Race-Mixing and Victimization

A Thesis

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

BY

Marie Wu

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS

FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Dr. David Knoke, Advisor

2023

© Marie Wu, 2023

Acknowledgments

Many thanks to my committee members, Chris Uggen, Carolyn Liebler, Steve Ruggles, and David Knoke, for different reasons. This thesis began in Dr. Uggen's Criminology class as a final course project when I was still a graduate student in the history department, before I transferred to sociology. While many historians are leery of quantitative methods, I grew familiar with them as a research assistant to Dr. Liebler that same year. It has been an honor to have Dr. Ruggles, a leading expert on data I used in Chapter 1, for an outside committee member. My advisor, Dr. Knoke, contributed not only his expertise in social network theory to the third chapter, on which we worked closely, but also years of patience and encouragement.

Chen-Yu Wu, my husband and fellow sociologist, has been a sounding board for as long as I have worked on this project.

Becky Drasin, the graduate studies coordinator, kept track of everything I needed to do to finish my degree, when I routinely forgot that there was more to it than writing the thesis.

I am beyond grateful to everyone mentioned here, and to the friends both in and out of the academy who gave me all manner of support along the way.

Dedications

This thesis is dedicated to my children, who made working on it nearly impossible.

Abstract

This thesis employs statistical modeling to answer research questions on the topic of race-mixing (interracial marriage and sex) and crime victimization. First, I used event history analysis of historical data from 1620 through 1959 to examine predictors of the passage of anti-miscegenation laws, with State Identity emerging most consistently as an important factor. Then I used logistic regression of the National Crime Victimization Survey 1992-2019 to test the hypothesis that victims of intimate partner violence (IPV) in mixed-race relationships have a lower risk of reporting their assault to the police compared to victims of IPV in same-race relationships, and found support for it. Finally, I analyzed the data from Wave 1 (1994-1995) of the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent to Adult Health (Add Health), and found support for my hypotheses that mixed-race students are less-centrally located in their social networks than single-race students (though not for all centrality measures), and also at higher risk of victimization, even after controlling for centrality.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter 1. Introduction

When I began working on this project several years ago, there was no particular immediacy to it. History lingers with us, but there is a difference between a living sociolegal phenomenon and one that has been dead for half a century, its metaphorical corpse almost fully decomposed. Legalized state discrimination against mixed-race couples ended in 1967. It was in that year that the U.S. Supreme Court ruled in *Loving v. Virginia* that anti-miscegenation laws are unconstitutional. There was a brief uptick in interest in the topic of anti-miscegenation laws in 2015, after the *Obergefell v. Hodges* decision, which put an end to government officials' discrimination against people in same-sex relationships seeking marriage licenses and legal recognition. The parallels between the two cases were clear. The well-timed movie *Loving*, about Mr. and Mrs. Loving's legal battle with Virginia over their marriage, came out in 2016.

According to 2021 Gallup Poll data, 94% of Americans approve of interracial marriage. It started out at 4% in 1958, when Gallup first asked the question, and has climbed at a steady rate. In 2013, it was still only at 87% (McCarthy 2021). Clearly, there has been a sea change in how Americans feel about mixed-race marriages. We can observe this in the breakdown by age: 97% of adults younger than thirty approve; 94% of adults thirty to fifty approve; and 91% of adults older than fifty approve. Given how many people older than fifty grew up with anti-miscegenation laws in place, and who were raised to take them for granted, this statistic is remarkable. It does reflect, in part, the die-off of archaic views, as those who hold them die in the flesh. But it also reflects individual and societal change.

Also, Mr. and Mrs. Loving were not exactly alone. The year that the Supreme Court ruled in their favor, 3% of newly-married couples were in mixed-race unions (Livingston and Brown 2017). That number would more than double by 1980, to 7%. In that same year, three million

people were in a mixed-race marriage, 3% of *all* married people. By 2015, 17% of newlyweds were racially mixed, as were eleven million total spouses.

Fifty-nine years earlier, in 1966, the year before anti-miscegenation laws became abruptly obsolete, Alfred Avins argued in the *University of Virginia Law Review* that these laws are a "constitutional landmark...ancient and once-respectable, [that] permit[] the states to draw distinctions between the races" (p. 1224). He concluded, "the abiding Constitution of the United States, which I believe will ultimately prevail, makes these anti-miscegenation laws completely valid" (p. 1255). Avins, today, sounds like a pure crank, but he was in fact a law professor, with a J.D. from the University of Chicago and a Ph.D. from the University of Cambridge. His argument was sufficiently acceptable in 1966 for a prestigious law review to publish it, but the ground was sliding out from under racists like him, thanks to the Civil Rights movement. Mixed-race marriage had been such a contentious issue for so long that most Civil Rights leaders, especially white ones, shied away from demanding a repeal of anti-miscegenation laws (Dailey 2020), but others had been calling for it for decades. Still, the rolling tide of equality had come for all explicitly racist laws. As Jim Crow fell, anti-miscegenation laws fell with it, and the only states that still had anti-miscegenation laws left to overturn come 1967 were Jim Crow states: the South, plus Oklahoma and Texas.

What was acceptable in 1966 was less so in 2009, when Keith Bardwell, a Louisiana justice of the peace, resigned after he was slammed with criticism for refusing to issue a marriage license to a mixed-race couple. One of his state's senators called for his dismissal, and the Republican governor thought it right that he should lose his position. The couple had also filed a lawsuit against him, and he became the subject of a U. S. Justice Department investigation. The USJD found that he had turned away four other mixed-race couples. Bardwell

was defiant when he resigned. "'I would probably do the same thing again,'" he declared. "'I found out I can't be a justice of the peace and have a conscience.'" Mary Landrieu, the Democrat senator who had wanted him fired, said, "'Bardwell has finally consented to the will of the vast majority of Louisiana citizens and nearly every governmental official in Louisiana. Bardwell's refusal to issue marriage licenses to interracial couples was out of step with our Louisiana values and reflected terribly on our state. We are better off without him in public service'" (CNN 2009). Interracial marriage had become normalized, but take note of Landrieu's hedging: "'the vast majority'" and "'nearly every'" implied that there were in fact *some* Louisiana citizens, and *some* governmental officials, who agreed with Bardwell.

In June 2022, the U.S. Supreme Court handed down its decision in *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization*. The decision was not about interracial marriage. It was about abortion. The court overturned *Roe v. Wade* and *Planned Parenthood v. Casey*, two cases in which the court had previously held that the Due Process Clause in the Fourteenth Amendment conferred a right to privacy. This right to privacy conveyed the right to abortion access (prior to fetal viability). Pre-*Roe* draconian abortion laws were still on the books in many states, having never been struck out when they became unconstitutional. They were already in place to be enforced, and those states got to work restricting abortion access. If this could happen to *Roe*, then any jurisprudence resting on similar ground was now in danger. This included *Loving v. Virginia*, the ruling for which was based on the Fourteenth Amendment, through the Due Process Clause and the Equal Protection Clause. Will anti-miscegenation laws make a comeback?

The amazing thing about how views of interracial marriage have changed is not that there are holdouts who disapprove in the Gallup Polls, but that there are so *few* holdouts. Laws against race-mixing (interracial marriage and sex) have been a staple of law and society throughout U.S.

history. Chapter 2 will provide a history and analysis of the rise of anti-amalgamation laws (they were not called "anti-miscegenation laws" until the 1860s, as I will discuss at more length in Chapter 2). They have been a part of this country since its days as a British colony, and opposition to race-mixing contributed to segregation and other racially exclusionary policies and practices. This continued into the early days of the United States, through the antebellum and Civil War years, with a brief period of amelioration, especially in the South, during Reconstruction. In the decades after that, anti-black legislation, which came to be called "Jim Crow" laws, escalated, leading W. E. B. Du Bois to declare in 1904 that "the problem of the Twentieth Century is the problem of the color line" (vii).

Jim Crow ushered in not only a reign of terror against black people, but it also expanded the definition of its victim pool to persons with *any* black ancestry. This definition was known as the "One-Drop Rule." With Tennessee as the pioneer in 1910, nearly twenty states, including some outside the South, either passed a one-drop law, or harshened an existing, similar legal definition. These laws applied *all* the rules of segregation to more people, including restrictions on which race groups were closed off to them as sources of marriage partners. What was one drop of blood? It was a one-thirty-second (1/32) connection to a black ancestor, a single black great-great-great-grandparent, although there was some nuance permitted when nonwhite ancestors were nonblack (Garroutte 2003).

According to Dailey (2020), white female purity, that is, pure of virtue and of European lineage, was a personification of the South, in the eyes of white Southerners. A violation of this purity constituted a threat to Southern culture and identity. The white adults screeching at black children at the start of school integration in the 1950s were openly terrified that their daughters would fall in love with black boys if they so much as came into passing contact with them in the

classroom. There was also concern that their white sons would pollute their bloodlines by mixing with black girls, but it was faint. Many white parents were indifferent, or nearly indifferent, to the possibility that their sons might seduce, impregnate, and abandon a black girl. Anti-amalgamation laws, at any rate, would protect them from the moral imperative to welcome her into their family.

The gender differences ran deeper than that, though. In the pre-Jim Crow South, white men who married black women *sometimes* won their court cases when they were charged under anti-amalgamation laws (Pascoe 2010). White men could be trusted to establish their families as they saw fit; white women could not. This relative permissiveness on behalf of white men did not continue indefinitely, yet it emphasizes the particular significance of the White Woman in anti-miscegenation policy-in-practice.

There were of course some states without anti-amalgamation laws, but even there, the color line was carefully policed. Minnesota, for instance, never had an anti-amalgamation law, but if you look through late-nineteenth century Minnesota newspapers, you will find racial-slur laden news stories reporting angrily on perfectly ordinary white women who did nothing more exciting or scandalous than marrying a black man.

What about intermarriage between whites and nonblack nonwhites? This was generally discouraged, but not to the same extent as black/white intermarriage, and not all states with anti-amalgamation laws extended the bans to marriage with nonblack nonwhites. In addition, before the United States was the United States, French and English traders and adventurers entered into marital relationships with Native women. There were no white women as they moved further and further west, and so (for heterosexual men) their choices were to couple with a local woman, or celibacy. Their marriages were outside the church, and outside the laws of their own countries,

making them less “legitimate.” It was standard for European men to leave these wives whenever it was convenient for them, and the marriages were compatible with concurrent marriages to a white woman. Lawrence Taliaferro, who served as Indian Agent at Fort Snelling in the early nineteenth century, was married both to a Dakota woman, The Day Sets, and to Eliza Dillon, a white woman. As Eliza lived at Fort Snelling for several years, she had to have known of The Day Sets, and of Mary, Taliaferro's daughter with her. There were no apparent efforts at concealment. Incidentally, The Day Sets was also mixed-race, as her father, Cloud Man, chief of the Bde Maka Ska village, was the son of a Frenchman.

Scheick (1979) discovered, in his literary analysis, significant regional differences in how nineteenth-century fiction writers treated race-mixing between whites and Natives, and the children of these relationships. The greatest distinction was between Southern and non-Southern authors. Non-Southern authors tended to feel sympathy but ambivalence towards race-mixing with Natives; Southern writers were almost as disgusted by it as they were by black/white mixing. The Massachusetts-born author, William Joseph Snelling, son of Col. Josiah Snelling, the first commandant at Fort Snelling, wrote a novella (“The Bois Brule,” in his story collection *Tales of the Northwest*, first published in 1830) featuring a mixed-race white/Native hero. He pursues an archetypal hero's journey, which culminates in his marriage to a woman who is not only white, but also a member of the British nobility. Her father's opposition to the marriage is treated in the story as exasperating and irrational, as he himself finally admits when he blesses their union. However, our hero has to make sacrifices. His life among his mother's kin is incompatible with the needs of the delicate, ladylike noblewoman. The story ends with them headed together for Britain, implying a complete embrace of her culture, and a farewell to his. To Snelling, their races are compatible but their cultures are not.

As for Asian/white race-mixing, views fluctuated wildly over time, and there were vast differences depending on the Asian ethnicity and the historical context. Teng (2013) notes that, in the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries, intermarriage with whites was more common in New York's Chinatown than same-race, ethnically-Chinese marriages. Going back to the mid-nineteenth century, when Chinese men came to the U.S. as laborers, they intermarried, or at least intermixed, with the women they met there, much as European explorers once had. When the Yale-educated Chinese businessman, Yung Wing, married Mary Louise Kellogg in 1876, the public reaction ranged from strong disapproval to enthusiasm. But that was in Connecticut. Again, there were regional differences at play in perceptions of interracial marriage. In the Western U.S., states were rolling out anti-miscegenation laws that prohibited Asian/white intermarriage. Racists, triggered by immigration from across the Pacific, extended their white-purity anxiety to Japanese and Chinese men, along with black men. How could white men compete in the job market, they complained, when Asian laborers were more attractive workers because they accepted lower wages? And how could white men compete in the marriage market, when they were unemployed, and Asian men were earning a living? (Teng 2013). In the twentieth century, laws against race-mixing were updated to include “Hindoos” (meaning, imprecisely, “people from the Asian subcontinent” or “descendants of people from the Asian subcontinent”) in response to intermarriages between white women and men from India, who had thought that theirs was a same-race marriage as they were categorized as “Caucasian.” During the Great Depression, whites from all socioeconomic classes called for violence against, and exclusion of, Filipinos, who were seen as taking both white men’s jobs and white women’s hearts, and not only were they legally barred from marrying whites, but there was a powerful effort by the U.S. government to encourage them to move back to the Philippines (Takaki 1998).

The Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 had barred Chinese people from naturalization, marking them as perpetual foreigners. In 1907, the Marital Expatriation Act revoked U.S. citizenship from U.S.-born women who married noncitizens, but by law only white people could naturalize. White women who married Chinese men were sometimes classified as "Chinese" themselves, as if the government considered marriage to a Chinese man an erasure of white American female identity. There were no such issues when a white man married a Chinese woman, but that was more rare. The Exclusion Act would not be repealed until 1943.

Returning to the modern day: the former justice of the peace Keith Bardwell insisted that he was not a racist. As proof, he offered: "I do ceremonies for black couples right here in my house.'" If he weren't a racist, then why did he refuse to license black/white marriages? "My main concern is for the children[,]'" Bardwell explained (CNN 2009), fitting himself squarely into a proud tradition of concern-trolling over child welfare as a smokescreen for marriage bigotry. While hardline, hardcore racists wailed about white racial degeneracy, a softer breed of racists wrung their hands and whimpered about how miserable the children would be. In an interview with Associated Press, Bardwell said, "There is a problem with both groups accepting a child from such a marriage," therefore, "…those children suffer, and I won't help put them through it" (NBC News 2009). He was correct that mixed-race children sometimes face rejection from members of their parents' race groups. This is a topic that I will explore at more length in Chapter 4, but the reason for this rejection is bigotry. Bardwell was exercising *preemptive* bigotry in the name of preventing *future* bigotry. In Chapter 3, I will consider implications of societal disapproval of interracial relationships for the people within them.

In another parallel with same-sex marriage issues, homophobic organizations, and U.S. Supreme Court Chief Justice Roberts (who wrote the dissenting opinion in *Obergefell*) attempted

to block marriage equality measures by arguing that same-sex marriage is bad for the children (cf. Southern Poverty Law Center 2015). This line of "reasoning" is similar to Bardwell's, but Bardwell was first of all small fry, and second of all racist, which was unfashionable at that point in time. The main difference between them was that Roberts was engaging in slightly more socially-acceptable bigotry.

As time wore on, homophobia grew less acceptable, too. Same-sex marriage became, in large swaths of the country, as easy to take for granted as interracial marriage. Yet there remains a forceful undercurrent of opposition, most of it coming from white nationalist, fundamentalist Christian organizations, which preach that homosexuality and race-mixing are offenses against God.

Leon M. Bazile was not an unkind man. He was the Virginia circuit court judge on the *Loving* case, in 1965. He gave Mr. and Mrs. Loving the lightest sentence possible. It was not out of hatred, but out of sincere conviction that he repeated an old idea that God had put people of different races on different continents so that they would remain separate. To mix would be to defy God Himself. To Bazile, race-mixing was unnatural and profane. And today, people like Bazile think that same-sex relationships are unnatural and profane as well. Religious officiants can refuse to marry couples when they disagree with an element of their relationship, and parishes can decline to accept them. While this is more common with same-sex marriages than it is with interracial marriages, there are isolated incidents that remind us that prejudice against race-mixing still exists (e.g., Ng 2011). The conviction that any non-blood-related consenting adults may freely enter into marriage with each other has nevertheless gained significant traction in the American consciousness.

Post-*Dobbs*, progressive and moderate congresspeople scrambled to provide federal-level statutory protection for same-sex and interracial marriages. This was a safeguard against the Supreme Court's willingness to overturn Fourteenth Amendment-based decisions. The *Dobbs* decision was handed down on June 24, 2022; the bill for a Respect for Marriage Act to protect marriage equality, which had been kicking around the halls of Congress since 2015, was reintroduced the next month. It was passed by both houses, and signed into law in December of that same year.

There was much rejoicing, but we are not out of the woods yet. Tennessee House Bill 878 is taking aim at marriage protections. If it makes its way into becoming a law, then the same excuses allowed to religious organizations to refuse to marry a couple will be extended in Tennessee to *anybody* in a position to issue a license. It will include government officials (Levey 2023). It is sure to be challenged at the first opportunity, and then the courts will determine its ultimate fate. Depending on the outcome, we could be poised to see a wave of similar laws all across the Southern U.S., and possibly also in the non-Southern states that had previously passed anti-miscegenation laws. It is with no happiness that I say that my research is relevant to our political climate, and to our place in history.

Chapter 2 will use event history analysis of historical data to model the passage of anti-miscegenation laws, conceptualizing these laws themselves as an offense perpetrated by the United States against people in mixed-race relationships. Chapter 3's logistic regression analysis of the 1992-2019 waves of the National Crime Victimization Survey will estimate the risk that a victim of intimate partner violence in a mixed-race relationship (compared to a victim in a same-race relationship) will report the assault to the police. I treat this as a proxy for whether the victim is defensive of the relationship. Chapter 4 relies on social network data from the National

Longitudinal Study of Adolescent to Adult Health, collected in the mid-1990s, to test the hypothesis that mixed-race children were less-centrally located in their social networks than single-race children, and at higher risk of violent victimization.

Chapter 2. The Rise of Anti-Miscegenation Laws

The caste line between whites and Negroes is based upon, and defended by, the anti-amalgamation doctrine.

Gunnar Myrdal 1944:54

Bans on intermarriage were the norm rather than the exception for most states, and most eras, in U.S. history. However, despite the fact that they spanned so much time and territory, and have been the subject of more than one hundred years of academic inquiry, there are as yet no systematic quantitative analyses of these bans. In this chapter, I use discrete-time logistic regression Gompertz models to analyze factors that influence the risk of passage of an anti-amalgamation law in each state and year.

Background and Literature Review

The Rise of Anti-Amalgamation Laws in the British Colonies

In the British colonies of North America that later became the United States, "anti-miscegenation legislation protected business interests and economic advantages of the wealthy class by legislating the boundaries between [poor] whites and non-whites" (Root 2001:112). This was not an invention of that time and place. Prevention of intermarriage as a strategy to impede group alliances that could have posed a threat to the state is a tactic as old as Ancient Rome (Arnold 1893), while the Book of Deuteronomy contains a prohibition on intermarriage between Israelites and their enemies, the seven nations of Canaan (7:1-4). In the New England colonies and the early United States, laws against black/white race-mixing promoted the hoarding of

Anglo-colonial resources in fewer hands: if all the disadvantaged people in the colonies had risen up together regardless of race, then the elite would have stood no chance against them.

The first black/white race-mixing ban in North America was not an original product of New England, but instead of New Netherland, in 1638. It was not until 1662 that Virginia's assemblymen wandered into a similar law when they addressed "doubts [as to] whether children got by any Englishman upon a Negro woman should be slave or ffree…" and those doubts were resolved with the declaration that "all children borne in the country shalbe held bond or free only according to the condition of the mother…" The assemblymen instituted a fine against "any Christian [who] shall commit fornication with a negro man or woman" regardless of slave status, and while "fornication" with a fellow white person was also illegal, the fine was only half the amount of the fine for interracial "fornication." By "Christian," it is obvious from the opposing word "negro" that "European" or "white" was implied, as only a relatively small number of Natives were converts. (Virginia General Assembly 1662:170).

Two years later, north of Virginia, the Maryland General Assembly enacted a law targeting "freeborne English women [who,] forgetfull of their free Condicion and to the disgrace of our Nation doe intermarry with Negro Slaves" by these means: "whatsoever free borne woman shall intermarry with any slave…shall Serve the master of such slave dureing the life of her husband. And that all the Issue of such freeborne woemen soe marryed shall be Slaves as their fathers were." There was no policy in those days against ex post facto laws, and "all the Issues of English or other freeborne women that have already marryed Negroes shall serve the Masters of their Parents till they be Thirty years of age…" (Maryland Assembly 1664:533).

Along came Nell. An Irish servant girl indentured to the third Lord Baltimore, governor of Maryland, Nell fell in love with Charles Butler, an enslaved black man. She was only about

sixteen years old on her wedding day in 1681. Lord Baltimore tried to dissuade her, reminding her of the legal consequences for herself and her children, but Nell chose enslavement with Mr. Butler over freedom without him. Shortly thereafter, under Lord Baltimore's influence, the Maryland assemblymen enacted a new law supposedly to protect white servant women from themselves, as they explained:

> diverse ffreeborne Englishe or White-woman sometimes by the Instigacion Procurement of Conievance of theire Masters Mistresses or dames, & always to the Satisfaccion of their Lascivious & Lustful desires & to the disgrace not only of the English butt also of many other Christian nations, doe Intermarry with Negroes & Slaves… (Maryland Assembly 1681:203).

We see in this tortured sentence a white male anxiety that white women will be irresistibly attracted to black men. The law assessed no penalty to the married couple, only to the white servant woman's "Master Mistress or dame[,]" as the indenture would be forfeited, and the employer would have to pay fine. As for the bride, she would remain a freewoman (and freer than before, without indenture), and her children likewise would be free. Over the century that followed, Mr. and Mrs. Butler's numerous descendants sued for their freedom on the basis of this law. By 1791, they were all free.

Exactly one hundred years earlier, Virginia passed the "Act for Suppressing Outlying [that is, "runaway"] Slaves" (a reaction to the recent Slave Conspiracies, some of which were real, while others were more likely the imagined product of white people's collective nightmares), which enabled persons of "lawfull authority" to hunt down runaway enslaved people and to shoot them to death if they resisted arrest, and required anyone who manumitted enslaved people to have them transported out of the colony within six months or else pay a large

fine. The act contained a provision "for prevention of that abominable mixture and spurious issue which hereafter may increase in this dominion, as well by negroes, mulattoes, and Indians intermarrying with English, or other white women…" The method of prevention was the penalty of exile from the colony: "whatsoever English or other white man or woman being free shall intermarry with a negroe, mulatto, or Indian man or woman bond or free shall within three months after such marriage be banished and removed from this dominion forever…" (Virginia Assembly 1691:86-87).

