the study is expected to take approximately 30 minutes.

Participation is confidential and participants may withdraw from the study at any time. If participants have any questions, they may contact me at mgf269@gmail.com

Thank you.

References

Archer, L. (2012). "Between authenticity and pretension": Parents', pupils' and young professionals' negotiations of minority ethnic middle-class identity. *The Sociological Review, 60,* 129-148. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-954X.2011.02042.x

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

Brackett, K. P., Marcus, A., McKenzie, N. J., Mullins, L. C., Tang, Z., & Allen, A. M. (2006). The effects of Multiracial identification on students' perceptions of racism. *The Social Science Journal*, 43, 437-444. doi:10.1016/j.soscij.2006.04.016

Branscombe, N. R., Ellemers, N., Spears, R., & Doosje, B. (1999). The context and content of social identity threat. In Ellemers, N., Spears, R., and Doosje, B. (Eds.) *Social identity: Context, commitment, content* (pp. 35-58). Oxford, England: Blackwell.

Brittian, A. S., Umaña-Taylor, A. J. & Derlan, C. L. (2013). An examination of Biracial college youths' family ethnic socialization, ethnic identity, and adjustment: Do self-identification labels and university context matter? *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 19,* 177-189. doi: 10.1037/a0029438

Brunsma, D. L., & Rockquemore, K. A., (2001). The new color complex: Appearances and Biracial identity. *Identity: An international journal of theory and research, 3*, 29-52.

Buckley, T. R., & Carter, R. T. (2004). Biracial (Black/White) women: A qualitative study of racial attitudes and beliefs and implications for therapy. *Women & Therapy*, 27, 45–64. doi:10.1300/J015v27n01_04

Campbell, M. E. & Troyer, L. (2007). ''The Implications of Racial Misclassification by Observers.'' *American Sociological Review, 72*, 50–65.

Charmaraman, L., & Grossman, J. M. (2010). Importance of race and ethnicity: An exploration of Asian, Black, Latino, and Multiracial adolescent identity. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 16*, 144-151. doi: 10.1037/a0018668

Charmaraman, L., Woo, M., Quach, A., & Erkut, S. (2014). How have researchers studied multiracial populations? A content and methodological review of 20 years of research. *Cultural Diversity And Ethnic Minority Psychology, 2*0, 336-352. doi:10.1037/a0035437

Chito Childs, E. C. (2002). Families on the color-line: patrolling borders and crossing boundaries. *Race and Society, 5,* 139-161.

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

Collins, J. F. (2000). Biracial Japanese American identity: An evolving process. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology*, *6,* 115–133.

Cramer, K. M., & Barry, J. E. (1999). Conceptualizations and measures of loneliness: A comparison of subscales. *Personality and Individual Differences, 27,* 491-502.

Diener, E., Emmons, A., Larsen, R., & Griffin, S. (1985). The satisfaction with life scale: A measure of life satisfaction. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 49,* 71–75.

Dormann, C. F., Elith, J., Bacher, S., Buchmann, C., Carl, G., Carré, G….Lautenbach, S. (2012). Collinearity: A review of methods to deal with it and a simulation study evaluating their performance. *Ecography, 36,* 27-46. doi: 10.1111/j.1600-0587.2012.07348.x

Durkee, M. I., & Williams, J. L. (2015). Accusations of acting White: Links to Black students' racial identity and mental health. *Journal of Black Psychology, 41,* 26-48. doi: 10.1177/0095798413505323

Erikson, E. (1968). *Identity: Youth and crisis*. New York: Norton.

Field, A. P. (2009). Discovering statistics using SPSS. London, England: SAGE.

Flesch, R. (1948). A new readability yardstick. *Journal Of Applied Psychology*, *32,* 221-233. doi:10.1037/h0057532

Franco, M. G., Katz, R. O'Brien, K. M. (2015). *Forbidden identities: A qualitative examination of racial identity invalidation for Black/White Biracial individuals*. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Giamo, L. S., Schmitt, M. T. & Outten, H. R. (2012). Perceived discrimination, group identification and life satisfaction among Multiracial people: A test of the rejection-identification model. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 18,* 319-328. doi:10.1037/a0029729

Gillem, A. R., & Thompson, C. A. (2004). Introduction: Biracial women in therapy: Between the rock of gender and the hard place of race. *Women & Therapy, 27*, 1-18. doi: 0.1300/J015v27n01_01

Gullickson, A., Morning, A. (2011). Choosing race: Multiracial ancestry and identification. *Social Science Research, 40,* 498-512. doi:10.1016/j.ssresearch.2010.12.010

Harris, C. A. & Khanna, N. (2010). Black is, Black ain't: Biracials, middle-class Blacks, and the social construction of blackness. *Sociological Spectrum*. 30, 639-670.