In addition, the law carried a penalty for white women who gave birth to a black child out of wedlock. The mother would be assessed a hefty fine (£15 sterling, £5 of which would go to the person, if any, who had informed against her), and if she could not pay it within the first month post-partum, then she would be "taken in the possession of the…Church wardens…" for five years. If she were a servant, then, after serving out her indenture to her employer, "she shall be sold by the said Church wardens…for five years" of additional servitude. As for her child, they would be "bound out as a servant by the said Church wardens" until they turned thirty years old (Ibid:87). It was in general a bad time to be the child of unwed parents in Virginia: white "bastards" also were "bound out as servants" by the church, but only until they turned twenty. The 1791 law stole not only the childhoods of black/white people born out of wedlock, but also prime years of their adulthood. Maryland followed the next year with a new, gender-neutral law prohibiting intermarriage and nonmarital co-parenting between white persons and "Negroes or other Slaves" and a sentence of seven years of servitude to the white spouse or parent (Maryland Assembly 1692:546).

Massachusetts was the next domino to fall, banning both black/white marriage and nonmarital coupling in 1705, under penalty of flogging and the exile of the black partner from

the colony. Furthermore, the officiant would be fined the ruinous sum of £50. North Carolina, ten years later, set a £50 fine not only against the officiant of a marriage between a white person and a black or Native person, but also against the white spouse. In that same year, the assembly introduced a law extending by two years the indenture of white female servants who gave birth to children with black or Native fathers. Two years later, South Carolina banned interracial marriage, and three years after that, Delaware did the same, with Pennsylvania following close behind. Georgia's law came in 1750. In addition to preventing the development of kinship relations between the black and white laboring classes, anti-amalgamation laws excluded nonwhites, especially blacks, from the body politic of the burgeoning colonies, which became the United States of America. The Founding Fathers, among them Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Jefferson, were explicit about their vision for this new country as a haven for white people (Takaki 1998).

Race-Mixing Post-Independence

After independence, as the United States sprawled south and west through a series of wars and treaties with both European powers and Native nations (and also naked land theft and wholesale murder in the case of the latter), the new territorial and state legislatures passed laws against interracial coupling. By 1860, a grand total of twenty-nine states had passed some form of prohibition of white/nonwhite marriage or cohabitation. Regardless, interracial sex continued to occur, and countless mixed-race children were born into slavery. During the 1850s alone, there was a sixty-seven percent increase in the mixed-race enslaved population, compared to a mere twenty percent increase among the single-race black enslaved population (Zack 1993). In most cases, their white fathers had raped their mothers. However, consensual black/white

relationships did exist. In the South in the years leading up to the Civil War, laws against intermarriage were inconsistently enforced, and sometimes only for the practical, economic purposes of regulating transmission of property, invoked to deny the children of interracial unions—legally, bastards—the wealth of their parents' estates. According to Domínguez (1986), the hoarding of wealth and property was the intention of some states' intermarriage bans. They were a key method by which "racist institutions…have generated, enhanced and reproduced the mobility or prosperity of white Americans for many generations" (Feagin 2014:66).

Although racism flourished before and during the Civil War as well as after, distinctions based on race were more fluid in the antebellum years, as, "for almost 250 years of slavery, racial difference was driven and determined primarily by status [i.e., enslaved versus free], rather than visible distinction or legal definition" (Holder 2008:153), but anti-amalgamation laws continued to solidify the distinction between whites and blacks in order to concentrate privilege in the hands of the elite (Cox 1948; Domínguez 1986).

Generally, however, blacks, even free blacks, were not on equal terms with whites. So-called "Black Codes," which predated the Civil War, restricted black people's movements, determining where they were allowed to live, which occupations they could take up, and made it harder for them to advance by making it a criminal offense to teach a black person to read or write. There were strict rules about manumission, reminiscent of Virginia's 1691 law, and for a similar reason: first, the successful Haitian revolution at the turn of the nineteenth century, and then Nat Turner's rebellion in August 1831, which combined the forces of both enslaved and free black people, put elite whites in a lather of fear. Throughout the 1830s, the Southern states interfered with the liberties of slaveholders by throwing up legal hurdles to them manumitting

enslaved people, forcing them to get approval from the courts or state legislature. In the decades to follow, Georgia, Mississippi, and Texas made manumission illegal altogether.

Formerly enslaved people who had been either manumitted or who fled their "owners," frequently went North to free states, where they did not always feel so free. They could vote in some Northern states, but not all. In some states they were not permitted to testify in court against white people, or to serve on juries. Several states did not allow black people to reside there without paying an exorbitant bond of $500 or more as a guarantee of good behavior. They were denied service at private businesses and segregated from whites in public spaces. While intermarriage was legal in some Northern states, the limits on interaction between white and black people, to say nothing of the social opprobrium, made it uncommon. It remained a source of fear for whites, and from the 1850s onward, racist, Democrat demogogues reiterated a myth that abolitionist Northern Republicans would not only manumit all enslaved people, but would also enforce race-mixing. In 1858, the Republican Abraham Lincoln sought to reassure voters that he opposed black/white intermarriage as well as allowing black people to serve on juries, vote, or hold public office (Douglas 1991).

Emancipation and White Male Anxiety

In the winter of 1863-64, the word "miscegenation" came into being with a pamphlet titled *Miscegenation: The Theory of the Blending of the Races, Applied to the American White Man and Negro*. Chapters included, "Physiological Equality of the White and Colored Races," "Superiority of Mixed Races," "The Blending of Diverse Bloods essential to American Progress," all of a similar, inflammatory sort. The section "NEW WORDS USED IN THIS BOOK" offered a dictionary definition: "*Miscegenation*—from the Latin *Miscere*, to mix, and

Genus, race, is used to denote the abstract idea of the mixture of two or more races" (ii, *italics* in original). The text prattled on in glowing terms of the joys and virtues of "miscegenation." It was advertised in abolitionist newspapers, and racist politicians railed against the practice of miscegenation. It was one of the greatest hoaxes in the history of the United States. The authors, David Goodman Croly and George Wakeman, were anti-black, Democrat propagandists. The word stuck, and from then on, legal prohibitions on racial intermarriage were dubbed "anti-miscegenation" laws.

After slavery ended in the United States, all of those things that Lincoln had said he opposed, happened. Reconstruction ushered in an era of unforeseen racial equality in the South. Life was still back-breakingly hard for most black people in the former Confederacy, but at the higher levels of society, black men joined white men in the halls of power, and anti-miscegenation laws were in some states repealed by legislatures, in others overturned by state supreme courts, and in others ignored with impunity.

Reconstruction increased the capacity for black men to compete with white men in the job market, allowing, therefore, for an increased ability to compete in the marriage market as well. At the same time, many poor white men struggled financially, which created a disincentive, or at least lowered the incentive, for white women to select white men over black men. In addition, there remained the Southern gentry's need to prevent the unity of "poor white and blacks in a class allegiance" via marriage during an era of intense socioeconomic inequality (Yamin 2012:40).

On Christmas Eve of 1865, less than a year after Robert E. Lee's surrender at Appomattox, six veteran officers of the Confederate Army formed a social club, the Ku Klux Klan. It appears that they started out intending to amuse themselves and nothing more, but it

quickly grew into something dark and scary, "the paramilitary arm of the Democratic party" (Edwards 1997:176). They attacked anyone who extended aid to black people, including white teachers who welcomed black children into their schools. They ran Republican politicians out of entire counties, and unleashed hideous brutality on black people who had done nothing whatsoever besides exist. And that was *during* Reconstruction. Then came the end of Reconstruction, in 1877.

In the absence of any "interfering" Northerner reformers, Southern white elites increasingly introduced new forms of separation between their fellow whites and nonwhites. The white elite had economically stabilized far more easily than poor whites had. The latter group was more likely to have served in the war, not out of a sense of conviction (the troops could not help but feel that they had been drafted to fight a rich man's war, since after all, it was not every white man who could afford to be an enslaver), but because they could not buy their way out of the draft. In battle, they had lost their lives, limbs, sons, brothers, or friends, and they had also lost their livestock and property to confiscation by Union troops and Confederate troops alike. Elite white men suffered a different, pettier blow, one which struck at their egos: "Slavery, which allowed African Americans only limited room to challenge their masters' assertions of authority, [had] lulled slaveholders into thinking that the world actually did revolve around them." Come the end of the war, "[e]mancipation shattered this illusion, providing African Americans with new opportunities to act in their own interests and leaving elite white men feeling displaced" (Ibid:114). The historian Laura F. Edwards argues that wealthy white Southern males perceived a "distorted reality" in which *they* were the ones who were marginalized: "the power they lost loomed much larger in their minds than the power they retained" (Ibid).

There are few things more dangerous than a group that is both powerful and desperate, but the elites had to bide their time. They were initially unappealing to voters, white and black alike. Their major coup was the roll-back of voting rights, which kicked off immediately in Georgia in 1877, with a poll tax. Similar measures sprouted up across the South like mushrooms after the rain. In addition to a poll tax, there were more restrictive residency requirements, which were an additional barrier to poor men who struggled to find stable housing, and literacy tests. The complication with that last one was that, during Reconstruction, black parents had placed great store in education for their children, and when those children reached adulthood, their literacy rate exceeded white people's. No matter: the literacy tests were subjective, and the assessors rejected even well-educated black people. White violence against blacks, in particular by the Klan, also intimidated many eligible black voters and kept them away from the polls. Southern lawmakers also reinstated laws against race-mixing, again blocking marital alliances between blacks and whites.

Meanwhile, all over the country, throughout the Civil War, Reconstruction, and the years to follow, states outside the South had continued to pass anti-amalgamation laws. State legislators came to see it as (or to proclaim that it was) their responsibility to maintain the "racial purity" of their white constituency (Botham 2009). Part of this resulted from what Crawford (2008) calls "dilution anxiety," the fear that the white race would become "diluted" (at the individual level, less physically and mentally capable; at the socio-political level, less powerful) or less strong, as a result of mixing with other races. In addition, Lubin argues that anti-amalgamation laws helped "to assuage white men's historic fear of political collusion between white women and black men" (2005: 138).

There was an additional factor in the South. There, resentment of the federal government was especially potent, from long before the Civil War. And in the West, the frontiersman identity lulled the people of new territories and young states into believing that they did not need the remote politicians in Washington, D.C. to tell them what to do. In both South and West, these mentalities led lawmakers to seize upon those responsibilities, including regulation of marriage, which the United States Constitution devolved to them (cf. Yamin 2012). Anti-amalgamation laws gave state governments an opportunity to flex their power.

As time passed since the war, additional justifications arose for anti-amalgamation laws. In the South, penalties for race-mixing were harsher, and the laws tended to focus on blacks. Other states, especially in the West, had lower penalties, but a broader sweep, banning intermarriage between whites and persons of all other races (as discussed in Chapter 1), and in a few states, intermarriage between members of different nonwhite races were also rendered illegal. Regardless of their relative lack of focus and higher leniency, Millward (2010) argues that the implications of all such laws extended beyond the individual states, and "served as the blueprint for defining national marriage rights, thereby bolstering the process of social othering" (p. 27). Though all states with anti-miscegenation laws barred whites from marrying blacks, and only some prevented them from marrying Asians and Natives, the effect of social exclusion extended nationwide to those latter groups as well (Sohoni 2007).

Animating Fictions

In the words of Pascoe (2010:6), "Miscegenation law was...the foundation for the larger racial projects of white supremacy and white purity." She identified three "animating fictions" which served to justify them. The first of these was Constitutional: "laws punishing both partners

in an interracial relationship were racially equal rather than racially discriminatory" (p. 7). That is to say, a white woman who marries a black man was penalized along with her husband (a typical feature of the later waves of anti-amalgamation laws), and therefore, persons of any race were *equally* restricted. The asymmetry with which the laws were enforced starkly reveals their true intentions: in states where intermarriage between nonwhite races were prohibited, the law was not enforced in those cases with nearly the degree of rigor as were marriages between whites and nonwhites (Harris 1998).

The second fiction was Scientific (or Pseudo-scientific): "racial purity[,]" defined as descent from one race group alone, "could and should be protected" (Pascoe 2010:7). This conviction soared in popularity in the early twentieth century under the influence of what modern race scholars term "scientific racism." Lubin explains that, "under scientific racism, mixed-race progeny were understood to be degenerate" (2005:70). This was not an entirely new idea at the time. As early as the sixteenth century, the term "mulatto" was used to describe the offspring of a black parent and a white parent, as the word derived from the Spanish word for "mule" (mulato) and mixed-race persons were believed, like mules, to be sterile. The sociologist Gunnar Myrdal, writing of racism in the U.S. in 1944, noted, "Sometimes the view is expressed that the offspring of crossbreeding is inferior to both parental stocks. Usually it is only asserted that it is inferior to the 'pure' white stock" (54). Scientific racism had its heyday in the first decades of the twentieth century, as the Eugenics Movement's concern for degeneration "led scientists and social reformers to fear that interracial intimacy would lead to 'race suicide'" (Pascoe 2010:70), breeding a race of inferior, sickly humans (Yamin 2012). And in fact, anti-miscegenation laws continued to build force in both numbers and higher sentences for violation during this time.

The third fiction Pascoe identified is more ineffable: “the popular notion that race actually existed, that it was a thing that could be measured, determined, gotten to the truth of” (p.8). This was widely accepted by social scientists as well as the average American, and had a substantial impact on the harshening and broadening of anti-miscegenation laws.

There was a fourth motivating, and non-fictional, factor, which, Kitch (2009) theorizes, is the most important of them all: “The ultimate purpose of post-war anti-miscegenation laws across the board was to restrict the privileges of white racial blood exclusively to the progeny of white men and white women” (p.144). Writing in 1948, Cox explained, “In reality, both the Negroes and their white exploiters know that economic opportunity comes first and that the white woman comes second; indeed, she is merely a significant instrument in limiting the first” (526-7).

The Real Danger of Race-Mixing

There are so many examples throughout U.S. history of white men viciously assaulting black men and boys because they had had sexual contact with a white woman, or merely were accused of having sexual contact with a white woman, or were suspected of wanting or attempting to have sexual contact with a white woman, that the historian struggles to choose among them for an illustration. There was Coleman Thomas, whose corpse was found with his throat slit in 1866 in Salt Lake City for walking with a white woman; Elias Clayton, Elmer Jackson, and Isaac McGhie, who were beaten by a mob and hanged from a light pole in 1920 in Duluth because a white teenager had accused them of rape; Emmet Till, the fourteen-year-old who was sadistically tortured and killed by two white men in 1955 in Money, Mississippi, all because a white woman had said he’d wolf-whistled at her, and perhaps thousands more. Race

riots triggered by white men's sexual paranoia were a grisly feature of life under Jim Crow, and led to deaths or injuries not only of the accused black men, but also of uninvolved black people. The mobs were comprised mostly of poor white men, but elite white men were among them, and instigated them. Southern politicians in Congress protected the (white) folks back home by blocking federal anti-lynching bills under the guise of states' rights (Cox 1948).

It wasn't only black men who risked violence if they had relationships with white women. Chinese laundrymen in the 1930s knew that their white female customers were a similar social class to them, and yet, "they had to keep socially distant from white women or else they would be run out of town" (Takaki 1997:243). White men in the 1920s and 1930s, frightened that Filipinos would take their jobs and their women, lashed out as individuals and as mobs. A white riot erupted in Watsonville, California, in December 1929, after Perfecto Bandalan, who had been arrested for sleeping in the same room in a boarding house as a white girl, was released after the girl's mother explained to the police that he was her daughter's fiancé. Four hundred white men unleashed their fury on a Filipino dance hall, and they kept up their brutality for four whole days, beating untold numbers of Filipino victims and shooting one to death; more than twenty others nearly died of their injuries. The white impulse to riot spread throughout California. In Stockton, someone blew up a Filipino club. In the years that followed, white men's jealousy towards Filipinos did not dissipate, and in 1934, the state's anti-miscegenation law was amended to include them in the category of races who were not allowed to intermarry with whites. Laws against race-mixing, no matter which races were chosen for exclusion, illustrated Coskun (2007)'s insight that "Through law we give expression to our moral standards, and as such law reflects the law that is in the minds of people" (p.21).

Prior Studies on Racism Enshrined in Law

From their study of felon disenfranchisement laws from 1850 to 2002, Behrens, Uggen, and Manza (2003) discovered that unabashed desire to exclude blacks from the electorate often motivated state legislators. Burkhardt (2011) tested the effect that the black:white ratio in state prison would have on whether a state would pass felon disenfranchisement laws, with the assumption that a greater ratio of blacks to whites would lead to an increased likelihood of passage. He found that the black:white ratio in prison does not influence whether a state would pass re-enfranchisement laws, which on the surface pushes against the assertion that felon disenfranchisement laws are racially motivated. Chiricos et al. (2012) tested the effect of the *assumption* that the prison population is mostly nonwhite—not the true ratio—on the tendency among citizens to support felon re-enfranchisement laws. They found that "...the perceived involvement of blacks in several crimes—the racial typification of crime" predicts opposition to re-enfranchisement laws "independent of the effects of general punitiveness, conservatism, and other predictors" (p.13). Chiricos et al.'s findings suggest that, even in the twenty-first century, race can play a powerful role in legislation.

Jacobs and Tope (2007) found that politicians' support for liberal policies, which generally benefit nonwhites more than conservative policies would, rises and falls with the racial composition of their electorates. The researchers found an inverse parabola of support for liberalism: as the black and Hispanic populations rose to moderate levels, support for liberalism decreased, while significantly larger nonwhite populations lead to an increase in support. In short, legislators often respond to their white constituents' anxiety about increasing numbers of nonwhites by establishing a "conservative" voting record. Then, if the electorate *becomes* majority nonwhite, these legislators adjust their voting patterns (this cannot be explained away as

a mere increase in liberal politicians, as Jacobs and Tope controlled for that in their model). This underscores the importance of Chiricos et al.'s findings regarding voters' perceptions, by indicating the influence of the electorate on legislation. These studies suggest a direction in which scholarship on anti-amalgamation laws could go.

Hypotheses

I developed three hypotheses regarding state-level factors that could influence the passage of anti-amalgamation laws.

State Identity Hypothesis

Yamin (2012) noted that some states used anti-miscegenation laws as a deliberate expression of states' rights, and so I hypothesize that anti-miscegenation laws may be entwined with self-concept at the state level.

> ***H1:*** *If a state passes an anti-amalgamation law, it will be most likely to happen within the first generation of achieving statehood.*

Racial Threat Hypothesis

Jacobs and Tope (2007) found that initial increases in the nonwhite population correspond to an increased chance of what is essentially racist legislation. The theory is that a larger nonwhite population triggers a perceived racial threat.

> ***H2:*** *Factors that induce in white males a sense of threat—higher percent black, lower percent white—will lead to a greater risk of passing anti-amalgamation laws.*

State Characteristics Hypothesis

States with an economy based on slavery, which were primarily in the South, had an extra incentive to prevent interracial alliances between blacks and poor whites; in addition, the labor conditions of the Western states influenced the level of support for anti-amalgamation bans.

H3: *Having ever permitted slavery, and also Southern or Western region, impact the risk of passage of anti-amalgamation laws.*

Methods

Modeling strategy

Using STATA 17.0, I employed discrete-time (event history) logistic regression Gompertz models to predict passage of states' first enacted anti-amalgamation laws (this excludes re-enacted laws after a repeal). This allowed me to capture time-varying effects of independent variables by modeling censored cases and time-varying predictors. Behrens et al. (2003) used this strategy to model passage of felon disenfranchisement laws. I tested each hypothesis in a separate model, and then combined the significant variables from all previous models in the final "trimmed" model.

Variables

Dependent variable: Timing of first laws

My population is the forty-eight contiguous United States. Hawai'i and Alaska are excluded from this analysis because, while not necessarily bastions of anti-racism, neither state had a political or cultural climate conducive to anti-miscegenation laws. Only nine states out of fifty have *never* banned interracial marriage: Alaska, Connecticut, Hawai'i, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Vermont, and Wisconsin. The models will treat the states that never had anti-amalgamation laws as right-censored, that is, at-risk for the entire observation period, from 1620, the year of the signing of the Mayflower Compact, to 1959. As discussed in Chapter 1, the Civil Rights movement had pressed so hard by the 1960s on overtly racist laws that most states had begun to shed them, and there was no risk that states that had not yet passed an anti-amalgamation law would do so after the 1950s.

I compiled a dataset of states' first anti-amalgamation laws from the list found in "Appendix B: Prohibitions of Interracial Marriage and Cohabitation" found in Sollors (1997:395-410)'s book. A state enters the risk pool upon establishment of a legislature, even if it has not yet become a state. For reference, Table 2.1 presents the timing for the establishment of legislature, statehood, and whether each state ever allowed slavery.

Table 2.1. Year of Establishment, Statehood, and Slavery

State	Establishment of Legislature	Year of Statehood	Ever a Slave State
Alabama	1817	1819	Yes
Alaska	*1884*	*1959*	*No*
Arizona	1861	1912	No
Arkansas	1819	1836	Yes
California	1848	1850	No

Colorado	1861	1876	No
Connecticut	1636	1788	Yes
Delaware	1704	1787	Yes
Florida	1822	1845	Yes
Georgia	1733	1788	Yes
Hawai'i	*1898*	*1959*	*No*
Idaho	1863	1890	No
Illinois	1809	1818	No
Indiana	1800	1816	No
Iowa	1838	1846	No
Kansas	1854	1861	No
Kentucky	1792	1792	Yes
Louisiana	1803	1812	Yes
Maine	1820	1820	No
Maryland	1634	1788	Yes
Massachusetts	1620	1788	Yes
Michigan	1812	1837	No
Minnesota	1849	1858	No
Mississippi	1798	1817	Yes
Missouri	1812	1821	Yes
Montana	1864	1889	No
Nebraska	1854	1867	No
Nevada	1861	1864	No
New Hampshire	1679	1788	Yes
New Jersey	1664	1787	Yes
New Mexico	1850	1912	No
New York	1664	1788	Yes
North Carolina	1691	1789	Yes
North Dakota	1889	1889	No
Ohio	1803	1803	No
Oklahoma	1890	1907	No
Oregon	1843	1859	No
Pennsylvania	1681	1787	Yes
Rhode Island	1644	1790	Yes
South Carolina	1719	1788	Yes
South Dakota	1889	1889	No
Tennessee	1790	1796	Yes
Texas	1836	1845	Yes
Utah	1850	1896	No
Vermont	1777	1791	No
Virginia	1619	1788	Yes
Washington	1853	1889	Yes
West Virginia	1861	1863	Yes
Wisconsin	1836	1848	No

Wyoming	1869	1890	No

In Table 2.2, I show the eras in which states passed their first anti-miscegenation laws.

Table 2.2. Passage of First Anti-Amalgamation Laws by Era

Era	States that Passed Anti-Miscegenation Law
Colonial (1620-1776)	Delaware, Georgia, Maryland, Massachusetts, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Virginia
Early U.S. (1777-1831)	Alabama, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Maine, Mississippi, Rhode Island, Tennessee
Antebellum (1832-1860)	Arkansas, California, Florida, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Missouri, Nebraska, New Mexico, Texas, Utah, Washington
Civil War through Reconstruction (1861-1877)	Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Nevada, Ohio, Oregon, West Virginia
Jim Crow (1878-1950s)	Montana, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Wyoming
Never	*Alaska*, Connecticut, *Hawai'i*, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Vermont, Wisconsin

Independent variables

For the *state identity hypothesis,* I created a dummy variable that indicates whether a state was in its first generation, that is, whether twenty or fewer years had passed since statehood (0 is "more than 20 years since statehood," and the variable is coded as missing data for the years prior to statehood). I added a control variable for "First Generation from Establishment of Legislature," (similar to the statehood variable, 0 is "more than 20 years since establishment of

legislature," and it is considered missing data before establishment), which preceded statehood (in colonial or territorial governments), to help determine whether statehood is what matters, or if anti-amalgamation laws were treated as a default. For the *racial threat hypothesis*, I calculated the percent black and percent white for each state by decade, based on the census figures from the first year of that decade, starting from 1790. Therefore, the percent black and percent nonwhite from 1790 are applied to 1791, 1792, 1793, all the way to 1799, and the numbers from 1800 are applied to 1800, 1801, 1802, and so on. The racial categories changed from one era to the next, but it is still possible to track changes over time. For example, in 1900, enumerators coded all respondents of visible black heritage as "black," but in 1910, enumerators recorded mixed-race black/white respondents as "Mulatto." For consistency, I coded black-white mixed-race persons as "black," because, in the years without a Mulatto category, that is how enumerators most likely would have listed them. The census administrators had some difficulty with data collection in the Southern states for the 1870 census, and the counts are "incomplete" (U.S. Census Bureau 1930:12-13), so I coded the race variables as "missing" for that decade.

For *state characteristics*, I have a dummy variable for "Ever a Slave State" and a dummy variable for "South and West" (1 is "Southern and Western States; 0 is "Midwestern and Northeastern States").

There are two sets of models. In the first, all predictors are run with a Linear Year variable; in the second, time is measured with Era dummy variables taken from the categories in Table 2.2: "Colonial," "Early United States," "Antebellum," "Civil War through Reconstruction," with "Jim Crow" omitted. Because race data was not available until the 1790 census, "Colonial" is not included in the *Racial Threat* model, and there are fewer subjects (states) and failures (passage of first anti-amalgamation law) compared to the other models.

Results

I began with bivariate analyses of predictors, shown in Table 2.3. I ran two sets of models for this also, one with Linear Year in addition to the predictor, and the other with Era variables.

Table 2.3. Bivariate Analyses of First Anti-Amalgamation Law (Discrete-Time Logistic Regression)

Variable	Linear Year	Era	Subjects	Failures
Within First Generation of Establishment of Legislature	.93**	.38	48	41
Within First Generation of Statehood	3.91***	2.78***	48	41
Percent Black	.50	5.91***	31	24
Percent White	-.58	-6.44***	31	24
Ever a Slave State	.02	.49	48	41
West or South	1.26***	1.07***	48	41
Era Only (Jim Crow omitted)			48	41
Colonial	--	1.00		
Early	--	1.17		
Antebellum	--	1.89***		
Civil War through Reconstruction	--	2.20***		
Linear Year Only	-.34	--	48	41

* $P < .10$.
** $P < .05$.
*** $P < .01$.

The complete models follow in Tables 2.4 and 2.5. In both the Linear Year model set in Table 2.4 and the Eras model set in Table 2.5, we see support for the State Identity Hypothesis. "Within First Generation of Statehood" is significant in both Model 1 and the Trimmed Model, as is "Within First Generation of Establishment of Legislature," but the former is positive and the latter is negative. In other words, territories and colonies were at decreased risk of passing an anti-amalgamation law within the first twenty years of their creation, while the twenty years after statehood are at greater risk. The Era Models in Table 2.5 reveal a similar pattern, except that "Within First Generation of Establishment of Legislature" is not significant in the Trimmed

Model. "First Generation of Statehood" is the only variable that is significant in the Trimmed Model of *both* the Era variables set and the Linear Year set.

Table 2.4. Complete Models Predicting First Anti-Amalgamation Law, Linear Year (Discrete-Time Logistic Regression)

	1	2	3	4
Variable	State Identity	Racial Threat	State Characteristics	Trimmed Model
Within First Generation of Establishment of Legislature	-0.68*			-1.07***
Within First Generation of Statehood	3.45***			3.39***
Percent Black		-1.25		
Percent White		-1.74		
Ever a Slave State			.46	
West and South			1.35***	.56
Year	-.34	-.36	-.34	-.34
Constant	-38.48***	15.33	-28.89***	-36.82***
Log Likelihood	78.10	66.17	69.66	80.83
LR Chi-square	48.10	10.62	31.23	53.57
Observations	10,727	1,424	10,727	10,727
Subjects	48	31	48	48
Failures	41	24	41	41

* $P < .10$.
** $P < .05$.
*** $P < .01$.

Neither "Percent Black" nor "Percent White" are significant in Model 2 of Table 2.4. However, "Percent White" is significant and negative in Model 2 of Table 2.5. This provides partial support for the Racial Threat Hypothesis. While the percentage of a state's black population does not impact risk according to these models, the Percent White does: a lower percent corresponds to a higher risk of an anti-amalgamation law. It is not significant in the Trimmed Model.

The models also partially support the State Characteristics Hypothesis. "Ever a Slave State" is significant in Model 3 of the Era variables set, but not in the Linear Year set. In the Era set, it is not significant in the Trimmed Model. As for "West and South," it is significant in Model 4 of both sets; as for the Trimmed Model, it is only significant in the Era set, not Linear Year.

Table 2.5. Complete Models Predicting First Anti-Amalgamation Law, Era Variables (Discrete-Time Logistic Regression)

	1	2	3	4
Variable	State Identity	Racial Threat	State Characteristics	Trimmed Model
Within First Generation of Establishment of Legislature	-1.11***			-.10
Within First Generation of Statehood	3.50***			1.83*
Percent Black		-6.78		
Percent White		-12.49***		-3.56
Ever a Slave State			.71**	-.90
South or West			1.23**	1.41**
Era (Jim Crow omitted)				
Colonial	.11	--	.54	--
Early	.18	.32	.71	1.45
Antebellum	1.10*	1.32	1.54**	1.85
Civil War through Reconstruction	1.43**	2.24**	2.04***	2.51**
Constant	-37.12***	17.75	-34.26***	-19.24
Log Likelihood	77.50	71.70	71.51	87.33
LR Chi-square	46.51	21.24	34.54	52.50
Observations	10,696	1,414	10,695	1,414
Subjects	48	31	48	31
Failures	41	24	41	24

* $P < .10$.
** $P < .05$.
*** $P < .01$.

Directions for Future Research

The results of this project underscore the significance of state identity and region for the passage of laws against race-mixing, and suggest the importance of racial threat as well. Future research could probe this further by investigating the impact of white men's economic conditions on passage of anti-amalgamation laws. For example, models could include variables for their employment rate or occupational prestige, or use a more sophisticated measure such as the socioeconomic index (SEI), which ranks occupation based on earnings and required education, allowing for an analysis of Average White Male SEI, Average Black Male SEI, or a ratio Average White Male SEI:Average Nonwhite Male SEI (or Average White Male SEI:Average Black Male SEI) at the state-year level.

Given that this project highlights the importance of the first generation of statehood, analyses can start from that point, by focusing on those years for each state. Another element deserving of attention is the different types of anti-amalgamation laws. What was going on in the world, the country, or the state that led to them being made harsher, with more extreme penalties? Breaking down the analysis to focus on region could allow researchers to answer questions like: What was the threshold of nonwhites that would trigger a sense of racial threat or economic competition, and inspire a Western state to amend an anti-amalgamation law to include more races with whom whites were no longer allowed to intermarry? Furthermore, what is the gender story? Does white women's employment rate play a role, by making white men feel inferior as providers? Addressing these points will help us to gain a better understanding, a cross-state, cross-time view, of the circumstances that can increase the risk not only of anti-miscegenation laws, but also racially oppressive legislation in general.

Chapter 3. Race-Mixing and Police Reports of Intimate Partner Violence

While societal acceptance of interracial marriage and dating had increased by the 1990s, and continued to rise through the next two decades, lingering hostility remained. The individuals in these marriages were aware of it, and more defensive of their union as a result. This chapter investigates the possibility that this defensiveness could decrease help-seeking behavior for victims of intimate partner violence (IPV) in interracial relationships. I use logistic regression analysis of National Crime Victimization Survey data (1992-2019) to test the hypothesis that IPV victims whose race differs from their assailant are at lower risk of reporting the incident to police than IPV victims whose race matches their assailant.

Literature Review

This chapter begins with a section on terminology, as several terms are employed, overlapping in concept, though not interchangeable with, "intimate partner violence." The subsequent section reviews the empirical literature surrounding race and intimate partner violence, to show what evidence has been found on the link or lack thereof, between race—either of the offender or of the victim—and intimate partner violence. There follows a discussion on the literature surrounding police notification of IPV incidents, and the arrest of IPV offenders.

Terminology

Scholars, advocates, and jurists have employed various terms to refer to abuse of a partner. In Minnesota, it is included in "domestic abuse," defined as acts committed against a member of the offender's family or household, and which may consist of physical harm, injury, or assault; the infliction of fear via threat of harm; "terroristic threats;" criminal sexual conduct;

or interference with an emergency call. Minnesota's Domestic Abuse Act defines "family or household members" as spouses and former spouses; parents and children; blood relations; persons who co-reside or who have ever co-resided; parents of a child in common; "a man and woman if the woman is pregnant and the man is alleged to be the father;" and "persons involved in a significant romantic or sexual relationship" (Minn. Stat. 2014). There is variation in wording from one state to the next, but the import of the legislation is similar.

Domestic abuse, sometimes also referred to as "domestic violence," (including in some other states' statutes) technically includes violence against *all* adult family members. However, many scholars, especially in the seventies through the nineties, primarily used it to refer to violence committed against sex partners. The term "spousal abuse" or "spousal violence" applies to domestic violence committed against spouses, excluding other relationships, familial or otherwise. "Intimate partner violence" encompasses all forms of "intimate" relationships, including those which are not actually sexual (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention 2014), such as casual dating relationships. Intimate partner violence became the preferred term of scholars in this field in recent decades, as it encompassed same-sex couples in the years before marriage was an option for them (who would have been excluded from "spousal violence"), as well as heterosexual couples in casual or cohabiting relationships. Both of these populations are increasing—or at least self-reporting—at a higher rate than ever in U.S. history (U.S. Bureau of the Census 1970; 1980; 1990; 2000; 2005).

Both in the Untied States and abroad, there has arisen an admirable advocacy movement for people who have suffered violence, especially sexual violence and intimate partner violence. One of the goals of the movement is to replace pity with respect, and to insist on calling abuse sufferers "survivors" instead of "victims," the former implying strength and the latter passivity.

My use of the latter term throughout this chapter must be understood as a technical term, contrasting it with "offender." It is not intended as a slight against survivors, and where it is clear in the literature that "survivor" is the best word, I use that instead.

Race and Intimate Partner Violence

Group differences in risk of intimate partner violence

The role that race plays in intimate partner violence is poorly understood, and overstated. There are other factors that contribute to the risk of intimate partner violence, many of which are economic in nature. Race and ethnicity are often conflated in the data with class, and so multivariate analyses are needed to control for spurious associations with race/ethnicity. At the contextual level of analysis, neighborhood disadvantage increases the risk of intimate partner violence (Wright and Benson 2011), while a larger number of police officers per capita decreases risk (Xie, Lauritsen, and Heimer 2012). In addition, witnessing community violence, which is more common in lower-income communities, increases the likelihood of a person committing intimate partner violence (Raghavan et al. 2009). Cho (2012) found that employment and education level do not affect victimization risk for women who are married or cohabiting, but financial security lowers victimization risk. Controlling for age, race, financial security, employment, education, and social network membership, he determined that age is the best predictor of intimate partner violence, and that older men are less likely than younger men to engage in it. This finding is in keeping with other research on violent behavior and age: violent behavior tends to decrease as a person ages. However, Johnson et al. (2015) found that women are *more* likely to commit intimate partner violence as their age increases.

Cho (2012) also suggested that the controls for social class and immigration status are

most important for reducing, even eliminating, racial differences in the data. He found that blacks are at highest risk for intimate partner violence victimization, followed by whites and Latinas, while Asians have the lowest risk. Upon introducing controls, race was *not a significant predictor* of intimate partner violence. Furthermore, Benson, Wooldrege, Thistlethwaite and Fox (2004) found that the correlation between race and domestic violence is reduced or disappears when controlling for neighborhood level of concentrated disadvantage (measured in percentiles). In addition, individual-level risk factors for domestic violence operate similarly for African-Americans and whites. Rennison and Planty (2003) likewise found that while bivariate analysis generates evidence of a significant relationship between race and rates of intimate partner violence, controls for victim's gender and annual household income rendered the race effect insignificant.

Cazenave and Straus' (1979) analysis, controlling for income, showed that blacks had lower rates of spousal violence than whites, with the exception of the income category $6,000-$11,999 (hovering around the poverty line in 1979, depending on family size), in which blacks had a higher level of spousal violence. Field and Caetano (2004)'s review of the literature, which included studies relying on both cross-sectional and longitudinal data, concluded that controlling for alcohol use and socioeconomic status diminishes racial and ethnic differences in intimate partner violence, but black couples still remain at greater risk than white or Hispanic couples. These findings are not incompatible, as Cazenave and Straus identified a connection between a specific income bracket and race for increased risk for blacks, and studies that did not have a similar measure would not have observed that nuance.

Race group differences among members of couples that experience intimate partner violence

There is another branch of closely-related literature on the differences in patterns of intimate partner violence among different race groups. These studies move away from determining which race group exhibits the highest level of violence, and instead focus on how victims or assailants of different race groups differ in other ways as well. Grossman and Lundy (2007) observed that Asian-American victims of intimate partner violence are almost exclusively female and older, more likely than other victims to be married, and usually victimized by current or former husbands. Black victims of intimate partner violence are more likely than victims of other races to have never been married. The same study also found that the rates of different forms of abuse (emotional, physical, or sexual) did not vary much from one racial group to the next.

Lipsky et al. (2012) had a conflicting finding. Their analysis suggested that, among intimate partner violence offenders, white men are more likely than black and Hispanic men to commit sexual violence, but less likely to commit severe physical violence. Both studies relied on a high number of cases, as Grossman and Lundy had 100,020 while Lipsky et al. had 4,470. Though Grossman and Lundy's population is larger, it is unlikely that the difference can be explained away as a "small N problem." Their samples are very different. Grossman and Lundy rely on client data, provided by victims of IPV and their caseworkers, while Lipsky et al.'s sample is IPV assailants. It is possible that this difference in population sample drives the conflict in results.

Pearlman et al. (2003)'a study found that, "across all levels of neighborhood poverty...the risk of police-reported domestic violence was higher for Hispanic and black women than for

white women" (p. 44). As with Grossman and Lundy, and Lipsky et al., Pearlman et al. have a large sample. They analyzed 14,700 incidents of police-reported domestic violence in Rhode Island for the years 1996 to 1998. Their data may be more representative of Rhode Island than the United States in general.

Lacey, Saunders, and Zhang (2011) found that the most important factors for making the decision to leave an abusive partner included threat with a weapon, which led victims to fear escalation, and being unmarried, which meant that, formally unattached to their abuser, it was easier for victims to extricate themselves. However, when women left, they usually returned to their abusive partner within a month. Nonwhite women with a higher socioeconomic status were less likely to leave abusive relationships than non-Hispanic white women of the same socioeconomic stratum, and non-Hispanic white women were especially likely to leave if they had been with their partner for fewer than five years and had children in the home.

Group Differences in Reporting Intimate Partner Violence to the Police

Non-race differences in reporting

A variety of factors impact the risk of reporting intimate partner violence to the police. Bosick et al. (2012) found that older victims are more likely than younger victims to report assaults to the police. Felson and Paré's research, published in 2005, suggested that this is not driven by cohort effect, because patterns of IPV victim's police-reporting behavior had not changed in the past forty years, holding steady since the 1960s. These patterns include: victims are as likely to report domestic violence as they are to report assaults by other offenders; male victims are more reluctant than female victims to report domestic violence; third parties are unlikely to report assaults of all kinds; and sexual assaults are less likely than physical assaults to

be reported. Weiss (2010) concluded, based on her content analysis of the narratives of crime victims, that shame could prevent victims of sexual assault from reporting.

While shame can play *some* role in the decision to refrain from reporting, Chen and Ullman (2010) found, from the National Violence Against Women Survey, that victims of sexual assault and victims of other forms of physical assault exhibit similar police-reporting patterns. In addition, Fleury et al. (1998)'s analysis indicated that considerations such as shame and embarrassment are rarely the only reason that a woman chooses not to report an assault to the police. Far more common reasons were: being physically prevented by an assailant from reaching a phone, or threats of escalated violence. In addition, "underreporting was related to previous (negative) experience with the police" (333). Uggen and Hlavka (2008) found that victims of sexual assault could be deterred from reporting on account of the stigma that might fall upon their assailants, who are often members of their own family. One finding that is not in dispute is that severity of the assault, regardless of type, plays a role in the reporting decision, and victims who sustained an injury are more likely to turn to the police (cf. Bachman and Coker 1995). An IPV offender having a drinking problem also increases the chance of reporting (Bonomi et al. 2006).

Personal history matters as well. Buzawa, Hotaling, and Byrne (2007) found that prior victimization, even in childhood, decreases the likelihood of an adult reporting current victimization to the police. Wolf et al. (2003) found that situational and personal factors impacted victims' decision to refrain from reporting, but the practical fear of repercussions from the assailant had an effect as well. Psychological and pragmatic reasons aside, external context matters. Sulak, Saxon, and Fearon (2014)'s survey of 891 adolescents suggested that "social norms and attitudes were predictive of… reporting behavior" (165) for victims of intimate

partner violence.

Race differences in reporting

Race appears to affect the risk of reporting intimate partner violence to the police. Bachman and Coker (1995) discovered that black women who are victims of intimate partner violence are more likely than nonblacks to report the incident to the police. Ackerman and Love (2014) found that nonwhites and Hispanics in general are more likely than non-Hispanic whites to call the police to report intimate partner violence. Socioeconomic differences explained some, but not all, of this difference in the likelihood of reporting. Akers and Kaukinen (2009) had some similar, and some conflicting, findings: the chance of reporting intimate partner violence to the police increased in the case of *visibly* nonwhite victims, but, in contrast with Ackerman and Love (2014), their data showed that income, education, and employment status did not influence reporting. Akers and Kaukinen had a larger sample, 25,876, compared to Ackerman and Love's 341, but that does not make Akers and Kaukinen's findings cancel out Ackerman and Love's. Akers and Kaukinen used data from the Canadian General Social Survey (CGSS), while Ackerman and Love used the United States' National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS). The NCVS is a more sensitive instrument for measuring crime incidents, as well as their effects and the reactions of victims, because, unlike the CGSS, that is its sole focus. In addition, though no one could argue against the similarities between the United States and Canada, they are not identical. Most likely, Ackerman and Love's finding represents the situation in the United States.

Lipsky et al. (2006) found that, while black women IPV victims at an urban emergency room in the United States were more likely than Hispanic women to turn to the police, they were not more likely to do so than were white women. While this appears to present a conflict with

Ackerman and Love's finding, it could be explained by potential differences in the clinical population, compared to the victims surveyed by NCVS, many of whom were not abused with enough severity to need medical attention. Also, Lipsky et al. rely on data from a single emergency room, and Ackerman and Love's data are nationally representative. Thus, Ackerman and Love's conflicting finding is again more likely to reflect the United States' broader victim population.

Couples' race and arrest patterns

Bachman and Coker (1995) found that black intimate partner violence offenders with black victims were more likely to be arrested. This is somewhat surprising, as Feder (1996) learned, in the course of reviewing 189 calls to the police in a Florida jurisdiction, that an offender's presence at the time of police arrival is the strongest predictor of arrest, and, as already stated, Grossman and Lundy (2007) found that black intimate partner violence victims are more likely than other victims to have never been married. Presumably, if they are not married to their partners, then there is an (at least somewhat) higher likelihood that they do not live with them, and therefore it should be less likely that the offender should be in the victim's home when the police arrive. It is possible that there was a high rate of nonmarital cohabitation in this sample, but there is another explanation: Bachman and Coker have a larger sample of 1,535 victims of IPV from the NCVS, and so it is reasonable to consider that local differences account for the conflict between their findings and Feder's. Feder (1996) also found that in cases where the offender was present, rates of arrest were identical in the case of both white and black victims (seventy-five percent), but thirty-five percent of black present offenders were arrested, compared to twenty-seven percent of white offenders. When the offender was not present, it was

less common for officers to contact and follow up with offenders in cases where either the offender or the victim was black.

Kane (1999) found that, at least among the Boston police officers he surveyed, the most important factor in determining whether to make an arrest in a domestic violence incident is perceived risk to the victim. Phillips and Varano (2008), upon surveying police officers, found that officers are more inclined to list criminal charges—an indication of how seriously the officer takes the offense—in cases of victim injury and an uncooperative offender. Injury is more likely to result from severe violence, which, according to Lipsky et al. (2012), is associated in the data with black offenders; also, as many scholars have observed, blacks are more likely than whites to distrust the police (c.f., Bayley and Mendelsohn 1969; Decker 1981; Flanagan and Vaughn 1996; Tuch and Weitzer 1997; Weitzer 1999) and so black offenders may be less willing to cooperate out of a lack of trust. This lack of trust in the police is well-founded, as police brutality against black people is common and frightening (cf. Cazenave 2018), and racist police officers can perceive a black person as uncooperative and deserving of violent arrest when there is no reason for it.

Background to the Project

Despite the fixation with which Americans regard interracial marriage, especially between blacks and whites (Root 2001:4), interracial couples remain an understudied demographic in the field of IPV research. Indirectly, one may approach the subject of racially heterogamous IPV police-reporting behavior by synthesizing tangential findings. Interracial couples often face rejection from their family members, leading to irritation and anger between the spouses in the marriage, as they displace their feelings towards their natal family onto their

partners (Root 2001). In addition, different socialization experiences lead to dissimilar gender role expectations by race (Cunningham 2001; Dade and Sloan 2000; Hill and Thomas 2000), a source of frustration for interracially-married women, and a predictor of conflict for white women, though not for women of other races (Forry, Leslie, and Letiecq 2007).

A woman who had suffered severe physical assaults at her husband's hands explained to Lee Bowker, a pioneering researcher in male violence, that she "didn't want to involve the police in her marriage because that would bring the violence into the public eye" (86:4). With flashing lights, blaring sirens, and a potential arrest record for the offender, calling 911 for an IPV incident can bring with it unwanted scrutiny from neighbors and the broader community. For IPV victims in an interracial relationship, an increased defensiveness of their union as a result of their family members' unwillingness to accept an in-law of a different race (Golebiowska 2007), combined with a greater "burden" placed on the relationship itself (Root 2001:56)—that is, a larger investment in "making it work"—could lead them to be less likely to report violence to the police compared to victims in same-race relationships.

Hypothesis

Victims of intimate partner violence in mixed-race relationships are less likely than victims in single-race relationships to report their victimization to the police.

Methods

Data

I used the public-use National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) data from 1992-2019. The Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) annually administers the NCVS to a nationally

representative sample of households. Each year, the sample comprises about 90,000 households and 160,000 individuals. If respondents report that they have been the victim of a crime in the past six months, then they remain in the sample for the next three years, and researchers from BJS interview them in person or over the phone every six months, and collect data on crimes that they have experienced since the prior interview.