Harris, D. R., Sim, J. J. (2002). Who is Multiracial? Assessing the complexity of lived race. *American Sociological Review, 67,* 614-627.

Herman, M. (2004). Forced to chose: Some determinants of racial identification among Multiracial adolescents. *Child Development, 75,* 730-748. doi:0009-3920/2004/7503-0006

Herman, M. (2010). Do you see what I am? Observers' backgrounds affect their perceptions of Multiracial faces. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 73*, 58-78. doi:10.1177/01902725103614

Hill, M. E. (2002). Race of the interviewer and perception of skin color; Evidence from the multi-city study or urban inequality. *American Sociological Review, 67,* 99.

Ho, K., Sidanius, D. T., Levin, M. R., & Banaji, M. R. (2011). Evidence for hypodescent and racial hierarchy in the perception of Biracial individuals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 100*, 492-506. doi: 10.1037/a0021562

Hoersting, R. C. & Rae Jenkins, S. (2011). No place to call home: Cultural homelessness, self-esteem and cross-cultural identities. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 35,* 17-30. doi:10.1016/j.ijintrel.2010.11.005

Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling, 6*, 1–55. doi:10.1080/10705519909540118

Jackson, K. F., Yoo, H. C., Guevarra, R., & Harrington, B. A. (2012). Role of identity integration on the relationship between perceived racial discrimination and psychological adjustment of Multiracial people. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 59,* 240-250. doi: 10.1037/a0027639

Kerwin, C., Ponterotto, J. G., Jackson, B. L., & Harris, A. (1993). Racial identity in Biracial children: A qualitative investigation. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 40,* 221 – 231.

Khanna, N. (2004). The role of reflected appraisals in racial identity: The case of

Multiracial Asians. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 67,* 115-131.

Khanna, N. (2010). "If you're half Black, you're just Black": Reflected appraisals and the persistence of the one-drop rule. *The Sociological Quarterly, 51,* 96–121. doi:10.1111/j.1533-8525.2009.01162.x

Khanna, N. (2011). *Biracial in America: Forming and performing racial identity*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Lee, J., Bean, F. D. (2004). America's changing color lines: Immigration, race/ethnicity, and Multiracial identification. *Annual Review of Sociology, 30,* 221-242. doi: 10.1146/annurev.soc.30.012703.110519

Lou, E., Lalonde, R.N., & Wilson, C. (2011). Examining a multidimensional framework of racial identity across different Biracial groups. *Asian American Journal of Psychology, 2*, 79-90. doi: 10.1037/a0023658

Meyer, I. H. (2003). Prejudice, social stress and mental health in lesbian, gay, and bisexual populations: conceptual issues and research evidence. *Psychological Bulletin*, *129,* 674-697. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.129.5.674

Miville, M. L., Constantine, M. G., Baysden, M. F., & So-Lloyd, G. (2005). Chameleon changes: An exploration of racial identity themes of Multiracial people. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *52*, 507-516. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.52.4.507

Nadal, K. L., Sriken, J., Davidoff, K. C., Wong, Y. & McLean, K. (2013), Microaggressions within families: Experiences of Biracial people. *Family Relations, 62,* 190–201. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-3729.2012.00752.x

Nadal, K. L., Wong, Y., Griffin, K., Sriken, J., Vargas, V., Wideman, M., & Kolawole, A. (2011). Microaggressions and the multiracial experience. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences, 1*, 36 – 44.

Nakashima, C. L. (1992). An invisible monster: The creation and denial of mixed-race people in America. In M. P. P. Root (Ed.), *Racially mixed people in America* (pp. 162–178). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Navarrete, V., & Jenkins, S. R., (2011). Cultural homelessness, multiminority status, ethnic identity development and self-esteem. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 35,* 791-804. doi:10.1016/j.ijintrel.2011.04.006

Nishimura, N. (2004). Counseling Biracial women: An intersection of multiculturalism and feminism. *Women & Therapy, 27,* 133-145. doi: 10.1300/J015v27n01_09

Ogbu, J. U. (2004). Collective identity and the burden of 'acting White' in Black history, community, and education. *The Urban Review, 36,* 1-35. doi:10.1023/B:URRE.0000042734.83194.f6

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

Radloff, L. S. (1977). The CES-D Scale: A self-report depression scale for research in the general population. *Journal of Applied Psychological Measures,* 385–401.

Rissanen, T., Viinamaki, H., Lehto, S. M., Hintikka, J., Honkalampi, K., Saharinen, T., & KoivumaaHonkanen, H. (2013). The role of mental health, personality disorders, and childhood adversities in relation to life satisfaction in a sample of general population. *Nordic Journal of Psychiatry, 67,* 109-115. doi:10.3109/08039488.2012.687788

Rockquemore, K. A. (1999). Between Black and White: Understanding the Biracial experience. *Race and Society, 2,* 197-212.