The NCVS gathers information from crime victims on the incidents they experienced regardless of whether those incidents were reported to the police (Rennison and Rand 2007). Researchers also ask victims about themselves, and about offender characteristics, and the actions that the victim took afterwards. Victims are typically interviewed separately from the rest of their family, in case one or more of the assailants is a family member. Publicly-available NCVS data are stored on the website of the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR). The ICPSR cooperates with government agencies and research institutions to gather data and increase its accessibility.

Sample selection

As my population of interest is victims of intimate partner violence, I limited the sample to include only adult respondents who were victims of assault, and who have, or previously had, an intimate (i.e., dating or married) relationship with their assailant. This includes females aggressed by male partners, as well as males aggressed by female partners, and victims in same-sex relationships. I further limited the sample to respondents who experienced violent victimization—violence and threats of violence—(as opposed to non-violent victimizations like theft) by their spouse or romantic partner. I also excluded Native Americans, Pacific Islanders, and Asians, on account of their small sample size in the public-use data.

Respondents could only select one race response in the 1992 to 2003 interview waves. For 2003 onward, when the option to select multiple races was introduced, I coded mixed-race black respondents as "black" for comparability with 1992-2003 data. My exploratory analysis revealed that it made no difference to the outcome variables to count them separately, and besides, they comprise a very small *N.* In 2004-2019, I only coded a respondent as "white" if they were single-race white. In addition, I excluded respondents whose assailants were neither white nor black. This leaves black victims and white victims of black offenders and white offenders, for a final sample of 7,785 respondents.

Variables

I used logistic regression in STATA 15 to implement the strategy outlined in this section. The dependent variable, "victim reported," is a dummy variable indicating whether the respondent reported the incident to the police. The key independent variable is "Interracial Relationship," a dichotomous variable (0 is "Same-Race Relationship"). The control variables are based on factors which prior research has shown to play a role in IPV reporting. There are dummy variables for victim's gender and offender's gender, both of which affect the risk of reporting IPV to the police (Johnson 2005; Anderson 1997; Abrar, Lovenduski and Margetts 2000; Yllo 2005; Bell and Naugle 2008), race of offender "white offender" (0 is "black offender") and also victim's race, "black victim" (0 is "white victim") (Ackerman and Love 2014), a dummy for whether the victim has had any amount of college education, (Cho 2012; Anderson 1997), a categorical measure of household income (Cho 2012; Anderson 1997; McKenry, Julian and Gavazzi 1995; Tauchen, Witte, and Long 1991; Cazenave and Straus 1990), a continuous measure of victim's age (Cho 2012; Bosick et al. 2012), a dummy for

whether the victim was injured (approximation of Bachman and Coker [1995]'s finding that severity of assault makes IPV victims more likely to report), and a dummy for whether the offender was drunk or high at the time of the assault (getting at Bonomi et al. (2006)'s finding that a victim is more likely to report the assault to the police if the offender has a substance abuse problem). There is also a continuous Year variable. Tables 3.1 and 3.2 present data for the dichotomous variables and non-dichotomous variables, respectively.

Table 3.1. Dichotomous Variables

	Response		
Variable	No	Yes	Total
Victim Reported to Police	4,217	3,568	7,785
Male Victim	6,461	1,321	7,782
Male Offender	1,263	6,522	7,985
White Offender	1,769	6,016	7,785
Victim has some college education	3,883	3,825	7,708
Victim Injured	1,992	4,597	6,589
Offender drunk or high	4,147	3,591	7,738
Black Victim	6,327	1,458	7,895
Interracial Relationship	7,350	435	7,895

Table 3.2. Non-Dichotomous Variables

Variable	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Age	7,723	34.93	11.42	18	90
Categorical Household income	5,773	--	--	1 "Less than $5,000 per year"	14 "$75,000 or more per year"
Year of Interview	7,895	--	--	1992	2019

Models I used a pair of sets of logistic regression equations to test my hypothesis. The second set of models does not include the "Interracial Relationship Dummy," while the first one does. The reason for this is that I observed in preliminary analysis that the R-square in the interracial relationship models was very small. To see if there was any impact to including this variable at all, I analyzed each model with and without it. I also report R-square to the thousandths place. As I will discuss in the following section, the differences are small but consistent.

In the first set, in addition to the mixed-race dummy, the first model consists of the Year variable alone. Every model contains this variable. In addition to it, the second model has Incident and Offender Characteristics: Male Offender dummy, White Offender dummy, Injury to Victim dummy, and Offender Drunk/High dummy. The third model shows Non-SES Victim Demographics: Male Victim dummy, continuous measure of Victim's Age, and Black Victim dummy. The fourth model has Victim SES variables: Some College dummy, and a categorical Household Income measure. The fifth and final model contains all variables. In the second set, all models are the same as the first, aside from not having an interracial relationship dummy variable.

Results

Table 3.3 shows results of the Pearsons' chi-square test for Victim Report and Interracial Relationship.

Table 3.3. Pearson's Chi-square, Victim Report by Interracial Relationship

	Interracial Relationship		
Victim Reported to Police	No	Yes	Total
No	3,956	261	4,217
Yes	3,394	174	3,568
Total	7,350	435	7,785
Pearson's chi-square			6.31*

* $P < .05$.

Table 3.4 shows the results of logistic regression analysis with the interracial relationship predictor.

Table 3.4. Logistic Regression Models, Police Reporting by Victims of Intimate Partner Violence, with Interracial Relationship Predictor Variable

	1	2	3	4	5
Variable	Year	Incident and Offender	Non-SES Victim Demographics	Victim SES Variables	Final
Interracial Relationship	-0.40***	-0.61***	-0.36**	-0.50***	-0.63**
Year	0.02***	0.02***	0.01***	0.01***	0.02***
Male Offender		0.12			0.61**
White Offender		-0.41***			-0.37
Victim Injured		0.10			-0.01
Offender Drunk/High		0.10			0.04
Victim's Age			0.04*		0.00
Male Victim			-0.16*		0.27
Black Victim			0.42***		-0.03
Victim has Some College Education				-0.07	-0.12
Household Income				-0.00	0.01
Constant	-33.30	-33.19	-30.39	-30.99	-32.90
Wald Chi-square	40.93	74.67	86.36	32.60	64.17
Pseudo R-square	0.004	0.010	0.010	0.005	0.012
N	7,504	6,333	7,443	5,543	4,706

* $P < .05$.
** $P < .01$.
*** $P < .001$.

The figures in Table 3.4 support my hypothesis that victims of intimate partner violence in interracial relationships are at lower risk than IPV victims in single-race relationships to report their assault to the police. In all models, Interracial Relationship lowers the reporting risk. It is somewhat surprising that only two control variables remain significant in the final model: Male Offender and Year, both of which increase risk of reporting. As expected, the pseudo-R-squares indicate that this collection of variables explains very little of the variation in reporting tendencies. Table 3.5 allows comparison with the same models, leaving out the Interracial Relationship variable.

Table 3.5. Logistic Regression Models, Police Reporting by Victims of Intimate Partner Violence, *without* Interracial Relationship Predictor Variable

	1	2	3	4	5
Variable	Year	Incident and Offender	Non-SES Victim Demographics	Victim SES Variables	Final
Year	0.01***	0.01***	0.01***	0.01***	0.01***
Male Offender		0.13			0.59**
White Offender		-0.30***			0.07
Victim Injured		0.10			0.00
Offender drunk/high		0.09			0.03
Victim's age			0.00*		0.00
Male victim			-0.16*		0.22
Black Victim			0.42***		0.39**
Victim has some college education				-0.08	-0.12
Household Income				-0.00	0.01
Constant	-31.98	-31.46	-29.02	-28.91	-32.03
Wald Chi-square	28.52	6,333	7,443	17.39	54.86
Pseudo R-square	0.003	0.007	0.009	0.003	0.010
N	7,504	6,333	7,443	5,543	4,706

* $P < .05$.
** $P < .01$.
*** $P < .001$.

Comparison of Table 3.4 with Table 3.5 reveals that the models that include the Interracial Relationship dummy explain slightly more variation than models without it. We also see that, without that in the equation, Black Victim remains significant in the final model.

Conclusions and Directions for Future Research

These results suggest the repercussions of social stigmatization of interracial relationships, which could be leading to IPV victims' reluctance to seek help from outsiders. With such a small pseudo R-square, however, it would be premature to draw any sweeping conclusions. It also must be understood that it is not the intention of this chapter to argue that IPV victims *should* call the police. In an evidence-based guidebook for current sufferers of domestic violence, Bowker was unenthusiastic about police officers as a resource, and noted that "in only half of the cases [in my sample] the officers provided an identifiable service to the battered wives" (1986:58; cf. Bowker 1982). More recently, the National Domestic Violence Hotline (NDVH)'s 2021 survey of more than 1,500 IPV survivors found that 55% of respondents who called 911 felt that the police had discriminated against them, and 25% were themselves "threatened with arrest." Most damningly, the NDVH stated in its report, "When asked if other resources had been available, would the survivors have chosen an alternative over police, 71% answered 'yes'…Respondents overwhelmingly expressed a desire for different kinds of interventions—one that did not rely on police" (National Domestic Violence Hotline n.d.).

Further research on IPV victims/survivors in interracial relationships should consider help-seeking behavior besides police reports, to see whether there is a difference in risk for reaching out to friends, natal family, or institutions and organizations that offer support to people in their situation. Investigating change over time among this population's help-seeking patterns,

with the increase in societal acceptance of interracial relationships, could prove interesting, as could examining different race pairings beyond black and white.

Chapter 4. Marginality, Vulnerability, and Mixed-Race Identity

This chapter uses social network theory to attempt to explain the relatively high risk of violence for mixed-race individuals in the United States. Relying on analyses of data from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent to Adult Health (Add Health), I compared the network centrality and victimization risk of single-race students to those of mixed-race students. I hypothesized that mixed-race students would have lower centrality scores than single-race students; that higher centrality lowers victimization risk; and that therefore mixed-race students would have a higher victimization risk than other students, even while controlling for centrality. All three hypotheses are supported by the analysis results.

Literature Review

Marginality and Vulnerability

Stein, Dukes, and Warren (2007) found, among middle- and high-school students in Colorado Springs, that mixed-race adolescent boys were more likely than single-race boys to report victimization incidents. My project is an effort to explain this statistic—why are mixed-race individuals disproportionately victims of crime? Is it borne out in a nationally-representative data sample?

As mentioned in Chapters 1 and 2 of this thesis, mixed-race people were seen, for a *long* stretch of U.S. history, as morally and physically inferior beings. Teng (2013) chronicled the transition in social science literature, led by Robert E. Park in the 1920s and 1930s, from treating them as "objects…of fear and loathing" to "[objects] of social scientific interest or importance." To this end, they "[t]urn[ed] their focus away from bodies, and…granted a new importance to life histories" (138).

To describe the precarious social position of mixed-race individuals, I apply the concept of "marginality," from Park (1928)'s and Stonequist (1937)'s research on what they called the "Marginal Man": "one who is poised in psychological uncertainty between two or more social worlds, reflecting in his soul the discords and harmonies, repulsions and attractions of these worlds" (Stonequist 1937:8). According to Stonequist, the "racial hybrid" is the "most obvious" of marginal men. He and Park documented mental health struggles among the mixed-race population, but Park in particular observed also a benefit to their position, in that persons who occupied it had more cultural perspective, making them less parochial in their views, and possessed of a greater wisdom. He was not implying that these were congenital characteristics, and did not believe that there *were* congenital implications to being mixed-race. His mentee, Wu Jingchao, provided evidence for that belief with cross-national research (in an unpublished dissertation) of Eurasians in the Chinese diaspora. Wu did observe that Eurasians suffered mental health problems, but also that these problems were much less common among those with Chinese fathers and white mothers, compared to the children of Chinese mothers and white fathers. It was a cultural issue: following patrilineal descent, the children of Chinese men were treated by ethnic Chinese people as fully Chinese, not subjected to prejudice. Not so for the mixed-race children of Chinese women (Teng 2013).

After *Loving*, the number of mixed-race children in the United States increased with the rise in intermarriages. In 1970, about 1% of infants living with both parents were in a mixed-race family. By 2013, that number had grown to 10% (Parker et al. 2015). As for adults, Parker et al. estimate that 6.3% of them might have been mixed-race in that year. The stigma attached to being mixed-race is fading, but, as with interracial relationships, American society did not automatically open its heart to mixed-race people post-*Loving*, and researchers did not abruptly

understand them more than it had in times past. For example, writing in 1979, literary scholar William J. Scheick summed up the science on mixed-race white/Natives with the ambivalent statement that “the biological facts remain uncertain” (11).

The prolific race scholar Maria P.P. Root edited a book in 1992 covering various topics relating to the mixed-race population up to that point. Contributors made assertions along the lines of: not all mixed-race people "have a problem" (Spickard 1992:13), and there is "lack of support for the deficit approach" (Stephan 1992:61, referring to the presumption that there is something damaging about being mixed-race) that today see almost quaint in their obviousness, but at the time they had to be supported with evidence, which the researchers provided. One set of contributors, Cauce et al. (1992), admitted to some surprise upon discovering that mixed-race subjects had appeared in their sample, as they had overlooked the fact of their existence, and had not been aware of the size of the population. Still, Johnson (1992), another contributor, warned, the number of mixed-race people in the U.S. was too small for nationally-representative data. As I will explain in the methods section, a nationally-representative survey capturing data on mixed-race people was just around the corner.

Root’s book was one of many to emerge starting shortly before the turn of the twenty-first century, in the “growing, but limited, literature on biracial individuals” (Sanchez and Garcia 2009). Shih and Sanchez (2005) reviewed that literature, and concluded that mixed-race people who entered the clinical population presented lower scores on measures of psychological well-being compared to single-race patients, but within the nonclinical population, mixed-race individuals were nearly as well-adjusted as their single-race peers.

Recently, Goodhines et al. (2020), found that discrimination against mixed-race adolescents led them to experience sleep problems and a negative mood at a higher rate than

single-race peers. Closer to the time period of interest (the 1990s), mixed-race black/white individuals were targets of discrimination (Birzer and Ellis 2006) at the hands of both whites and blacks (Fleischman 2000), while some Asian/whites faced exclusion from both Asians, who were suspicious of their difference (King-O'Riain and Chiyoko 2004; Spickard 1991) and whites, who saw them as inferior (Haney-Lopez 2006, Lee and Bean 2004). Fleischman (2000) noted that, in addition to outright discrimination, there was deep-seated animosity from both single-race whites and blacks towards mixed-race, black/white individuals. Root found that, in 2001, mixed-race children were sometimes still shunned by their parents' families on account of their mixed-race heritage. As of 2015, Parker et al. found that 21% of mixed-race black/white adults and 4% of mixed-race Native/white adults reported that "a relative or member of their extended family has treated them badly because they are mixed race."

However, Root also found in her 2001 study that the racial identities they had acquired from both parents were important to her mixed-race respondents. In 2015, Parker, Horowitz, Morin, and Lopez reported that their subjects were proud of being mixed-race. Townsend, Markus, and Bergsieker (2009) found that, for mixed-race individuals, even a minor source of identity erasure—a demographic questionnaire that allowed only single-race responses—lowered their motivation and self-esteem. This does not mean that a person who *can* identify as mixed-race always *will*. Liebler et al. (2016) observed that some people who reported multiple races in the U.S. Census in 2000 reported only one race in 2010, and vice versa. Similarly, of Parker et al.'s respondents, all of whom had mixed-race parentage, 39% did *not* describe themselves as "'mixed race or multiracial'" (2015).

Social networks and crime

The characteristics of networks, as well as a person's location within networks, can influence the risk of committing, and being the victim of, crime. The opportunity perspective, derived from Hawley (1950)'s theory of social ecology, posits that routine aspects of life, including social activities, influence opportunities to commit crimes as well as impact the risk of victimization (Haynie and Osgood 2005). What's more, "[t]he trust engendered by personal relations presents, by its very existence, enhanced opportunity for malfeasance" (Granovetter 1985:491). Victimization is most frequently an in-group phenomenon: people offend against members of their own race or age groups. However, in heterogeneous neighborhoods, offenders cross age- and race- lines, according to Sampson (1984)'s analysis of the National Crime Survey (forerunner of the National Crime Victimization Survey), 1973-1978.

Heide (1999) found that violent juvenile delinquents tend to have restricted social networks, and youths who are centrally located within delinquent peer networks are at higher risk of violent victimization, while those who are centrally located within non-delinquent peer networks are at decreased risk of violent victimization. Papachristos, Braga, and Hureau (2012) discovered, among the Cape Verdean community in Boston, a contagion effect of gunshot victimization within social networks: the closer you are to a gunshot victim, the greater your chance of becoming a gunshot victim as well. However, Lee (2000) concluded that violent victimization is less likely to occur within close-knit (in social network analysis terminology, this approximates to "high-density," reaching other group members through short path distances) communities.

The more ties a person has in a large social network, the less likely they are to commit crimes (Schreck, Fisher, and Miller 2004). It appears that aggression is in part a learned behavior

that may be absorbed via aggressive peer networks, according to Kraeger (2007a; 2007b). Kraeger (2007a) also found that male violence tends to restrict social networks, probably because there are not a lot of people who would want to be friends with someone who hurts them, but paradoxically, for male students who do poorly in academics, violent behavior leads to a "modest positive association to peer acceptance" (p. 893). In the same study, he found that violent female children have more friends in schools with high levels of violence. Student behavior, both in and out of school, and also students' interactions with peers, do not occur in a vacuum, but instead are greatly affected by administrative policies and conduct (Cook, Gottfredson, and Na 2010).

Kraeger (2007b) discovered that male student athletes who play contact sports—football and wrestling—are more likely to engage in "serious fights." Wright and Fitzgerald (2006) found that participation in school clubs, as well as sports, increase the tendency to engage in violent behavior. They suggest that members of these groups "may become targets for those outside the group, or they may group together in or as a gang, using their social unity and capacity for violence against other groups" (p. 1449).

Social networks and mixed-race identity

According to Iaonnides and Loury (2004), "[t]he social connections of one's parents are related to the pattern of social connections within one's ethnic group and may also influence one's own social connections" (p. 1082). This gives mixed-race children access to two or more race-of-origin groups, meaning that they have more connections than other students. Mixed-race youths, despite greater animosity towards them as a whole, do *not* have fewer friends than their single-race peers, the key difference being that mixed-race students have more racially diverse networks. Mixed-race individuals have an "unusually high tendency to form ties in general"

(Wimmer and Lewis 2010:620). Mixed-race black adolescents in particular serve as cutpoints between black- and nonblack networks (Quillian and Redd 2009). A cutpoint is a person who is the only connection between two groups, and if they leave, then those groups are separate.

Doyle and Kao (2007) had also found a "bridging" impact of mixed-race students, decreasing the social distance between networks comprised of single-race students. (Tangentially, Vaquera and Kao [2008] found that racially-homogenous friendships were far more common than racially-heterogenous friendships in Add Health). Bridges between social networks don't only connect members of both networks; they also serve as conduits for the resources (and presumably benefits and harms) available among members of both networks to flow back and forth (Oh, Chung, and Labianca 2004).

Network positions are neither inherently beneficial nor disadvantageous, as much depends upon the other characteristics of one's network, such as the attributes of the people who are in it and their relationships among themselves. Baker and Faulkner (2004) argued that, although "[s]ocial scientists tend to focus on the protective and beneficial role of social networks" (p. 93), social ties can in fact have both "protective [and] harmful effects" (p. 92).

The Junction of Social Networks, Race, and Crime

Donald Black (1983) theorized that an act of crime may be retaliatory, a form of informal social control. The more people present in a person's social network, the more people there are who are likely to have motives to retaliate against them. In other words, the aggregate likelihood of anyone retaliating against a person is greater in a large network than in a smaller one. People are most likely to be victimized by others known to them, who have more motives for anger (leading to violent crime), more knowledge of their victim's valuable possessions and where they

are kept (facilitating theft), and, of course, more opportunity. A woman is far more likely to be raped by her husband than by a stranger on the street, and a child is more likely to steal change from his mother's purse than to pick pockets on the walk to school.

Choi et al. (2012), analyzing a longitudinal study of young people from Washington State, found that mixed-race youth are more likely than their single-race white or Asian peers to commit violence, and to engage in substance abuse. Chavez and Sanchez (2010) used the 2001 California Health Interview Study to address a similar research question to Choi et al. (2012)'s, differing mainly in the ages of the sampled population (the California Health Interview Study interviewed people of a wide age range) and exclusive focus on substance use. Chavez and Sanchez discovered that mixed-race respondents were more likely to drink and smoke than single-race black or Asian respondents, but *less* likely than single-race white or Native respondents. Landor and Halpern (2016)'s study, using Add Health, demonstrated that young mixed-race people are more likely than single-race peers to engage in unsafe sex, indicating a higher disregard for personal safety.

Networks can have a protective effect against crime victimization (Browning, Feinberg, and Dietz 2004), because social capital (loosely, maybe even inchoately, defined as *the collective or economic resources available through personal connections* [i.e., within a social network]), has a moderating effect on risk of violence (Wright and Fitzpatrick 2006). There is variation in how social capital is measured, and disagreement about how it *should* be measured (Bankston and Zhou 2002). Fischer (2005) goes to far as to dispute the term itself. He calls social capital a "dreadful metaphor," and argues that it is downright misleading. He suggests "clearer and simpler terms" like "membership, family, sociability and trust" in its stead (157). Kadushin (2004) shares Fischer (2005)'s frustrations, and prefers the phrase "networked resources." I, too,

prefer this term, but will use "social capital" in this chapter for consistency with other research in the field.

Social network scholars can agree that there are demonstrable benefits to social ties, and that the network to which a person belongs can confer different benefits, compared to other networks that she might have chosen instead. McDonald (2011) found, among job seekers, that more opportunities appeared among networks predominantly consisting of white men, including neighborhood-based networks, and that these opportunities extended *to all members within them*, including nonwhites and women. White men had better, and more, connections, but they did not restrict their knowledge solely to their same-race, same-gender peers. Networks that mostly consisted of nonwhites, or women, did not confer the same number of opportunities, even to white, male members. Thus, it was the *network* that made the difference, dispersing the resource, often called the "capital." However defined, it is a consistent finding in the literature on networks and crime that social capital is "inversely associated with crime victimization" (Takagi, Ikeda and Kawachi 2012:1895).

The counterpoint to this conclusion is that a network can have high social capital, without every person in the network benefiting from it. Browning et al. (2004) found that the social networks formed in neighborhoods "provide a source of social capital for offenders" (503). In addition, "outsiders" who are part of a social network (that is, peripherally or marginally attached network members) do not always receive equal treatment within the network. Black residents in white communities (a proxy for networks) with higher social capital were at greater risk of hate crime victimization compared to black residents living in white communities with low social capital (Lyons 2007). Communities with high social capital might be closely-knit, and have a

well-defined group identity, and so "outsiders" could be seen as more threatening to neighborhood identity.

Given the marginal social position of mixed-race individuals, and existing literature on social networks and crime victimization, I develop three hypotheses.

Hypotheses

Mixed-race individuals, as the **"**most obvious" of marginal men (Stonequist 1937), are not the central actors in their own social circles:

> ***H1 Lower Centrality*** *Mixed-race respondents will have lower levels of centrality within their networks, compared to single-race respondents.*

This would suggest a position of marginality, of "outsiderness," which increases victimization risk (Lyons 2007). This leads to two hypotheses, H2 and H3, with the latter following from the former.

> ***H2 Lower Centrality Victimization Risk*** *Respondents with lower centrality within their networks will be at higher risk of victimization, compared to more-central respondents.*

> ***H3 Higher Victimization Risk for Mixed-Race Respondents*** *Mixed-race respondents will be at higher risk of victimization compared to their single-race peers, even while controlling for centrality*.

Data and Methods

I used Ordinary Least Squares and logistic regression analyses of data from the public-use National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent to Adult Health (Add Health). These data were collected during the 1994-1995 school year of 20,745 youth in the U.S. in seventh grade through senior year of high school, and their parents. The children were selected based on their enrollment either in high schools that were part of a nationally-representative sample, or in a "feeder" middle school identified by participating high schools. I analyzed two public-use datasets: Wave 1 and Network Variables Dataset (both have N=6,504), the data for which were gathered at the same time (Bearman, Moody, and Stovel 2004). I limited my sample to single-race white students, single-race black students, and mixed-race black students.

Table 4.1. Race Categories

	Response		
Variable	No	Yes	Total
Mixed-Race Black	5,183	155	5,338
Single-Race Black	3,875	1,463	5,338
Single-Race White	1,618	3,720	5,338

Respondents were instructed to choose all race categories that applied to them. Among the mixed-race black students, additional races selected were: Native, Asian/Pacific Islander, and Hispanic. While demographers, including the ones at the U.S. Census Bureau, consider "Hispanic" to be an ethnic, not a racial, identifier, it was clear in the Add Health data that these respondents self-identified *racially* as "Hispanic." Students who identified themselves as Hispanic on the ethnicity question tended to also select the "other" category in the race question

(a common choice for Hispanics, according to Fernández [1992]). Following their lead, I treated the "Hispanic" category as a race group.

A few students of mixed-race background self-identified as single-race in Wave 1. Exploratory analysis indicated that mixed-race respondents who self-identified as single-race in Wave 1 were more similar to respondents of the race with which they identified than to self-described mixed-race respondents. For this reason, I once again followed respondents' lead and categorized them as they categorized themselves.

Table 4.2. Races Selected with "Mixed-Race Black"

	Response		
Variable	No	Yes	Total
Hispanic	35	120	155
Native	105	50	155
Asian, Pacific Islander	143	12	155
White	70	85	155

NOTE. Some respondents selected more than two races.

I used grand sample weights for all models.

Addressing H1: Centrality

For this set of models, I used Ordinary Least Square (OLS) regression to predict centrality. In the first model are the race variables "Mixed-Race Black" and "Single-Race Black" ("Single-Race White" is omitted), as well as "High Education Black Sample," as a control. The High Education Black Sample was one of several non-genetic supplements with the data. It was drawn from the black student population with at least one college-educated parent, based on responses to a questionnaire that the parents filled out (Tourangeau and Shin 1999:9). The second model adds controls for "Mother Has a College Degree" and "Male Respondent."

Table 4.3. Non-Race Predictors of Centrality

	Response		
Variable	No	Yes	Total
Male	2,757	2,581	5,338
Mother Has a College Degree	3,815	1,523	5,338
High-Education Black Sample	4,830	503	5,338

While there were many more variables in the data that could help explain differences in centrality, most of them have incomplete data. For reference, I have provided a table (Table 4.4) of examples of variables that I would have included in the models if more respondents (and their parents) had provided data for them. The reason that I had to take a conservative approach with this is that the "Mixed-Race Black" category is already so small that even a few missing data points on a variable here and there chips away at the *N*.

Table 4.4. Would-be Predictors with Incomplete Data

	Response		
Variable	No	Yes	Total
White-Collar Mother	2,527	1,605	4,132
White-Collar Father	2,423	1,181	3,604
Aggressive Respondent	1,497	3,806	5,303
Respondent Takes Illegal Drugs	3,744	1,513	5,257
Risk-Taking Peers	1,586	3,649	5,235

There are seven centrality measures in Add Health. However, none of them has data for all respondents in my subsample. Five have data for just 3,723. Two measures, Proximity Prestige and Mean Geodesic Distance, have so many missing cases that I excluded them from the analysis. Data for the network variables were collected via nominations. The students in the sampled schools were asked to nominate up to five boys and five girls as friends. They were instructed to stick to friends who went to either their own school, or a sister school (for middle

school students, this was the high school to which their current school most frequently sent students; for high schoolers, it was the middle school whence most students at their current school had come, and for students at a combined middle- to -high school, there was no sister school), but some of the respondents nominated friends from elsewhere.

The first centrality measure, Reach, is the count of students whom the respondent/ego can access via their (nominated) connections. The second measure, Reach3, is the number of people whom the defendant can reach in three steps, with each step being a nomination. We can illustrate a hypothetical example for Respondent A, who only has three friends and whose friends and friend-of-friends each only have three friends (to make the calculation easier to follow). If Respondent A nominates B, C, and D, that is 3 people in one (first) step. Then, B nominates E, F, and G; C nominates H, I, and J; D nominates K, L, and M. The number has ballooned to 12 (3 in step one, added to 9 in step 2). Students E through J nominate no one who has not already been mentioned, meaning that they add no one new to Respondent A's network, while K nominates two new people, O and P, and L nominates new person Q, and M nominates R and S. This third step brings the total Reach3 of Respondent A to 17 (5 in step 3, plus 12 from steps one and two). The difference between Reach3 and Reach is that Reach is not limited to a number of steps but is the *total* number that the respondent can access.

The third measure, Influence Domain, is the number of students who can reach the respondent through nominated connections. The fourth measure, Indegree, is the number of students who nominated the respondent. The fifth is Bonacich Centrality, which weights respondent centrality by the centrality of the other people in their network (Bonacich 1987).

There is a separate regression model for each centrality measure. Table 4.6 shows summary statistics.

Table 4.5. Summary Statistics for Centrality Measures

Variable	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Reach	3,723	470.43	418.94	0	1,789
Reach3	3,723	59.23	47.56	0	264
Influence Domain	3,723	468.05	374.45	0	1,705
Indegree	3,723	4.68	3.78	0	30
Bonacich Centrality	3,723	0.804	0.628	0	4.29

Addressing H2: Lower Centrality Victimization Risk

For the set of models used to test this hypothesis, I use bivariate logistic regression to predict risk of victimization risk. The independent variable in each model is a centrality measure that the Hypothesis 1 models showed to be a significant predictor of victimization risk.

Addressing H3: Higher Victimization Risk for Mixed-Race Respondents

To address Hypothesis 3, I ran a set of logistic regression equations. The dependent variable is "Victim," based on whether the respondent reported being the victim of a physical assault or violent threat with a gun or knife in the past twelve months. The omitted category, as in the Hypothesis 1 Models, is Single-Race White. The base model contains the two other race variables, Mixed-Race Black and Single-Race Black, as well as the High-Education Black Sample control. The second model adds the centrality measures that impacted victimization risk in the models for Hypothesis 2. The third contains controls for "Mother Has a College Degree," and "Male." The fourth model consists of all predictors.

Results

Table 4.6 displays the results from the Pearson's Chi-square test for "Mixed-Race Black" and "Crime Victimization."

Table 4.6. Pearson's Chi-square for Victim x Mixed-Race Black

	Mixed-Race Black		
Victim	No	Yes	Total
No	4,172	114	4,286
Yes	1,011	41	1,052
Total	5,183	155	5,338
Pearson's chi-square			4.59*

* $P < .05$.

Table 4.7, below, shows the results of the test of *Hypothesis 1: Mixed-race students are less-centrally located in their networks than their single-race peers.*

Table 4.7. OLS Regression Models, Using Race to Predict Centrality

Independent Variables	**Reach**	**Reach3**	**Influence Domain**	Indegree	Bonacich Centrality
Mixed-Race Black	**-156.03*** **	**-15.46** **	**-87.21***	-0.65	-0.07
Single-Race Black	**-56.86** **	**-13.81*** **	**-52.50** **	-0.85***	-0.15***
High-Education Black Sample	**90.43** **	**2.78**	**86.14** **	-0.13	0.02
Constant	**474.68*** **	**62.72*** **	**468.88*** **	4.93***	0.85***
R-square	**0.004**	**0.013**	**0.003**	0.008	0.009
N	**3,723**	**3,723**	**3,723**	3,723	3,723

* $P < .05$.
** $P < .01$.
*** $P < .001$.

The first three models (bold text in Table 4.7), for the measures Reach, Reach3, and Influence Domain, support my hypothesis that mixed-race students are less-centrally located than single-race students, although the R-squares indicate that this explains only a small amount of the difference in centrality. Unlike single-race black students, mixed-race students do not significantly differ from single-race white students in Indegree or Bonacich centrality.

In Table 8, I present the results of my test of *Hypothesis 2: Respondents with lower centrality within their networks will be at higher risk of victimization, compared to more-central respondents.*

Table 4.8. Logistic Regression Models, Centrality's Impact on Odds of Victimization

Centrality Measures	Odds Ratio	Constant	Pseudo R^2	N
Reach	1.00**	0.27***	0.005**	3,723
Reach3	0.99***	0.30***	0.009***	3,723
Influence Domain	1.00***	0.25***	0.001	3,723
Indegree	**0.96****	**0.27*****	**0.004****	**3,723**
Bonacich Centrality	**0.65*****	**0.31*****	**0.01*****	**3,723**

* $P < .05$.
** $P < .01$.
*** $P < .001$.

Reach and Influence Domain do not significantly impact centrality risk, and Reach, with an odds ratio of 1.00, significantly does *not* impact centrality risk. However, Bonacich Centrality and Indegree lower the risk of victimization. It is interesting to note that the two centrality measures on which mixed-race respondents did not differ from single-race white students are the very ones that lower victimization risk.

In Table 9 are the results from testing *Hypothesis 3: Mixed-race respondents will be at higher risk of victimization compared to their single-race peers, even when controlling for centrality*.

Table 4.9. Logistic Regression Models, Using Race, Centrality, and Additional Controls to Predict Victimization (Odds Ratios)

Variable	Race Only	Race + Centrality	Race + Additional Controls	Full Model
Mixed-Race Black	2.91***	2.54**	3.12***	3.28***
Single-Race Black	2.07***	1.89***	2.01***	2.01***
High-Education Black	0.67**	0.79	0.87	0.90
Sample				
Indegree		0.99		1.00
Bonacich Centrality		0.69***		0.75**
Mother Has a College Education			0.50***	0.56***
Male			3.05***	2.84***
Constant	0.021	0.27	0.13	0.15
Wald Chi-square	73.49	68.12	249.20	156.75
Pseudo R-square	0.016***	0.022***	0.074***	0.067***
N	5,338	3,723	5,338	3,723

* $P < .05$.
** $P < .01$.
*** $P < .001$.

Between Model 1, Race Only, and Model 2, Race + Centrality, it is clear that adding the centrality measures helps to explain some of the difference in probability of victimization, as we see the higher risk for both mixed-race and single-race black students decrease between Model 1 and Model 2. However, between Model 3, Race + Additional Controls, and Model 4, the Full Model, we do not see this repeated. In all models, no matter which controls are added, mixed-race respondents consistently have a higher victimization risk than single-race white students, more so than single-race black students.

Conclusions and Directions for Future Research

The *N* in this study, particularly for mixed-race black students, was small. This is, however, a good starting place to consider future analysis. The first wave of Add Health data, which I used for these analyses, is now more than two decades old. Studies that rely on it, such as this one, provide an indication of the relative network locations of mixed-race students in the mid-1990s, but much has changed since then. The parents of respondents in this dataset had grown up in an era before *Loving v. Virginia*. And, though unenforceable, these laws remained on the books in many Southern states, and it was not until 2000 that Alabama repealed its ban on intermarriage. It is possible that the attitudes of these families were more inclined to disfavor mixed-race families and individuals, compared to what we might find in later cohorts.

Scholars should therefore turn to more recent data where their research question, unlike mine, is concerned more with the present than the past. Add Health is a rich resource, but this one wave is a snapshot in time. I will close this chapter on a hopeful note: In 2015, Parker et al.'s mixed-race respondents "overwhelmingly say that they have rarely ever felt ashamed or like an outsider because of their mixed racial background."

Chapter 5. Conclusion

History does not fully predict the future, but it can allow us to guess at it. In Chapter 2, I used event history analysis to investigate factors that contributed to the rise of anti-amalgamation laws. I found that the first generation of statehood was the crucial period, during which, if a law was not passed, it would be less likely that it ever *would* be passed. Obviously, this condition will not reoccur, but the idea underlying the inclusion of that variable was that state identity played a role in the decision to pass anti-amalgamation laws. The Tennessee House bill that I referenced in Chapter 1, HB 878, demonstrates how state's rights can undermine federal legislation intended to protect individual rights.

In Chapter 3, I used logistic regression to determine whether victims of intimate partner violence in mixed-race black/white relationships were less likely than victims in same-race white relationships (white/white or black/black) to make a police report (I use this as an indicator of defensiveness of their relationship), and found that the data supported my hypothesis. Finally, I found in my analyses in Chapter 4 that mixed-race black children in the mid-1990s were less-centrally located in their networks than single-race white or black peers on three measures out of five, and also had higher risk of violent victimization.

The fallout from *Loving* more than a quarter-century earlier was anticlimactic. After generations of rage and violence as white supremacists in mobs, the courts and legislatures policed the color line, it was apparently all over. In 2020, Dailey titled the conclusion of her book, *White Fright: The Sexual Panic at the Heart of America's Racist History*, "The Fall, Without a Whimper, of an Empire." She did acknowledge the continued presence of fringe Christian groups violently opposed to race-mixing, but "fringe" is the key word.

Teng observed in 2013 that "[i]n contemporary cultural politics, the figure of the hybrid subject [mixed-race person] operates as a metaphor for the simultaneous euphoria and anxiety surrounding the increasing cross-fertilization of cultures, languages, and capital in an age of globalization" (xvii). The U.S. is rife with anxiety, even more so now, ten years later. A global pandemic collided with an inefficient healthcare system and unreliable social safety net to create a national crisis. The crime rate spiked (Rosenfeld and Lopez 2021). Rates of clinical anxiety and depression soared, as did deaths caused by alcohol poisoning, drug overdose, and other methods of suicide (Panchal et al. 2023). The spread of COVID-19 shocked the world with the dangers inherent in globalization, and far-right political grifters stoked fears among panicking Americans (especially those who were already at some level xenophobic and racist) that China had cooked up the virus specifically to harm the U.S., as a form of bio-terrorism (Tucker 2020).

Even before the pandemic, the election of an openly-racist president gave closeted racists permission to express their views. "'He says what we're thinking'" one of Donald Trump's supporters told the BBC (Brown 2016). Families disintegrated as non-right-wingers increasingly felt that they could no longer enable racist, homophobic, and xenophobic relatives, now that they had grown prouder of their bigotry (Luscombe 2021). As right-wingers became more isolated because their views were intolerable to their loved ones, they turned to fellow right-wingers on social media. The intellectual echo chambers that they created for themselves, and that grifters created for them, fanned the flames of regressive American politics (Kydd 2021). The pandemic added fuel to a smoldering fire, and it raged.

"When a formerly dominant group is in decline, it may fear that in the future it will lack the bargaining power to maintain the status quo…" Kydd (2021:3) remarked, in his study of the factors that led up to the January 6, 2021 insurrection. His analysis picked up in the timeframe

where Dailey's left off: the wake of the Civil Rights movement, the outcome of which "set the stage for the modern era of mass self-indoctrination" (9). In a slow-building process over decades, the following four factors allowed this to come about: "partisan polarization, media polarization, the rise of social media, and the emergence of conservative armed groups" (Ibid). This would include the white-race purity fetishist Christian organizations discussed in Chapter 1.

According to Kydd, as the 1970s brought increased equality, "Conservatives, particularly white racists and evangelicals, believed, correctly, that their social dominance was being challenged, their beliefs scorned, and their morals condemned by the left." From the 1980s onward, with a few exceptions, "Moderate Republicans were consistently replaced by more extreme partisans…Polarization became increasingly asymmetric, in that Republicans were moving further to the right than Democrats were to the left" (10). Right-wing media figures told their viewers "everyone but us despises you, looks down upon you, is politically biased, and is lying to you. Only [we] are on your side and [are telling] you the truth" (10-11). Then, in the 2000s, thanks to social media, "[right-wing] conspiracy theories took off" (11). As for modern-day right-wing armed groups, Kydd traces their origins to the 1970s, but it was during the presidency of Barack Obama, our first black (that is, mixed-race black/white) president, that there emerged "a new ideology and practice of right-wing violence…The traditional conservative concern with demographic decline and opposition to immigration became apocalyptic[,]" as its adherents embraced the belief in a conspiracy to "dilute the white race" (12). Furthermore, "[these] structural conditions…are unlikely to ameliorate, so the potential for political violence will remain" (3). If the causes remain, then so will the effects.

Bibliography

Abrar, Stefania, Joni Lovenduski and Helen Margetts. 2000. “Feminist Ideas and Domestic Violence Policy Change.” *Political Studies* 48(2):239-262.

Ackerman, Jeffrey and Tony Love. 2014. “Ethnic Group Differences in Police Notification about Intimate Partner Violence.” *Violence Against Women* 20(2):162-185.

Akers, Caroline and Catherine Kaukinen. 2009. “The Police Reporting Behavior of Intimate Partner Violence Victims.” *Journal of Family Violence* 24(3):159-171.

Anderson, Kristin. 2002. “Perpetrator or Victim? Relationships between Intimate Partner Violence and Well-Being.” *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 64(4):851-63.

------. 1997. “Gender, Status, and Domestic Violence: An Integration of Feminist and Family Violence Approaches.” *Journal of Marriage and Family* 59(3):655-669.

Aquino, Karl and Stefan Thau. 2009. “Workplace Victimization: Aggression from the Target’s Perspective.” *Annual Review of Psychology* 60(1):717-41.

Archer, John. 2006. “Cross-Cultural Differences in Physical Aggression between Partners: A Social-Structural Analysis.” *Personality and Social Psychology Review* 10(2):113-133.

------. 2002. “Sex Differences in Physically Aggressive Acts between Heterosexual Partners: A Meta-Analytic Review.” *Aggression and Violent Behavior: A Review Journal* 7(4):313-351.

--------. 2000. “Sex Differences in Aggression between Heterosexual Partners: A Meta-Analytic Review.” *Psychological Bulletin* 126(5):651-680.

Arnold, Thomas. 1893. *The History of Rome*. New York: D. Appleton & Company.

Avins, Alfred. 1966. “Anti-Miscegenation Laws and the Fourteenth Amendment: The Original Intent.” *Virginia Law Review* 52(7): 1224-1255.

Bachman, Ronet and Ann Coker. 1995. “Police Involvement in Domestic Violence: The Interactive Effects of Victim Injury, Offender’s History of Violence, and Race.” *Violence and Victims* 10(2):91-106.

Baker, Wayne E. and Robert R. Faulkner. 2004. “Social Networks and Loss of Capital.” *Social Networks* 26(2):91-111.

Bankston III, Carl L. and Min Zhou. 2002. “Social Capital as Process: The Meanings and Problems of a Theoretical Metaphor.” *Sociological Inquiry* 72(2):285-317.

Barrett, Betty Jo, Melissa St. Pierre and Nadine Vaillancourt. 2011. “Police Response to Intimate Partner Violence in Canada: Do Victim Characteristics Matter?” *Women & Criminal Justice* 21(1):38-62.

Baumer, Eric P., Richard B. Felson and Steven F. Messner. 2003. “Changes in Police Notification for Rape, 1973-2000.” *Criminology* 41(3):841-872.

Bayley, David and Harold Mendelsohn. 1969. *Minorities and the Police: Confrontation in America*. New York: Free Press.

Behrens, Angela, Christopher Uggen and Jeff Manza. 2003. “Ballot Manipulation and the ‘Menace of Negro Domination’: Racial Threat and Felon Disenfranchisement in the United States, 1850-2002.” *American Journal of Sociology* 109(3):559-605.

Bell, Kathryn and Amy Naugle. 2008. “Intimate Partner Violence Theoretical Considerations: Moving towards a Contextual Framework.” *Clinical Psychology Review* 28(7):1096-107.

Bennett, Pamela. 2011. “The Social Position of Multiracial Groups in the United States: Evidence from Residential Segregation.” *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 34(4):707-729.

Benson, Michael, John Wooldredge, Amy Thistlethwaite and Greer Litton Fox. 2004. “The Correlation between Race and Domestic Violence is Confounded with Community Context.” *Social Problems* 51(3):326-342.

Bidart, Claire. 2021. “Commentary on Bott’s ‘Family and Social Network.’” Pp. 118-134 in Mario Luis Small (ed.) *Personal Networks: Classic Readings and New Directions.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Birzer, Michael and Richard Ellis. 2006. “Debunking the Myth that All is Well in the Home of 'Brown v. Topeka Board of Education': A Study of Perceived Discrimination.” *Journal of Black Studies* 36(6):793-814.

Black, Donald. 1983. “Crime as Social Control.” *American Sociological Review* 48(1):34-45.

Black, Donald. 1979. “Common Sense in the Sociology of Law.” *American Sociological Review* 44(1):18-27.

Blackwell, Brenda Sims and Michael S. 2003. “Police Civil Liability for Inappropriate Response to Domestic Assault Victims.” *Journal of Criminal Justice* 31(2):129-146.

Bonacich, Phillip. 1987. “Power and Centrality: A Family of Measures.” *The American Journal of Sociology* 92(5):1170-1182.

Bonomi, Amy, Victoria Holt, Diane Martin and Robert Thompson. 2006. “Severity of Intimate Partner Violence and Frequency of Police Calls.” *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 21(2):1354-64.

Bosick, Stacey, Callie Marie Rennison, Angela Gover and Mary Dodge. 2012. “Reporting Violence to the Police: Predictors through the Life Course.” *Journal of Criminal Justice* 40(6):441-451.

Botham, Fay. 2009. *Almighty God Created the Races: Christianity, Interracial Marriage, & American Law.* Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.

Bowker, Lee. 1986. *Ending the Violence: A Guidebook Based on the Experience of 1,000 Battered Wives*. Holmes Beach, FL: Learning Publications.

------. 1982. “Police Services to Battered Women: Bad or Not So Bad?” *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 9(4):476-494.

------. 1977. *Drug Use Among American Women, Old and Young: Sexual Oppression and other Themes*. San Francisco: R and E Research Associates.

Bowles, Roger, Maria Garcia Reyes and Nuno Garoupa. 2009. “Crime Reporting Decisions and the Costs of Crime.” *European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research* 15(4):365-377.

Box-Steffensmeier, Janet M. and Bradford S. Jones. 2004. *Event History Modeling: A Guide for Social Scientists*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Bradshaw, Carla K. 1992. “Beauty and the Beast: On Racial Ambiguity.” Pp. 77-88 in Maria P. P. Root (ed.), *Racially Mixed People in America*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Brown, Taylor Kate. 2016, June 10. “Why They Love Trump: ‘He says what we’re thinking” [Video file]. Retrieved February 9, 2023 (https://www.bbc.com/news/av/election-us-2016-36493678).