Rockquemore, K. A. (2002). Negotiating the color line: The gendered process of racial identity construction among Black/White Biracials. *Gender & Society 16*, 485-503. doi: 10.1177/0891243202016004005

Rockquemore, K. A., & Brunsma, D. L. (2001). Beyond Black: Biracial identity in America. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

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

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

Rockquemore, K. A., & Laszloffy, T. A. (2003). Multiple realities: A relational narrative approach in therapy with Black-White mixed-race clients. *Family Relations: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Applied Family Studies, 52*, 119-128.doi: 10.1111/j.1741-3729.2003.00119.x

Romo, R. (2011). Between Black and Brown: Blaxican (Black-Mexican) Multiracial identity in California. *Journal of Black Studies, 42,* 402-426. doi:10.1177/0021934710376172

Root, M. P. P. (1998). Experiences and processes affecting racial identity development: Preliminary results from the Biracial sibling project. *Cultural Diversity and Mental Health, 4*, 237–247.

Rosenberg, M. (1979). *Conceiving the self.* New York: Basic Books.

Roth, W. D. (2005). The end of the one-drop rule? Labeling of Multiracial children in Black intermarriages. *Sociological Forum, 20*, 35-67. doi: 10.1007/s11206-005-1897-0

Russell, D. W. (1996). UCLA loneliness scale (version 3): Reliability, validity, and factor structure. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 1,* 20-40.

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

Samuels, G. M. (2009). "Being raised by White people": Navigating racial difference among adopted Multiracial adults. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 71*, 80-94. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-3737.2008.00581.x

Sanchez, D. T. (2010). How do forced-choice dilemmas affect Multiracial people? The role of identity autonomy and public regard in depressive symptoms. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 4*0, 1657-1677.

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

Seaton, E. K., Upton, R., Gilbert, A., & Volpe, V. (2014). A moderated mediation model: Racial discrimination, coping strategies, and racial identity among Black adolescents. *Child Development, 85*, 882-890. doi:10.1111/cdev.12122

Sellers, R. M., Caldwell, C. H., Schmeelk-Cone, K., & Zimmerman, M. A. (2003). The role of racial identity and racial discrimination in the mental health of African American young adults. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 44*, 302–317.

Sellers, R. M., & Shelton, J. N. (2003). The role of racial identity in perceived racial discrimination. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84,* 1079–1092. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.84.5.1079

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

Smith-Bynum, M. A., Lambert, S. F., English, D., & Ialongo, N. S. (2014). Associations between trajectories of perceived racial discrimination and psychological symptoms among African American adolescents. *Development And Psychopathology, 26*, 1049-1065. doi:10.1017/S0954579414000571

Suzuki-Crumly, J., & Hyers, L. L. (2004). The relationship between ethnic identity, psychological well-being, and intergroup competence: An investigation of two biracial groups. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology, 10,* 137–150.

Spencer, M. B., Noll, E., Stoltzful, J. & Harpalani, V. (2001). Identity and school adjustment: Questioning the "Acting White" assumption*, Educational Psychology, 36,* 21-30.

Spruhan, P. (2007). The origins, current status, and future prospects of blood quantum as the definition of membership in the Navajo nation. *Tribal Law Journal, 8,* 1–17.

Standen, B. C. (1996). Without a trace: The biracial Korean/White experience. In M. P. P. Root (Ed.), *The multiracial experience: Racial borders as the new frontier* (pp. 245–262). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Storrs, D. (1999). Whiteness as stigma: Essentialist identity work by mixed race women. *Symbolic Interaction,* 22, 187-212.

Tashiro, C. J. (2002). Considering the significance of ancestry through the prism of the mixed-race identity. *Advances in Nursing Science, 25*, 1-21.

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

U. S. Census Bureau. (2000). Overview of race and Hispanic origin: 2010. Retrieved December 8, 2012, from http://www.census.gov/prod/2001pubs/c2kbr01-1.pdf

Urdy, R. J. Li, R. M., & Hendrickson-Smith, J. (2003). Health and behavior risks of adolescence with mixed-race identity. *American Journal of Public Health, 93,* 1865-1870.

Vanderweele, T. J., Hawkley, L. C., Thisted, R. A., Cacioppo, J. T. (2011). A marginal structural analysis for loneliness: Implications for intervention trial and clinical practice. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 79,* 225-235. doi:10.1037/a0022610

Vivero, V. N., & Jenkins, S. R. (1999). Existential hazards of the multicultural individual: Defining and understanding “cultural homelessness”. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology,* 5, 6-26.