Browning, Christopher. 2002. “The Span of Collective Efficacy: Extending Social Disorganization Theory to Partner Violence.” *Journal of Marriage and Family* 64(4):833-850.

Browning, Christopher, Seth Feinberg, Robert Dietz. 2004. “The Paradox of Social Organization Networks, Collective Efficacy, and Violent Crime in Urban Neighborhoods.” *Social Forces* 83(2):503-534.

Burkhardt, Brett. 2011. “Ideology over Strategy: Extending Voting Rights to Felons and Ex-felons, 1966-1992.” *Social Science Journal* 48(2):356-363.

Buzawa, Eve, Gerald T. Hotaling and James Byrne. 2007. "Understanding the Impact of Prior Abuse and Prior Victimization on the Decision to Forego Criminal Justice Assistance in

Domestic Violence Incidents: A Life-Course Perspective." *Brief Treatment and Crisis Intervention* 7(1):55-76.

Calabresi, Steven G. and Andrea Matthews. 2012. "Originalism and Loving v. Virginia." *Brigham Young University Law Review* 2012(5):1393-1471.

Capaldi, Deborah, Hyoun Kim, and Joann Shortt. 2007. "Observed Initiation and Reciprocity of Physical Aggression in Young, At-Risk Couples." *Journal of Family Violence* 22(2):101-111.

------. 2004. "Women's Involvement in Aggression in Young Adult Romantic Relationships." Pp. 223-241 in Martha Putallaz and Karen Bierman (eds.), *Aggression, Antisocial Behavior, and Violence among Girls*. New York: Guilford Press.

Capaldi, Deborah and Lee Owen. 2001. "Physical Aggression in a Community Sample of At-Risk Young Couples: Gender Comparisons for High Frequency, Injury, and Fear." *Journal of Family Psychology* 15(3):425-440.

Cauce, Ana Mari, Yumi Hiraga, Craig Mason, Tanya Aguilar, Nydia Ordonez, and Nancy Gonzales. 1992. "Between a Rock and a Hard Place: Social Adjustment of Biracial Youth." Pp. 207-222. in Maria P. P. Root (ed.), *Racially Mixed People in America*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Cazenave, Noel A. 2018. *Killing African Americans: Police and Vigilante Violence as a Racial Control Mechanism*. New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group.

Cazenave, Noel and Darlene Alvarez. 1999. "Defending the White Race: White Male Faculty Opposition to a White Racism Course." *Race and Society* 2(9):25-50.

Cazenave, Noel and Murray Straus 1999. "Race, Class, Network Embeddedness, and Family Violence: A Search for Potent Support Systems." Pp. 321-339 in Murray Straus and Richard Gelles (eds.), *Physical Violence in American Families: Risk Factors and Adaptations to Violence in 8,145 Families*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

------. 1979. "Race, Class, Network Embeddedness, and Family Violence: A Search for Potent Support Systems." *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* 10(3):281-300.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. June 24, 2014. "Intimate Partner Violence: Definitions." Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Retrieved November 8, 2014 (http://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/intimatepartnerviolence/definitions.html).

Centola, Damon. 2021. "Influencers, Backfire Effects, and the Power of the Periphery." Pp. 73-86 in Mario Luis Small (ed.) *Personal Networks: Classic Readings and New Directions* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Chavez, George and Diana Sanchez. 2010. “A Clearer Picture of Multiracial Substance Use: Rates and Correlates of Alcohol and Tobacco Use in Multiracial Adolescents and Adults.” *Race and Social Problems* 2(1):1-18.

Chen, Yingyu and Sarah Ullman. 2010. “Women’s Reporting of Sexual and Physical Assaults to Police in the National Violence Against Women Survey.” *Violence Against Women* 16(3):262-279.

Chiricos, Ted, Kathy Padgett, Jake Bratton, Justin Pickett and Marc Gertz. 2012. “Racial Threat and Opposition to the Re-enfranchisement of Ex-felons.” *International Journal of Criminology and Sociology* 1:13-28.

Cho, Hyunkag. 2012. “Racial Differences in the Prevalence of Intimate Partner Violence against Women and Associated Factors.” *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 27(2):344-363.

Choi, Yoonsun, Michael He, Todd Herrenkohl, Richard Catalano and John Toumbourou. 2012. “Multiple Identification and Risks: Examination of Peer Factors across Multiracial and Single-Race Youth.” *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 41(7):847-862.

CNN 2009. “Louisiana Justice who Refused Interracial Marriage Resigns.” *CNN*. Retrieved March 2, 2023 (https://www.cnn.com/2009/US/11/03/louisiana.interracial.marriage/index.html).

Cohen, Lawrence E. and Marcus Felson. 1979. “Social Change and Crime Rate Trends: A Routine Activity Approach.” *American Sociological Review* 44(4):588-608.

Coleman, Diane and Murray Straus. 1999. “Marital Power, Conflict, and Violence in a Nationally Representative Sample of American Couples.” Pp. 287-304 in Murray Straus and Richard Gelles (eds.), *Physical Violence in American Families: Risk Factors and Adaptations to Violence in 8,145 Families*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Cook, Philip J., Denise C. Gottfredson and Chongmin Na. 2010. “School Crime Control and Prevention.” *Crime and Justice* 39(1):313-440.

Coskun, Deniz. 2007. *Law as Symbolic Form: Ernst Cassirer and the Anthropocentric View of Law.* Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer Verlag.

Cox, Oliver. 1948. *Caste, Class, and Race: A Study in Social Dynamics*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Crawford, Margo Natalie. 2008. *Dilution Anxiety and the Black Phallus*. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press.

Cunningham, Mick. 2001. “The Influence of Parental Attitudes and Behaviors on Children’s Attitudes Toward Gender and Household Labor in Early Adulthood.” *Journal of Marriage and Family* 63(1):111-122.

Dade, Lennell R. and Lloyd R. Sloan. 2000. "An Investigation of Sex-Role Stereotypes in African Americans." *Journal of Black Studies* 30(5):676-690.

Dailey, Jane. 2020. *White Fright: The Sexual Panic at the Heart of America's Racist History.* New York: Basic Books.

Daniel, G. Reginald. 1992a. "Passers and Pluralists: Subverting the Racial Divide." Pp. 91-107. in Maria P. P. Root (ed.), *Racially Mixed People in America*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

------. 1992b. "Beyond Black and White: The New Multiracial Consciousness." Pp. 333-341in Maria P. P. Root (ed.), *Racially Mixed People in America*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Daniels, Cynthia. 1997. *Feminists Negotiate the State: The Politics of Domestic Violence.* Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Davies, Barbara, Stephen Ralph, and Michael Hawton. 1995. "A Study of Client Satisfaction with Family Court Counselling in Cases Involving Domestic Violence." *Family Court Review* 33(3):324-341.

Davis, Kim, Carolyn Rebecca Block and Jacquelyn Campbell. 2007. "Seeking Help from the Police: Battered Women's Decisions and Experiences." *Criminal Justice Studies* 20(1):15-41.

Davis, F. James. 2001. *Who Is Black? One Nation's Definition.* University Park, PA: Penn State University Press.

Decker, Scott. 1981. "Citizen Attitudes toward the Police: A Review of Past Findings and Suggestions for Future Policy." *Journal of Police Science and Administration* 9(3):80-87.

Demanet, Jannick, Orhan Agirdag and Mieke Van Houtte. 2012. "Constrict in the School Context: The Impact of Ethnic School Diversity on the Quantity and Quality of Friendships." *The Sociological Quarterly* 53(4):654-675.

DeMaris, Alfred, Meredith Pugh, and Erika Harman. 1992. "Sex Differences in the Accuracy of Recall of Witnesses of Portrayed Dyadic Violence." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 54(2):335-345.

Dibble, Ursula and Murray Straus. 1999. "Some Social Structure Determinants of Inconsistency between Attitudes and Behavior: The Case of Family Violence." Pp. 167-180 in Murray Straus and Richard Gelles (eds.), *Physical Violence in American Families: Risk Factors and Adaptations to Violence in 8,145 Families*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Dichter, Melissa E. and Richard J. Gelles. 2012. “Women’s Perceptions of Safety and Risk Following Police Intervention for Intimate Partner Violence.” *Violence Against Women* 18(1):44-63.

Dixon, Louise and Nicola Graham-Kevan. 2011. “Understanding the Nature and Etiology of Intimate Partner Violence and Implications for Practice and Policy.” *Clinical Psychology Review* 31(7):1145-155.

Dobash, Russell and R. Emerson Dobash. 2004. “Women’s Violence to Men in Intimate Relationships: Working on a Puzzle.” *British Journal of Criminology* 44(3):324-50.

------. 1979. *Violence against Wives: A Case against the Patriarchy*. New York: Free Press.

Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization, 597 U.S. ___ (2022)

Domínguez, Virginia. 1986. *White by Definition: Social Classification in Creole Louisiana*. New Brunswick, NJ: Brunswick University Press.

Doreian, Patrick, Vladimir Batagelj and Anuška Ferligoj. 2005. Pp. 77-97 in Peter J. Carrington and Stanley Wasserman (eds.), *Models and Methods in Social Network Analysis*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Douglas, Stephen. 1991. *The Complete Lincoln-Douglas Debates of 1858.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Doyle, Jamie Mihoko and Grace Kao. 2007. “Friendship Choices of Multiracial Adolescents: Racial Homophily, Blending, or Amalgamation?” *Social Science Research* 36(2):633-53.

Du Bois, W. E. Burghardt. 1904. *The Souls of Black Folk.* Chicago: A. C. McClurg & Company.

Dutton, Donald. 2006. *Rethinking Domestic Violence.* Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

------. 2002. *The Abusive Personality: Violence and Control in Intimate Relationships.* New York: Guilford Press.

------. 2001. “The Neurobiology of Abandonment Homicide.” *Aggression and Violent Behavior.* 7(4):1-15.

Dutton, Donald and Kenneth Corvo. 2006. “Transforming a Flawed Policy: A Call to Revive Psychology and Science in Domestic Violence Research and Practice.” *Aggression and Violent Behavior* 11(5):457-483.

Dutton, Donald and Tonia Nicholls. 2005. "The Gender Paradigm in Domestic Violence Research and Theory: Part 1—The Conflict of Theory and Data." *Aggression and Violent Behavior* 10(6):680-714.

Dutton, Donald, Keith Saunders, Andrew Starzomski, and Kim Bartholomew. 1994. "Intimacy Anger and Insecure Attachment as Precursors of Abuse in Intimate Relationships." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 24(15):1367-86.

Dutton, Donald and Andrew Starzomski. 1993. "Borderline Personality in Perpetrators of Psychological and Physical Abuse." *Violence and Victims* 8(4):203-222.

Eckhardt, Christopher, Krista Barbour, and Gerald Davis. 1998. "Articulated Thoughts of Maritally Violent and Nonviolent Men During Anger Arousal." *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 66(2):259-269.

Edwards, Laura. 1997. *Gendered Strife and Confusion: The Political Culture of Reconstruction.* Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Everett, Martin G. and Stephen P. Borgatti. 2005. Pp. 57-76 in Peter J. Carrington and Stanley Wasserman (eds.), *Models and Methods in Social Network Analysis*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Fagan, Jeffrey, Douglas Stewart, and Karen Hansen. 1983. "Violent Men or Violent Husbands? Background Factors and Situational Correlates." Pp. 49-68 in David Finkelhor, Richard Gelles, Gerald Hotaling, and Murray Straus (eds.) *The Dark Side of Families: Current Family Violence Research*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Faust, Katherine. 2005. "Using Correspondence Analysis for Joint Displays of Affiliation Networks." Pp. 117-147 in Peter J. Carrington and Stanley Wasserman (eds.), *Models and Methods in Social Network Analysis*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Feagin, Joe. 2014. *Racist America: Roots, Current Realities, and Future Reparations*. New York: Routledge.

Feder, Lynette. 1996. "Police Handling of Domestic Calls: The Importance of Offender's Presence in the Arrest Decision." *Journal of Criminal Justice* 24(6):481-90.

Feld, Scott and Murray Straus. 1999. "Escalation and Desistance from Wife Assault in Marriage." Pp. 489-505 in Murray Straus and Richard Gelles (eds.), *Physical Violence in American Families: Risk Factors and Adaptations to Violence in 8,145 Families*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Felson, Richard. 2008. "The Legal Consequences of Intimate Partner Violence for Men and Women." *Children and Youth Services Review* 30(6):639-646.

Felson, Richard, Jeffrey Ackerman and Catherine Gallagher. 2005. “Police Intervention and the Repeat of Domestic Assault.” *Criminology* 43(3):563-588.

Felson, Richard, Jeffrey Ackerman and Seong-Jin Yeon. 2003. “The Infrequency of Family Violence.” *Journal of Marriage and Family* 65(3):622-634.

Felson, Richard, Steven Messner, Anthony Hoskin and Glenn Deane. 2002. “Reasons for Reporting and Not Reporting Domestic Violence to the Police.” *Criminology* 40(3):617-648.

Felson, Richard and Noah Painter-Davis. 2012. “Another Cost of Being a Young Black Male: Race Weaponry, and Lethal Outcomes in Assaults.” *Social Science Research* 41(5):1241-1253.

Felson, Richard and Paul-Philippe Paré. 2005. “The Reporting of Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault by Nonstrangers to the Police.” *Journal of Marriage and Family* 67(3):597-610.

Fernández, Carlos A. 1992. “La Raza and the Melting Pot: A Comparative Look at Multiethnicity.” Pp. 126-143 in Maria P. P. Root (ed.), *Racially Mixed People in America*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Field, Craig and Raul Caetano. 2004. "Ethnic Differences in Intimate Partner Violence in the US General Population: The Role of Alcohol Use and Socioeconomic Status." *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse* 5(4):303-317.

Finn, Jeanine, Lynn Westbrook, Tiffany Chen and Priscilla Mensah. 2011. “Unprepared for Information Interactions: Abuse Survivors and Police.” *Journal of Documentation* 67(6):933-957.

Fischer, C.S. 2005. “Bowling Alone: What's the Score?” *Social Networks* 27(2):155-167.

Flanagan, Timothy and Michael Vaughn. 1996. “Public Opinion about Police Abuse of Force.” Pp. 113-28. in William Geller and Hans Toch (eds.), *Police Violence* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Fleischman, Anne. 2000. “Neither Fish, Flesh, nor Fowl: Race and Region in the Writings of Charles W. Chesnutt.” *African American Review* 34(3):461-473.

Fleury, Ruth, Cris Sullivan, Deborah Bybee, I. Davidson and S. William. 1998. “‘Why Don't they Just Call the Cops?’ Reasons for Differential Police Contact among Women with Abusive partners.” *Violence and Victims* 13(4):333-346.

Follingstad, Diana R., Ann P. Neckerman and Julia Vormbrock. 1988. “Reactions to Victimization and Coping Strategies of Battered Women: The Ties that Bind.” *Clinical Psychology Review* 8(4):373-390.

Forry, Nicole D., Leigh A. Leslie and Bethany L. Letiecq. 2007. "Marital Quality in Interracial Relationships: The Role of Sex Role Ideology and Perceived Fairness." *Journal of Family Issues* 28(12):1538-1552.

Frank, Ove. 2005. "Network Sampling and Model Fitting." Pp. 31-56 in Peter J. Carrington and Stanley Wasserman (eds.), *Models and Methods in Social Network Analysis*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Freeman, Linton C. 2005. "Graphic Techniques for Exploring Social Network Data." Pp. 248-269 in Peter J. Carrington and Stanley Wasserman (eds.), *Models and Methods in Social Network Analysis*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Frías, Sonia and Ronald Angel. 2013. "Ethnic Heterogamy and the Risk of Partner Violence in Mexico." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 36(11):1666-686.

Frye, Victoria. 2007. "The Informal Social Control of Intimate Partner Violence Against Women: Exploring Personal Attitudes and Perceived Neighborhood Social Cohesion." *Journal of Community Psychology* 35(8):1001-1018.

Garroutte, Eva. 2003. *Real Indians: Identity and the Survival of Native America.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Gavazzi, Stephen M., Patrick C. McKenry, Jill A. Jacobson, Teresa W. Julian and Brenda Lohman. 2000. "Modeling the Effects of Expressed Emotion, Psychiatric Symptomology, and Marital Quality Levels on Male and Female Verbal Aggression." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 62(3):669-682.

Gelles, Richard. 1999a. "Methodological Issues in the Study of Family Violence." Pp. 17-28 in in Murray Straus and Richard Gelles (eds.), *Physical Violence in American Families: Risk Factors and Adaptations to Violence in 8,145 Families*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

------. 1999b. "Violence and Pregnancy: Are Pregnant Women at Greater Risk of Abuse?" Pp. 279-286 in Murray Straus and Richard Gelles (eds.), *Physical Violence in American Families: Risk Factors and Adaptations to Violence in 8,145 Families*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Gelles, Richard and Eileen Hargreaves. 1999. "Maternal Employment and Violence toward Children." Pp. 263-277 in Murray Straus and Richard Gelles (eds.), *Physical Violence in American Families: Risk Factors and Adaptations to Violence in 8,145 Families*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Gelles, Richard and Murray Straus. 1999. "The Medical and Psychological Costs of Family Violence." Pp. 425-430 in Murray Straus and Richard Gelles (eds.), *Physical Violence in*

American Families: Risk Factors and Adaptations to Violence in 8,145 Families. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

------. 1988. *Intimate Violence.* New York: Simon and Schuster.

Gibbs, Jewelle Taylor and Alice M. Hines. 1992. Pp. 223-238 in Maria P. P. Root (ed.), *Racially Mixed People in America*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Goffman, Erving. 1963. *Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity.* New York: Prentice Hall.

Golebiowska, Ewa A. 2007. "The Contours and Etiology of Whites' Attitudes Toward Black-White Interracial Marriage." *Journal of Black Studies* 38(2):268-287.

Goodhines, Patricia A. Jessica M. Desalu, Michelle J. Zaso, Les A. Gellis and Aesoon Park. 2020. "Sleep Problems and Drinking Frequency Among Urban Multiracial and Monoracial Adolescents: Role of Discrimination Experiences and Negative Mood." *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 49(10):2109-2123.

Gover, Angela R., Courtney Welton-Mitchell, Joanne Belknap and Anne P. Deprince. 2013. "When Abuse Happens Again: Women's Reasons for Not Reporting New Incidents of Intimate Partner Abuse to Law Enforcement." *Women and Criminal Justice* 23(2):99-120.

Graham, Katherine, Samantha Wells, and Jennifer Jelley. 2002. "The Social Context of Physical Aggression among Adults." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 17(1):64-83.

Graham-Kevan, Nicola. 2007. "Domestic Violence: Research and Implications for Batterer Programs in Europe." *European Journal of Criminal Policy Research* 13(3-4):217-225.

Graham-Kevan, Nicola and John Archer. 2009. "Control Tactics and Partner Violence in Heterosexual Relationships." *Evolution and Human Behavior* 30(6):445-452.

Granovetter, Mark. 1985. "Economic Action and Social Structure: The Problem of Embeddedness." *American Journal of Sociology* 91(5):481-510.

Greenberg. 2003. "Long-Term Trends in Crimes of Violence (Comment on Cooney, 2003)." *Criminology* 41(4):1407-1418.

Grossman, Susan and Marta Lundy. 2007. "Domestic Violence across Race and Ethnicity: Implications for Social Work Practice and Policy." *Violence against Women* 13(10):1029-52.

Gullickson, Aaron. 2006. "Black/White Interracial Marriage Trends, 1850-2000." *Journal of Family History* 31(3):289-312.

Hall, Christine C. Iijima. 1992a. “Please Choose One: Ethnic Identity Choices for Biracial Individuals.” Pp. 250-264 in Maria P. P. Root (ed.), *Racially Mixed People in America*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

--------. 1992b. “Coloring Outside the Lines.” Pp. 326-329 in Maria P. P. Root (ed.), *Racially Mixed People in America*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Hamel, John. 2005. *Gender-Inclusive Treatment of Intimate Partner Abuse: A Comprehensive Approach*. New York: Springer.

Haney-Lopez, Ian. 2006. *White by Law: The Legal Construction of Race.* New York: New York University Press.

Harris, Cheryl. 1998. “Whiteness as Property.” Pp. 103-18 in David Roediger (ed.), *Black on White: Black Writers on What it Means to be White*. New York: Shocken Books.

Harris, Kathleen Mullan and J. Richard Udry. 2022. *National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent to Adult Health (Add Health), 1994-2018* [Public Use Dataset and Codebooks]. Carolina Population Center, University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill [distributor], Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor]. Retrieved January 28, 2012 (https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR21600.v25).

Harris, Keshia L. 2018. “Biracial American Colorism: Passing for White.” *American Behavioral Scientist* 62(14):2072-2086.

Hawley, Amos. 1950. *Human Ecology: A Theory of Community Structure.* New York: Ronald.

Haynie, Dana and D. Wayne Osgood. 2005. “Reconsidering Peers and Delinquency: How Do Peers Matter?” *Social Forces* 84(2):1109-1130.

Heide, Kathleen. 1999. *Young Killers: The Challenge of Juvenile Homicide.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Helper, Hinton Rowan. 1857. *The Impending Crisis of the South: How to Meet it.* New York: Burdick Brothers.

Hetling, Andrea and Haiyan Zhang. 2010. “Domestic Violence, Poverty, and Social Services: Does Location Matter?” *Social Science Quarterly* 91(5):1144-1163.

Hickman, Christine. 1997. “The Devil and the One Drop Rule: Racial Categories, African Americans, and the U.S. Census.” *Michigan Law Review* 95(5):1161-1265.

Hill, Miriam R. and Volker Thomas. 2000. “Strategies for Racial Identity Development: Narratives of Black and White Women in Interracial Partner Relationships.” *Family Relation* 49(2):193-200.

Holder, Ann. 2008. “What’s Sex Got to Do with It? Race, Power, Citizenship, and ‘Intermediate Identities’ in the Post-Emancipation United States.” *Journal of African American History* 93(2):153-173.

Holmes, William. 1993. “Police Arrests for Domestic Violence.” *American Journal of Police* 12(4):101-25.

Holtzworth-Munroe, Amy, Leonard Bates, Natalie Smutzler, and Elizabeth Sandin. 1997. “A Brief Review of the Research on Husband Violence: Part I. Maritally Violent Versus Nonviolent Men.” *Aggression and Violent Behavior* 2(1):65-99.

Holtzworth-Munroe, Amy, Gregory Stuart, and Glenn Hutchinson. 1997. “Violent versus Nonviolent Husbands: Differences in Attachment Patterns, Dependency, and Jealousy.” *Journal of Family Psychology* 11(3):314-331.

Holy Bible: *English Standard Version.* 2001. Wheaton, IL: Crossway Bibles.

Horwitz, Susan H., Despina Mitchell, Michelle LaRussa-Trott, Lizette Santiago, Joan Pearson, David M. Skiff and Catherine Cerulli. 2011. “An Inside View of Police Officers’ Experience with Domestic Violence.” *Journal of Family Violence* 26(8):617-625.

Hotaling, Gerald, Murray Straus and Alan Lincoln. “Intrafamily Violence and Crime and Violence Outside the Family.” Pp. 431-470 in Murray Straus and Richard Gelles (eds.), *Physical Violence in American Families: Risk Factors and Adaptations to Violence in 8,145 Families*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

House of Commons Sitting. July 16, 1973. *Battered Wives*. House of Commons Debate 860:218-28. Retrieved November 8, 2014 (http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/commons/1973/jul/16/battered-wives).

Hughey, Matthew. 2012. “Stigma Allure and White Antiracist Identity Management.” *Social Psychology Quarterly* 75(3):219-241.

Huisman, Mark and Marijtje A. J. van Duijin. 2005. “Software for Social Network Analysis.” Pp. 270-316 in Peter J. Carrington and Stanley Wasserman (eds.), *Models and Methods in Social Network Analysis*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Huitsing, Gijs, René Veenstra, Miia Sainio and Christina Salmivalli. 2012. “‘It Must be Me’ or ‘It Could be Them?’: The Impact of the Social Network Position of Bullies and Victims on Victims’ Adjustment.” *Social Networks* 34(4):379-386.

Hutchinson, Ira, J. David Hirschel, and Carolyn Pesackis 1994. “Family Violence and Police Utilization.” *Violence and Victims* 9(4):299-313.

Ioannides, Yannis M. and Linda Datcher Loury. “Job Information Networks, Neighborhood Effects, and Inequality.” *Journal of Economic Literature* 42(4):1056-1093.

Jacobs, David and Daniel Tope. 2007. “The Politics of Resentment in the Post Civil Rights Era: Minority Threat, Homicide, and Ideological Voting in Congress.” *American Journal of Sociology* 112(5):1458-1494.

Jacobs, James H. 1992. “Identity Development in Biracial Children.” Pp. 190-206 in Maria P. P. Root (ed.), *Racially Mixed People in America*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Jacobson, Neil, John Gottman, Eric Gortner, Sara Berns, and Joann Shortt. 1996. “Psychological Factors in the Longitudinal Course of Battering: When Do the Couples Split up? When Does the Abuse Decrease?” *Violence and Victims*. 11(4):371-392.

Jacobson, Neil, John Gottman, Jennifer Waltz, Regina Rushe, Julia Babcock, Amy Holtzworth-Munroe and Larry Beutler. 1994. “Affect, Verbal Content, and Psychophysiology in the Arguments of Couples with a Violent Husband.” *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 62(5):982-988.

Jenkins, Lyndsay N. and Michelle Kilpatrick Demaray. 2012. “Social Support and Self-Concept in Relation to Peer Victimization and Peer Aggression.” *Journal of School Violence* 11(1):56-74.

Johnson, Deborah J. 1992. “Developmental Pathways: Toward an Ecological Theoretical Formulation of Race Identity in Black-White Biracial Children.” Pp. 37-49 in Maria P. P. Root (ed.), Racially Mixed People in America. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Johnson, Ida M. 2007. “Victims’ Perceptions of Police Response to Domestic Violence Incidents.” *Journal of Criminal Justice* 35(5):498-510.

Johnson, Michael. 2005. “Domestic Violence: It’s Not about Gender—Or is it?” *Journal of Marriage and Family* 67(5):1126-1130.

------. 1995. “Patriarchal Terrorism and Common Couple Violence: Two Forms of Violence Against Women.” *Journal of Marriage and Family* 57(2):283-294.

Johnson, Ronald C. 1992. “Offspring of Cross-Race and Cross-Ethnic Marriages in Hawaii.” Pp. 239-249 in Maria P. P. Root (ed.), *Racially Mixed People in America*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Johnson, Wendi, Peggy Giordano, Wendy Manning, and Monica Longmore. 2015. “The Age-IPV Curve: Changes in the Perpetration of Intimate Partner Violence During Adolescence and Young Adulthood.” *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 44(3):708-726.

Jones, Edward, Amerigo Farina, Albert Hastorf, Hazel Markus, Dale Miller, & Robert Scott. 1984. *Social Stigma: The Psychology of Marked Relationships.* New York: Freeman.

Jones, Lisa, Kimberly J. Mitchell and David Finkelhor. 2012. “Trends in Youth Internet Victimization: Findings from Three Youth Internet Safety Surveys 2000-2010.” *Journal of Adolescent Health* 50(2):179-186.

Kadushin, Charles. 2004. “Too Much Investment in Social Capital?” *Social Networks* 26(1):75-90.

Kalmuss, Debra and Murray Straus. 1999. “Wife’s Marital Dependency and Wife Abuse.” Pp. 369-382 in Murray Straus and Richard Gelles (eds.), *Physical Violence in American Families: Risk Factors and Adaptations to Violence in 8,145 Families*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Kane, Robert. 1999. “Patterns of Arrest in Domestic Violence Encounters: Identifying a Police Decision-Making Model.” *Journal of Criminal Justice* 27(1):65-79.

Kantor, Glenda Kaufman and Murray Straus. 1999a. “The ‘Drunken Bum’ Theory of Wife Beating.” Pp. 203-224 Straus, Murray. 1999. “The Conflict Tactics Scales and Its Critics: An Evaluation and New Data on Validity and Reliability.” Pp. 49-73 in Murray Straus and Richard Gelles (eds.), *Physical Violence in American Families: Risk Factors and Adaptations to Violence in 8,145 Families*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

------ 1999b. “Response of Victims and the Police to Assaults on Wives.” Pp. 473-487 in Murray Straus and Richard Gelles (eds.), *Physical Violence in American Families: Risk Factors and Adaptations to Violence in 8,145 Families*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Kaukinen, Catherine. 2004. "The Help-Seeking Strategies of Female Violent-Crime Victims the Direct and Conditional Effects of Race and the Victim-Offender Relationship." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 19(9):967-990.

Kaukinen, Catherine Elizabeth, Silke Meyer and Caroline Akers. 2013. “Status Compatibility and Help-Seeking Behaviors Among Female Intimate Partner Violence Victims.” *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 28(3):577-601.

Kernsmith, Poco and Sarah Craun. 2008. “Predictors of Weapon Use in Domestic Violence Incidents Reported to Law Enforcement.” *Journal of Family Violence* 23(7):589-96.

Knoke, David and Song Yang. 2020. *Social Network Analysis*. Los Angeles: Sage Publications.

Kich, George Kitahara. 1992. “The Developmental process of Asserting a Biracial, Bicultural Identity.” Pp. 304-317 in Maria P. P. Root (ed.), *Racially Mixed People in America*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

King, Ryan, Steven Messner and Robert Baller. 2009. “Contemporary Hate Crimes, Law Enforcement, and the Legacy of Racial Violence.” *American Sociological Review* 74(2):291-315.

King-O’Riain, Rebecca Chiyoko. 2004. “Model Majority? The Struggle for Identity among Multiracial Japanese Americans.” Pp. 177-192 in Heather M. Dalmadge (ed.), *The Politics of Multiracialism: Challenging Racial Thinking*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Kitch, Sally. 2009. *The Specter of Sex: Gendered Foundations of Racial Formation in the United States.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Kleinberg, Sally J. 1999. *Women in the United States, 1830-1945.* New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Koehly, Laura M. and Philippa Pattison. 2005. “Random Graph Models for Social Networks: Multiple Relations or Multiple Raters.” Pp. 162-191 in Peter J. Carrington and Stanley Wasserman (eds.), *Models and Methods in Social Network Analysis*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Kraeger, Derek. 2007a. “When it's Good to be 'Bad': Violence and Adolescent Peer Acceptance.” *Criminology* 45(4):893-923.

Kraeger, Derek. 2007b. “Unnecessary Roughness? School Sports, Peer Networks, and Male Adolescent Violence.” *American Sociological Review* 72(5):705-724.

Kydd, Andrew H. 2021. “Decline, Radicalization and the Attack on the US Capitol.” *Violence: An International Journal* 2(1):3-23.

Lacey, Krim, Daniel Saunders and Lingling Zhang. 2011. “A Comparison of Women of Color and Non-Hispanic White Women on Factors Related to Leaving a Violent Relationship.” *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 26(5):1036-55.

Landor, Antoinette M. and Carolyn Tucker Halpern. 2016. “Prevalence of High-Risk Sexual Behaviors Among Monoracial and Multiracial Groups from a National Sample: Are Multiracial Young Adults at Greater Risk?” *Archives of Sexual Behavior* 45(2):467-475.

Lee, Hee Yun, Eonju Park and Elizabeth Lightfoot. 2010. “When Does a Battered Woman Seek Help from the Police? The Role of Battered Women’s Functionality.” *Journal of Family Violence* 25(2):195-204.

Lee, Jennifer and Frank D. Bean. 2004. “America’s Changing Color Lines: Immigration, Race/Ethnicity, and Multiracial Identification.” *Annual Review of Sociology* 30(1):221-242.

Lee, Matthew R. 2000. “Community Cohesion and Violent Predatory Victimization: A Theoretical Extension and Cross National Test of Opportunity Theory.” *Social Forces* 79(2):683-706.

Leonard, Kenneth and Linda Roberts. 1998. “The Effects of Alcohol on the Marital Interactions of Aggressive and Nonaggressive Husbands and their Wives.” *Journal of Abnormal Psychology* 107(4):602-615.

Levey, Jessica. 2023, March 9. “The Beginning of the End of Marriage Equality in Tennessee? A Closer Look at HB 878.” *American Marriage Ministries* Retrieved March 12, 2023 (https://theamm.org/articles/1598-the-beginning-of-the-end-of-marriage-equality-in-tennessee-a-closer-look-at-hb-8).

Liebler, Carolyn and Marie DeRousse-Wu. 2012. “Intergenerational Transmission of Race: Permeable Boundaries between 1970 and 2010.” Center for Economic Studies (Census Bureau) Working Paper CES-WP-12-24.

Liebler, Carolyn A., Sonya R. Porter, Leticia E. Fernandez, James M. Noon and Sharon R. Ennis. 2017. “America’s Churning Races: Race and Ethnicity Response Changes Between Census 2000 and the 2010 Census.” *Demography* 54(1):259-284.

Lininger, Tom. 2009. “The Sound of Silence: Holding Batterers Accountable for Silencing their Victims.” *Texas Law Review* 87(5):857-912.

Lipsky, Sherry, Raul Caetano, Craig A. Field and Gregory L. Larkin. 2006. “The Role of Intimate Partner Violence, Race, and Ethnicity in Help-Seeking Behaviors.” *Ethnicity and Health* 11(1):81-100.

Lipsky, Sherry, Meg Cristofalo, Sarah Reed, Raul Caetano and Peter Roy-Byrne. 2012. “Racial and Ethnic Disparities in Police-Reported Intimate Partner Violence Perpetration: A Mixed-Methods Approach.” *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 27(11):2144-62.

Lipsky, Sherry, Raul Caetano, Craig Field and Gregory Larkin. 2006. "The Role of Intimate Partner Violence, Race, and Ethnicity in Help-Seeking Behaviors." *Ethnicity and Health* 11(1):81-100.

Livingston, Gretchen and Anna Brown. 2017, May 18. “Intermarriage in the U.S. 50 Years After Loving v. Virginia.” *Pew Research Center* Retrieved February 18, 2023 (https://www.pewresearch.org/social-trends/2017/05/18/1-trends-and-patterns-in-intermarriage/).

Loving v. Virginia, 388 U.S. 1 (1967)

Lubin, Alex. 2005. *Romance and Rights: The Politics of Interracial Intimacy, 1945-1954.* Jackson, MS: University Press of Mississippi.

Luscombe, Belinda. 2021, January 21. "'It Makes Me Sick with Grief': Trump's Presidency Divided Families. What Happens to Them Now?" *Time* Retrieved March 8, 2023 (https://time.com/5931349/trump-divided-families/).

Lyons, Christopher. 2007. "Community (Dis)Organization and Racially Motivated Crime." *American Journal of Sociology* 113(3):815-863.

MacQueen, Sarah and Paul A. Norris. 2014. "Police Awareness and Involvement in Cases of Domestic and Partner Abuse." *Policing and Society* 26(1):55-76.

Margolin, Gayla, Richard John, and Lisa Gleberman. 1989. "Affective Responses to Conflictual Discussions in Violent and Non-Violent Couples." *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 56(3):24-33.

Marsden, Peter V. 2005. "Recent Developments in Network Measurement." Pp. 8-30 in Peter J. Carrington and Stanley Wasserman (eds.), *Models and Methods in Social Network Analysis*. N32 York: Cambridge University Press.

Martin, John Levi and Hyunku Kwon. 2021. "Festinger, Schachter, and Back's *Social Pressures in Informal Groups*." Pp. 151-162 in Mario Luis Small (ed.) *Personal Networks: Classic Readings and New Directions.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Maryland Assembly. 1692, May 10-June 9. An Act concerning Negro Slaves. Pp. 546-49 in William Browne (ed.) *Archives of Maryland*. Vol. 13 (1893). Baltimore: Maryland Historical Society.

------. 1681, September. An Act concerning Negroes & Slaves. Pp. 203-4 in William Browne (ed.) *Archives of Maryland*. Vol. 7 (1889). Baltimore: Maryland Historical Society.

------. 1664, September. An Act Concerning Negroes & other Slaves. Pp. 533-34 in William Browne (ed.), *Archives of Maryland*. Vol. 1 (1883). Baltimore: Maryland Historical Society.

Mass, Amy Iwasaki. 1992. "Interracial Japanese Americans: The Best of Both Worlds or the End of the Japanese American Community?" Pp. 265-279 in Maria P. P. Root (ed.), *Racially Mixed People in America*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Massachusetts Body of Liberties. 1641. The Hanover Historical Texts Project. Retrieved November 8, 2014 (http://history.hanover.edu/texts/masslib.html).

Massachusetts General Court. 1705, December 5. AN ACT FOR THE BETTER PREVENTING OF A SPURIOUS AND MIXTD ISSUE, [&c.] Pp. 578-79 in *The ACTS AND RESOLVES, PUBLIC AND PRIVATE, OF THE* Province of the Massachusetts Bay. Vol. 1 (1869). Boston: Wright & Potter.

McCarthy, Justin. 2021, September 10. "U.S. Approval of Interracial Marriage at New High of 94%." *Gallup News* Retrieved March 8, 2023 (https://news.gallup.com/poll/354638/approval-interracial-marriage-new-high.aspx).

McCarty, Christopher. 2021. "Implications of Informant Accuracy Research for Ego Networks." Pp. 174-184 in Mario Luis Small (ed.), *Personal Networks: Classic Readings and New Directions.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

McDonald, Steve. 2011 "What's in the 'Old Boys' Network? Accessing Social Capital in Gendered and Racialized Networks." *Social Networks* 33(4):317-330.

McKenry, Patrick C., Teresa W. Julian and Stephen M. Gavazzi. 1995. "Toward a Biopsychosocial Model of Domestic Violence." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 57(2):307-320.

Medalia, Nahum Z. 1962. "Mydral's Assumptions on Race Relations: A Conceptual Commentary." *Social Forces* 40(3):223-227.

Meier, Robert and Terance Miethe. 1993. "Understanding Theories of Criminal Victimization." *Crime and Justice* 17:459-499.

Meloy, Reid. 1992. *Violent Attachments*. Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson, Inc.

Merton, Robert K. 1972. "Insiders and Outsiders: A Chapter in the Sociology of Knowledge." *American Journal of Sociology* 78(1):9-47.

Meyer, Silke. 2012. "Why Women Stay: A Theoretical Examination of Rational Choice and Moral Reasoning in the Context of Intimate Partner Violence." *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology* 45(2):179-193.

Miller, Robin L. 1992. "The Human Ecology of Multiracial identity. Pp. 24-36 in Maria P. P. Root (ed.), *Racially Mixed People in America.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Millward, Jessica. 2010. "'The Relics of Slavery': Interracial Sex and Manumission in the American South." *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies* 31(3):22-30.

Mische, Ann. 2021. "On Parachutes and Lion-Taming." Pp. 199-210 in Mario Luis Small (ed.), *Personal Networks: Classic Readings and New Directions.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Minnesota Statute 2014. 518B.01.

Miscegenation: The Theory of the Blending of the Races, Applied to the American White Man and Negro. 1864. New York: H. Dexter, Hamilton & Company.

Morgan, Edmund. 1975. *American Slavery American Freedom: The Ordeal of Colonial Virginia*. New York: W.W. Norton.

Myrdal, Gunnar. 1944. *An American Dilemma: The Negro Problem and Modern Democracy.* New York: Harper & Row.

Nakao, Keiko and Judith Treas. 1994. "Updating Occupational Prestige and Socioeconomic Scores: How the New Measures Measure Up." *Sociological Methodology* 24:1-72.

Nakashima, Cynthia. 1992. "An Invisible Monster: The Creation and Denial of Mixed Race People in America." Pp. 162-178 in Maria P. P. Root (ed.), *Racially Mixed People in America*, Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Nash, Philip Tajitsu. 1992. "Multicultural Identity and the Death of Stereotypes." Pp. 330-332 in Maria P. P. Root (ed.), *Racially Mixed People in America*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

National Domestic Violence Hotline. n.d. "Survivors of Domestic Violence Report Feeling Less Safe After Contacting Law Enforcement." National Domestic Violence Hotline. Retrieved March 7, 2023 (https://www.thehotline.org/news/survivors-of-domestic-violence-report-feeling-less-safe-after-contacting-law-enforcement/).

National Women's Aid Federation n.d. "Our History - 1970s." National Women's Aid Federation. Retrieved November 8, 2014 (http://www.womensaid.org.uk/landing_page.asp?section=00010001001900040004).

NBC News, 2009, November 3. "La. Official Quits After Interracial Marriage Flap: A Louisiana Justice of the Peace who Refused to Marry a Couple Because the Bride was White and Groom was Black Resigns." *NBC News.* Retrieved March 4, 2023 (https://www.nbcnews.com/id/wbna33609707).

Ng, Christina. 2011, December 1. "Kentucky Church Bans Interracial Couples." *ABC News* Retrieved March 8 2023 (https://abcnews.go.com/US/kentucky-church-bans-interracial-couples/story?id=15065204).

Novkov, Julie. 2011. "The Thirteenth Amendment and the Meaning of Familial Bonds." *Maryland Law Review* 71(1):203-228.

Obergefell v. Hodges, 576 U.S. 644 (2015).

Oh, Hongseok, Myung-Ho Chung and Giuseppe Labianca. 2004. "Group Social Capital and Group Effectiveness: The Role of Informal Socializing Ties." *The Academy of Management Journal* 47(6):860-875.

O'Leary, K. Daniel, Amy Smith Slep, and Susan O'Leary. 2007. "Multivariate Models of Men's and Women's Partner Aggression." *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 75(5):752-764.

Omi, Michael and Howard Winant. 1994. *Racial Formation in the United States from the 1960s to the 1990s*. New York: Routledge.

Panchal, Nirmita, Heather Saunders, Robin Rudowitz and Cynthia Cox. 2023, March 20. "The Implications of COVID-19 for Mental Health and Substance Use." *KFF* Retrieved March 28, 2023 (https://www.kff.org/coronavirus-covid-19/issue-brief/the-implications-of-covid-19-for-mental-health-and-substance-use/).

Papachristos, Andrew V. 2009. "Murder by Structure: Dominance Relations and the Social Structure of Gang Homicide." *American Journal of Sociology* 115(1):74-128.

Papachristos, Andrew V., Anthony A. Braga and David M. Hureau. 2012. "Social Networks and the Risk of Gunshot Injury." *Journal of Urban Health* 89(6):992-1003.

Papachristos, Andrew V., David M. Hureau and Anthony A. Braga. 2013. "The Corner and the Crew: The Influence of Geography and Social Networks on Gang Violence." *American Sociological Review* 78(3):417-447.

Park, Robert E. 1928 "Human Migration and the Marginal Man." *American Journal of Sociology* 33(6): 881-893.

Parker, Kim, Juliana Menasce Horowitz, Rich Morin and Mark Hugo Lopez. 2015, June 11. "Multiracial in America: Proud, Diverse and Growing in Numbers." *Pew Research Center* Retrieved August 27, 2015 (https://www.pewresearch.org/social-trends/2015/06/11/multiracial-in-america/).

Pascoe, Peggy. 2010. *What Comes Naturally.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Pauker, Kristin, Chanel Meyers, Diana T. Sanchez, Sarah E. Gaither and Danielle M. Young. 2018. "A Review of Multiracial Malleability: Identity, Categorization, and Shifting Racial Attitudes." *Social and Personality Psychology Compass* 12(6):1-15.

Pearlman, Deborah, Sally Zierler, Annie Gjelsvik and Wendy Verhoek-Oftedahl. 2003. "Neighborhood Environment, Racial Position, and Risk of Police-Reported Domestic Violence: A Contextual Analysis." *Public Health Reports* 118(1):44-58.

Pennell, Susan and Cynthia Burke. 2002. "Evaluation of a Centralized Response to Domestic Violence by the San Diego County Sheriff's Department Domestic Violence Unit 1998-1999." Ann Arbor, Michigan: Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor].

Phillips, Scott and Sean Varano. 2008. "Police Criminal Charging Decisions: An Examination of Post-Arrest Decision-Making." *Journal of Criminal Justice* 36(4):307-15.

Planned Parenthood of Southeastern Pennsylvania v. Casey, 505 U.S. 833 (1991).

Pleck, Elizabeth. 1989. "Criminal Approaches to Family Violence." *Family Violence* 11:19-57.

------. 1979. "Wife Beating in Nineteenth-Century America." *Victimology: An International Journal* 4(3):64-5.

Poteyeva, Margarita and Ivan Y. Sun. 2009. "Gender Differences in Police Officers' Attitudes: Assessing Current Empirical Evidence." *Journal of Criminal Justice* 37(5):512-522.

Powell, John A. 2013. "Tracing the History of Racial Inclusion and Debunking the Color-Blind/Post-Racial Myth." *Human Rights* 40(1):17-21.

Putnam, Robert. 2000. *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community.* New York: Simon & Schuster.

Quillian, Lincoln and Rozlyn Redd. 2009. "The Friendship Networks of Multiracial Adolescents." *Social Science Research* 38(2):279-295.

Rabe-Hemp, Cara E. 2008. "Female Officers and the Ethic of Care: Does Officer Gender Impact Police Behaviors?" *Journal of Criminal Justice* 36(5):426-434.

Raghavan, Chitra, Valli Rajah, Katie Gentile, Lillian Collado and Ann Marie Kavanagh. 2009. "Community Violence, Social Support Networks, Ethnic Group Differences, and Male Perpetration of Intimate Partner Violence." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 24(10):1615-1632.

Rennison, Callie Marie and Mike Planty. 2003. "Nonlethal Intimate Partner Violence: Examining Race, Gender, and Income Patterns." *Violence and Victims* 18(4):433-443.

Rennison, Callie Marie and Michael Rand. 2007. "Introduction to the National Crime Victimization Survey." In James P. Lynch and Lynn A. Addington (eds.), *Understanding Crime Statistics: Revisiting the Divergence of the NCVS and the UCR.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Respect. 2008, November 8. "Respect Position Statement: Gender and Domestic Violence." Respect. Retrieved November 17, 2014 (http://respect.uk.net/data/files/respect_gender__dv_position_satatement.doc).

"Respect for Marriage Act" H.R. 8404. 2022, December 13. 117th Congress Public Law 228.

Reyns, Bradford W. and Christine M. Englebrecht. 2010. "The Stalking Victim's Decision to Contact the Police: A Test of Gottfredson and Gottfredson's Theory of Criminal Justice Decision Making." *Journal of Criminal Justice* 38(5):998-1005.

Robins, Garry and Philippa Pattison. 2005. "Interdependencies and Social Processes: Dependence Graphs and Generalized Dependence Structures." Pp. 192-214 in Peter J. Carrington and Stanley Wasserman (eds.), *Models and Methods in Social Network Analysis*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Rocha, Rene R. and Tetsuya Matsubayashi. 2013. "The Politics of Race and Voter ID Laws in the States: The Return of Jim Crow?" *Political Research Quarterly* 67(3):666-679.

Roe v. Wade, 410 U.S. 113 (1973).

Roediger, David. 1999. *The Wages of Whiteness: Race and the Making of the American Working Class.* New York: Verso.

Root, Maria P. P. 2001. *Love's Revolution: Interracial Marriage.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

------. 1992a. "Within, Between, and Beyond Race." Pp. 3-11 in Maria P. P. Root (ed.), *Racially Mixed People in America*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

------. 1992b. "Back to the Drawing Board: Methodological Issues in Research on Multiracial People." Pp. 181-189 in Maria P. P. Root (ed.), *Racially Mixed People in America*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

------. 1992c. "From Shortcuts to Solutions." Pp. 342-347 in Maria P. P. Root (ed.), *Racially Mixed People in America*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Roscigno, Vincent, Diana Karafin, and Griff Tester. 2009. "The Complexities and Processes of Racial Housing Discrimination." *Social Problems* 56(1):49-69.

Rosenfeld, Richard and Ernesto Lopez. 2021, May. "Pandemic, Social Unrest, and Crime in U.S. Cities: March 2021 Update." Prepared for the National Commission on COVID-19 and Criminal Justice *Council on Criminal Justice* Retrieved March 8, 2023 (https://councilоncj.org/impact-report-covid-19-and-crime/).

Rubertsson, Christine, Ingegerd Hildingsson and Ingela Rådestad. 2010. "Disclosure and Police Reporting of Intimate Partner Violence Postpartum: A Pilot Study." *Midwifery* 26(1):1-5.

Ruggles, Steven, Sarah Flood, Matthew Sobek, Danika Brockman, Grace Cooper, Stephanie Richards, and Megan Schouweiler. 2023. IPUMS USA: Version 13.0 [dataset]. Minneapolis, MN: IPUMS. Retrieved November 20, 2023 (https://doi.org/10.18128/D010.V13.0).

Russell-Cole, Kathy, Midge Wilson, and Ronald E. Hall. 2013. *The Color Complex: The Politics of Skin Color in a New Millennium.* New York: Anchor Books.

Sampson, Robert. 1984. "Group Size, Heterogeneity, and Intergroup Conflict: A Test of Blau's *Inequality and Heterogeneity*." *Social Forces* 62(3):618-39.

Sanchez, Diana and Julie Garcia. 2009. "When Race Matters: Racially Stigmatized Others and Perceiving Race as a Biological Construction Affect Biracial People's Daily Well-Being." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 35(9):1154-1164.

Sapouna, Maria, Dieter Wolke, Natalie Vannini, Scott Watson, Sarah Woods, Wolfgang Schneider, Sibylle Enz and Ruth Aylett. 2012. "Individual and Social Network Predictors of the Short-Term Stability of Bullying Victimization in the United Kingdom and Germany." *British Journal of Educational Psychology* 82(2):225-240.

Scheick, William J. 1979. *The Half-Blood: A Cultural Symbol in 19th-Century American Fiction*. Lexington, KY: The University Press of Kentucky.

Schore, Alan. 2003a. *Affect Dysregulation and the Disorders of the Self.* New York: Norton.

------. 2003b. *Affect Regulation and the Repair of the Self.* New York: Norton.

Schreck, Christopher, Bonnie Fisher, and J. Mitchell Miller. 2004. "The Social Context of Violent Victimization: A Study of the Delinquent Peer Effect." *Justice Quarterly* 21(1):23-47.

Shih, Margaret and Diana T. Sanchez. 2005. "Perspectives and Research on the Positive and Negative Implications of Having Multiple Racial Identities." *Psychological Bulletin* 131(4):569-591.

Sirin, Selcuk and Lisa R. Jackson. 2001. "Examining School Engagement of African American Adolescents." *Institute of Education Services* Retrieved October 30, 2011 (https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED454318).

Smith, Douglas. 1987. "Police Response to Interpersonal Violence: Defining the Parameters of Legal Control." *Social Forces* 65(3):767-782.

Snelling, William Joseph. 1985. *Tales of the Northwest*. Minneapolis: Dorset Press.

Snijders, Tom A. B. 2005. "Models for Longitudinal Network Data." Pp. 215-247 in Peter J. Carrington and Stanley Wasserman (eds.), *Models and Methods in Social Network Analysis*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Sohoni, Deenesh. 2007. "Unsuitable Suitors: Anti-miscegenation Laws, Naturalization Laws, and the Construction of Asian Identities." *Law and Society Review* 41(3):587-618.

Sollors, Werner. 1997. *Neither Black Nor White Yet Both*. Oxford University Press: New York.

De Souza, Leite, Maísa Tavares, Maria Fernanda Santos Figueiredo, Orlene Veloso Dias, Maria Aparecida Vieira, Luís Paulo Souza e Souza and Danilo Cangussu Mendes. 2014. "Reports of Violence Against Women in Different Life Cycles." *Revista Latino-Americana de Enfermagem* 22:85-92.

South, Scott and Steven Messner. 1986. "Structural Determinants of Intergroup Association: Interracial Marriage and Crime." *American Journal of Sociology* 91(6):1409-1430.

Southern Poverty Law Center. 2015, November 13. "Meet the Anti-LGBT Hate Group that Filed an Amicus Brief with the Alabama Supreme Court." Southern Poverty Law Center. Retrieved March 7, 2023 (https://www.splcenter.org/hatewatch/2015/11/13/meet-anti-lgbt-hate-group-filed-amicus-brief-alabama-supreme-court).

Spickard, Paul R. 1992. "The Illogic of American Racial Categories." Pp. 12-23 in Maria P. P. Root (ed.), *Racially Mixed People in America*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Spickard, Paul R. 1991. *Mixed Blood: Intermarriage & Ethnic: Intermarriage and Ethnic Identity in Twentieth Century America*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Stein, Judith A., Richard L. Dukes, and Jazmin I. 2007. "Adolescent Male Bullies, Victims, and Bully-Victims: A Comparison of Psychosocial and Behavioral Characteristics." *Journal of Pediatric Psychology* 32(3):273-282.

Stephan, Cookie White. 1992. "Mixed-Heritage Individuals: Ethnic Identity and Trait Characteristics." Pp. 50-63 in Maria P. P. Root (ed.), *Racially Mixed People in America*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Stets, Jan and Murray Straus. 1999a. "Gender Differences in Reporting Marital Violence and Its Medical and Psychological Consequences." Pp. 151-165 in Murray Straus and Richard Gelles (eds.), *Physical Violence in American Families: Risk Factors and Adaptations to Violence in 8,145 Families*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

------. 1999b. "The Marriage License as a Hitting License: A Comparison of Assaults in Dating, Cohabitating, and Married Couples." Pp. 227-244 Straus, Murray. 1999. "The Conflict Tactics Scales and Its Critics: An Evaluation and New Data on Validity and Reliability." Pp. 49-73 in Murray Straus and Richard Gelles (eds.), *Physical Violence in American Families: Risk Factors and Adaptations to Violence in 8,145 Families*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Stith, Sandra, Douglas Smith, Carrie Penn, David Ward, and Dari Tritt. 2004. "Intimate Partner Physical Abuse Perpetration and Victimization Risk Factors: A Meta-Analytic Review." *Aggression and Violent Behavior* 10(1):65-98.

Stonequist, Everett V. 1937. *The Marginal Man*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Straus, Murray. 1999a. “Injury and Frequency of Assault and the ‘Representative Sample Fallacy’ in Measuring Wife Beating and Child Abuse.” Pp. 75-91 in Murray Straus and Richard Gelles (eds.), *Physical Violence in American Families: Risk Factors and Adaptations to Violence in 8,145 Families*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

------. 1999b. “Measuring Intrafamily Conflict and Violence: The Conflict Tactics Scales.” Pp. 29-47 in Murray Straus and Richard Gelles (eds.), *Physical Violence in American Families: Risk Factors and Adaptations to Violence in 8,145 Families*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

------. 1999c. “Ordinary Violence, Child Abuse, and Wife Beating: What Do They Have in Common?” Pp. 403-424 in Murray Straus and Richard Gelles (eds.), *Physical Violence in American Families: Risk Factors and Adaptations to Violence in 8,145 Families*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

------. 1999d. “Social Stress and marital Violence in a National Sample of American Families.” Pp. 181-201 Straus, Murray. 1999. “The Conflict Tactics Scales and Its Critics: An Evaluation and New Data on Validity and Reliability.” Pp. 49-73 in Murray Straus and Richard Gelles (eds.), *Physical Violence in American Families: Risk Factors and Adaptations to Violence in 8,145 Families*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

------. 1999e. “The Conflict Tactics Scales and Its Critics: An Evaluation and New Data on Validity and Reliability.” Pp. 49-73 in Murray Straus and Richard Gelles (eds.), *Physical Violence in American Families: Risk Factors and Adaptations to Violence in 8,145 Families*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

------. 1999f. “The National Family Violence Surveys.” Pp. 3-16 in Murray Straus and Richard Gelles (eds.), *Physical Violence in American Families: Risk Factors and Adaptations to Violence in 8,145 Families*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Straus, Murray and Richard Gelles. 1999a. “How Violent Are American Families? Estimates from the National Family Violence Resurvey and Other Studies.” Pp. 95-112 in Murray Straus and Richard Gelles (eds.), *Physical Violence in American Families: Risk Factors and Adaptations to Violence in 8,145 Families*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

------. 1999b. “Societal Change and Change in Family Violence from 1975 to 1985 As Revealed by Two National Surveys.” Pp. 113-131 in Murray Straus and Richard Gelles (eds.), *Physical Violence in American Families: Risk Factors and Adaptations to Violence in 8,145 Families*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Straus, Murray, Richard Gelles, and Suzanne Steinmetz. 1980. *Behind Closed Doors: Violence in the American Family*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Press/Doubleday.

Straus, Murray and Christine Smith. 1999a. “Family Patterns and Child Abuse.” Pp. 245-261 in Murray Straus and Richard Gelles (eds.), *Physical Violence in American Families: Risk Factors and Adaptations to Violence in 8,145 Families*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

------. 1999b. “Family Patterns and Primary Prevention of Family Violence.” Pp. 507-526 in Murray Straus and Richard Gelles (eds.), *Physical Violence in American Families: Risk Factors and Adaptations to Violence in 8,145 Families*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

------. 1999c. “Violence in Hispanic Families in the United States: Incidence Rates and Structural Interpretations.” Pp. 341-367 in Murray Straus and Richard Gelles (eds.), *Physical Violence in American Families: Risk Factors and Adaptations to Violence in 8,145 Families*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Sugarman, David and Susan Frankel. 1996. “Patriarchal Ideology and Wife-Assault: A Meta-Analytic Review.” *Journal of Family Violence* 11:13-40.

Suitor, J. Jill, Karl Pillemer and Murray Straus. 1999. “Marital Violence in a Life Course Perspective.” Pp. 305-317 in Murray Straus and Richard Gelles (eds.), *Physical Violence in American Families: Risk Factors and Adaptations to Violence in 8,145 Families*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Sulak, Tracey, Terrill Saxon and Danielle Fearon. 2014. “Applying the Theory of Reasoned Action to Domestic Violence Reporting Behavior: The Role of Sex and Victimization.” *Journal of Family Violence* 29(2):165-173.

Sulak, Tracey, Terrill Saxon, and Danielle Fearon. 2014. “Applying the Theory of Reasoned Action to Domestic Violence Reporting Behavior: The Role of Sex and Victimization.” *Journal of Family Violence* 29(2):165-173.

Sun, Ivan Y. 2007. “Policing Domestic Violence: Does Officer Gender Matter?” *Journal of Criminal Justice* 35(6):581-595.

Suttles, Gerald. 1972. *The Social Construction of Communities.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Swartz, Kristin, Bradford W. Reyns, Pamela Wilcox and Jessica R. Dunham. 2012. “Patterns of Victimization Between and Within Peer Clusters in a High School Social Network.” *Violence and Victims* 27(5):710-729.

Swigert, Victoria and Ronald Farrell. 1976. *Murder, Inequality and the Law.* Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Takagi, Daisuke, Ken’ichi Ikeda and Ichiro Kawachi. 2012. “Neighborhood Social Capital and Crime Victimization: Comparison of Spatial Regression Analysis and Hierarchical Regression Analysis.” *Social Science & Medicine* 75(10):1895-1902.

Takaki, Ronald. 1998. *Strangers from a Different Shore: A History of Asian Americans*. New York: Little, Brown and Company.

Tauchen, Helen V., Ann Dryden Witte and Sharon K. Long. 1991. "Domestic Violence: A Nonrandom Affair." *International Economic Review* 32(2):491-511.

Theall, Katherine, Claire Sterk, and Kirk Elifson. 2004. "Past and New Victimization among African American Female Drug Users who Participated in an HIV Risk-Reduction Intervention." *Social Forces* 41(4):400-407.

Teng, Emma Jinhua. 2013. *Eurasian: Mixed Identities in the United States, China, and Hong Kong, 1842–1943.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Tennessee General Assembly. 2023. HB0878. Reg. Sess. 2023-2024.

Thomas, Kristie A., Susan B. Sorenson and Manisha Joshi. 2010. "Police-Documented Incidents of Intimate Partner Violence Among Young Women." *Journal of Women's Health* 19(6):1079-1087.

Thornton, Michael C. 1992a. "The Quiet Immigration: Foreign Spouses of U.S. Citizens 1945-1985." Pp. 64-76 in Maria P. P. Root (ed.), *Racially Mixed People in America*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

--------. 1992b. "Is Multiracial Status Unique? The Personal and Social Experience." Pp. 321-325 in Maria P. P. Root (ed.), *Racially Mixed People in America*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Tourangeau, Roger and Hee-Choon Shin. 1999. "National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health Grand Sample Weight." *Carolina Population Center* Retrieved June 6, 2013 (https://addhealth.cpc.unc.edu/wp-content/uploads/docs/user_guides/weights.pdf).

Townsend, Sarah S. M., Hazel R. Markus and Hilary B. Bergsieker. 2009. "My Choice, Your Categories: The Denial of Multiracial Identities." *Journal of Social Issues* 65(1):185-204.

Trujillo, Monica Perez and Stuart Ross. 2008. "Police Response to Domestic Violence: Making Decisions About Risk and Risk Management." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 23(4):454-473.

Truman, Jennifer and Lynn Langton. 2014. "Criminal Victimization, 2013." *Bureau of Justice Statistics* National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NJS) 247648.

Tuch, Steven and Ronald Weitzer. 1997. "The Polls--Trends: Racial Differences in Attitudes toward the Police." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 61(4):642-63.

Tucker, Patrick. 2020, March 10. “Iranian, Russian, Chinese Media Push COVID-19 ‘Bioweapon’ Conspiracies.” *Science & Tech* Retrieved March 7, 2023 (https://www.defenseone.com/technology/2020/03/iran-and-russian-media-push-bioweapon-conspiracies-amid-covid19-outbreak/163669/).

Tyler, Tom R. 2004. “Enhancing Police Legitimacy.” *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 593(1):84-99.

Uggen, Christopher, Angela Behrens, and Jeff Manza. 2005. “Criminal Disenfranchisement.” *Annual Review of Law and Social Science* 1(1):307-322.

Uggen, Christopher and Heather Hlavka. 2008. "Does Stigmatizing Sex Offenders Drive Down Reporting Rates-Perverse Effects and Unintended Consequences." *Northern Kentucky Law Review* 35(4):347-370.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. 2005. *Statistical Abstract of the United States, 2004-2005*, 124th ed. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

--------. 2000. Census SF1, Table DP-1 “Profiles of General Demographic Characteristics: 2000.” Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

--------. 1990. *Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1990*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

--------. 1980. *Census of Population and Housing, 1980*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

--------. 1970. *Census of Population, 1970: General Social and Economic Characteristics*, final report PC (1)-13. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

--------. 1953. *Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1950*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

--------. 1941. *Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1940*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

--------. 1930. *Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1930*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

--------. 1921. *Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1920*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

--------. 1911. *Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1910*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

--------. 1901. *Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1900*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

--------. 1892. *Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1891*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

--------. 1881. *Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1880*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

--------. 1872. *Compendium of the Ninth Census, 1870*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

--------. 1864. *Compendium of the Eighth Census, 1860*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

--------. 1854. *Compendium of the Seventh Census, 1850*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

United States Bureau of Justice Statistics. 2020. *National Crime Victimization Survey, Concatenated File, 1992-2019* [Dataset and Codebook]. Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor]. Retrieved August 17, 2021 (https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR37689.v1).

Valverde, Kieu-Lihn Caroline. 1992. "From Dust to Gold: The Vietnamese Amerasian Experience." Pp. 144-161 in Maria P. P. Root (ed.), *Racially Mixed People in America*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Vaquera, Elizabeth and Grace Kao 2008. "Do You Like Me as Much as I Like You? Friendship Reciprocity and its Effects on School Outcomes among Adolescents." *Social Science Research* 37(1):55-72.

Vazquez, Salvador, Mary K. Stohr, Karen Skow and Marcus Purkiss. 2005. "'Why is a Woman Still Not Safe When She's in Her Home?': Seven Years of NIBRS Data on Victims and Offenders of Intimate Partner Violence." *Criminal Justice Studies* 18(2):125-146.

Villazor, Rose Cuison. 2011. "The Other *Loving*: Uncovering the Federal Government's Racial Regulation of Marriage." *New York University Law Review* 86(5):1361-1439.

Virginia General Assembly. 1691, April 3. An act for suppressing outlying slaves. Pp. 86-88 in William Waller Hening (ed.), *The Statutes at Large: Being a Collection of All Laws of Virginia*. Vol. 3 (1823). R. & W. G. Bartow. Philadelphia: Thomas DeSilver.

------. 1662, December. Act XII—Negro womens children to serve according to the conditions of the mother. P. 170 in William Waller Hening (ed.), *The Statutes of Large of Virginia: Being a Collection of All Laws of Virginia*. Vol. 2 (1823). New York: R. & W. & G. Bartow.

Wacquant, Loïc. “La race comme crime civique.” 2005. *Revue internationale des sciences sociales* 183:135-152.

Valente, Thomas W. 2005. “Network Models and Methods for Studying the Diffusion of Innovations.” Pp. 98-116 in Peter J. Carrington and Stanley Wasserman (eds.), *Models and Methods in Social Network Analysis*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Wasserman, Stanley and Katherine Faust. 1994. *Social Network Analysis: Methods and Applications*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Wasserman, Stanley and Garry Robins. 2005. “An Introduction to Random Graphs, Dependence Graphs, and p*.” 2005. Pp. 148-161 in Peter J. Carrington and Stanley Wasserman (eds.), *Models and Methods in Social Network Analysis*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Wauchope, Barbara and Murray Straus. 1999. “Physical Punishment and Physical Abuse of American Children: Incidence Rates by Age, Gender, and Occupational Class.” Pp. 133-148 in Murray Straus and Richard Gelles (eds.), *Physical Violence in American Families: Risk Factors and Adaptations to Violence in 8,145 Families*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Weiss, Karen. 2010. “Too Ashamed to Report: Deconstructing the Shame of Sexual Victimization.” *Feminist Criminology* 5(3):286-310.

Weitzer, Ronald. 1999. “Citizens’ Perceptions of Police Misconduct.” *Justice Quarterly* 16(4):819-46.

Wellman, David. 1993. *Portraits of White Racism*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Wellner, A.S. 2002. “The Census Report.” *American Demographics* 24(Suppl.1):3-7.

Whitaker, Daniel, Tadesse Haileyesus, Monica Swahn, and Linda Saltzman. 2007. “Differences in Frequency of Violence and Reported Injury between Relationships with Reciprocal and Nonreciprocal Intimate Partner Violence.” *American Journal of Public Health* 97(5):941-947.

Wilkinson, Deanna L. and Susan J. Hamerschlag. 2005. “Situational Determinants in Intimate Partner Violence.” *Aggression and Violent Behavior* 10(3):333-361.

Williams, Teresa Kay. 1992. “Prism Lives: Identity of Binational Amerasians.” Pp. 280-303 in Maria P. P. Root (ed.), *Racially Mixed People in America*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Wilson, Terry P. 1992. “Blood Quantum: Native American Mixed Bloods.” Pp. 108-125 in Maria P. P. Root (ed.), *Racially Mixed People in America*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Wimmer, Andreas and Kevin Lewis. 2010. “Beyond and Below Racial Homophily: ERG Models of a Friendship Network Documented on Facebook.” *American Journal of Sociology* 116(2):583-642.

Wolf, Marsha, Uyen Ly, Margaret Hobart and Mary Kernic. 2003. "Barriers to Seeking Police Help for Intimate Partner Violence." *Journal of Family Violence* 18(2):121-129.

Wolfgang, Marvin. 1958. *Patterns in Criminal Homicide*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.

Wright, Darlene and Kevin Fitzpatrick. 2006. “Social Capital and Adolescent Violent Behavior: Correlates of Fighting and Weapon Use among Secondary School Students.” *Social Forces* 84(3):1435-1453.

Wright, Emily and Michael Benson. 2011. “Clarifying the Effects of Neighborhood Context on Violence ‘Behind Closed Doors.’” *Justice Quarterly* 28(6):775-98.

Xie, Min, Janet Lauritsen and Karen Heimer. 2012. “Intimate Partner Violence in US Metropolitan Areas: The Contextual Influences of Police and Social Services.” *Criminology* 50(4):961-992.

Yamin, Priscilla. 2012. *American Marriage: A Political Institution*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Yancey, George. 2007. “Experiencing Racism: Differences in the Experiences of Whites Married to Blacks and Non-Black Racial Minorities.” *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* 38(2):197-213.

Yllo, Kersti. 2005. “Through a Feminist Lens: Gender, Diversity, and Violence: Extending the Feminist Framework.” Pp. 19-34 in Donileen Loseke, Richard Gelles and Mary Cavanaugh (eds.), *Current Controversies on Family Violence*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Yllo, Kersti and Murray Straus. 1999. “Patriarchy and Violence against Wives: The Impact of Structural and Normative Factors.” Pp. 383-399 in Murray Straus and Richard Gelles (eds.), *Physical Violence in American Families: Risk Factors and Adaptations to Violence in 8,145 Families*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Zack, Naomi. 1993. *Race and Mixed Race.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Zavala, Egbert. 2010. “Deviant Lifestyles and the Reporting of Physical Victimization to Police.” *Journal of Family Violence* 25(1):23-31.

Zeoli, April M., Alexis Norris and Hannah Brenner. 2010. “A Summary and Analysis of Warrantless Arrest Statutes for Domestic Violence in the United States.” *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 26(14):2811-2833.