

WHY CAN'T WE ALL BE FRIENDS?
DO FRIENDSHIPS INFLUENCE A PERSON'S PERCEPTION OF RACIAL TEASING?

A Dissertation

by

LORENA LISA GONZALEZ

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

May 2009

Major Subject: Counseling Psychology

WHY CAN'T WE ALL BE FRIENDS?

DO FRIENDSHIPS INFLUENCE A PERSON'S PERCEPTION OF RACIAL TEASING?

A Dissertation

by

LORENA LISA GONZALEZ

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Approved by:

Co-Chairs of Committee,	Collie Conoley Linda Castillo
Committee Members,	Daniel Brossart Arnold LeUnes
Head of Department,	Victor Willson

May 2009

Major Subject: Counseling Psychology

ABSTRACT

Why Can't We All Be Friends?

Do Friendships Influence a Person's Perception of Racial Teasing? (May 2009)

Lorena Lisa Gonzalez, B.S., The University of Texas Pan-American;

M.A., University of Houston-Clear Lake

Co-Chairs of Advisory Committee: Dr. Collie Conoley

Dr. Linda Castillo

The purpose of this study was to explore how having Mexican American friends influences a person's perception to racial/ethnic (Mexican American) specific teasing. This study sought to extend the research on friendships and prejudice by investigating how friendship influences a person rating of ethnic specific teasing. This study is significant because promoting interracial friendships could be an avenue to alleviate some of the negative effects of racial teasing. Moreover, it may help facilitate and create a more comfortable social environment that might help ethnic minorities in school.

Participants were asked to rate vignettes, including characters that were identified as Mexican American, which contained racial/ethnic specific teasing. They were asked to rate the vignettes according to adjectives that were either positive or negative, such as: humorous, friendly, mean, and cruel. Additionally, measures of empathy, social desirability, prejudice, and white racial consciousness were administered. Participants were asked to think of a Mexican American friend and complete a questionnaire, the Acquaintance Description Form F-2, as a way of measuring the intensity and closeness of this friendship.

The major hypothesis was that participants who indicated a greater and more intense friendship with their Mexican American friend would rate the teasing as less positive and more disapproving. Analysis found that people have a more disapproving attitude toward teasing to the extent that they have, respectively, at least one Mexican American friend or a higher level of exposure to African Americans. Statuses of white racial consciousness were also found to be strong predictors for how participants rated vignettes.

Findings somewhat supported both the Extended Contact Theory and the Intergroup Contact Theory, adding to the literature that finds when groups spend not only time together but quality time together benefits can be expected. Some of these benefits may help to reduce the positive perception of racial teasing and presumably less racial teasing. Future research should explore the relationship between white racial consciousness and attitudes and perceptions of racial specific teasing as a strong associate between the two emerged in this study. Additionally future research may explore whether less positive feelings of racial teasing is related to less racial teasing behaviors.

DEDICATION

At the risk of sounding self-absorbed, I dedicate this to the 18 year old version of myself. She was a young woman, who had an appetite for learning and a need to challenge her own and others' expectations. She had a vision of what she wanted and a fearless naiveté about how to get it. I love her because she knew I would be here someday, and now that I am- I thank her.

I also dedicate this to my family. I share this with you because you deserve this as much as I do.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my advisor, Collie Conoley, for his wonderful support and amazing encouragement. He planted the seeds for the ideas in this dissertation. Many, many thanks to Linda Castillo, for adopting me when my chair found himself on the sunny side of California, and Daniel Brossart and Arnold LeUnes for being incredibly supportive and flexible. You helped my dream of graduation come true.

I am also very thankful to my friend Jason for being my hands and legs in Texas when I was in South Carolina. You are a great listener and a great friend, and I literally couldn't have done this without you, at least not without my teleporting machine.

Alisa, you are my reminder that there is life, life after 641, life after comps, life after internship, life after dissertation, you get the picture. And along the way you are my reminder that life is better with friends, so thank you for being my friend- and all the other stuff.

At A&M I met many wonderful, caring, and intelligent people, and for all of them I am eternally grateful. Especially Scott and Brig. Scott, I thank you because you know me better than most, and you only use that against me minimally, and Brig because you are by far one of the most incredible people I have ever met. I love you.

Tricia, I owe you many thanks, too. You have been kind, generous, and supportive. You let me disappear when I needed to. And to all of the Sexual Health and Violence Prevention crew, thank you for being my cheerleaders!

There are not enough words to say thank you to my family. Mom and Dad, please know that I couldn't be where I am without you. I am because of you. Ruben,

Roel, and Leanna, I am lucky to be your sister. Your love is unconditional, and I couldn't ask for more. I love you all beyond words!

And last but not least, I owe much love and gratitude to my Abigail Frances. Abby has been my constant companion and a best friend. Abby has taught me patience and the value of a good lick- but only one of those will work with clients.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT.....	iii
DEDICATION.....	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	viii
LIST OF TABLES.....	xi
CHAPTER	
I INTRODUCTION.....	1
Overview of Teasing and Related Violence	1
Statement of the Problem.....	5
Extended Contact Theory.....	6
Intergroup Contact Theory.....	6
Purpose of This Study	8
Research Questions.....	8
II LITERATURE REVIEW.....	10
Introduction.....	10
Defining Teasing	11
Defining Teasing as a Type of Bullying.....	11
Outcomes of Teasing	12
Teasing and Harmful Consequences.....	13
Teasing in Schools.....	15
Teasing in Other Countries.....	17
Teasing and Violence.....	17
Targets of Teasing	19
Characteristics of Those Who Tease	20
Racial Differences.....	21
Racial Attitudes Toward Mexican Americans.....	22
White Racial Consciousness and Empathy.....	23
Extended Contact Theory	25
Intergroup Contact Theory	26
Benefits of Friendship	29
Present Study	30
Research Questions	31

CHAPTER	Page
III	METHODOLOGY 34
	Participants 34
	Procedure 34
	Instruments..... 35
	Demographic Information Sheet 35
	White Racial Consciousness Development Scale Revised (WRCDS-R)..... 35
	Acquaintance Descriptor Form (F-2) 35
	Balanced Emotional Empathy Scale (BEES)..... 37
	Blatant and Subtle Prejudice Scale (BSPS)..... 37
	Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (M-C 2(10))..... 39
	Vignettes 40
IV	RESULTS 43
	Question One..... 44
	Question Two..... 45
	Question Three..... 47
	Question Four..... 49
V	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION 51
	Limitations..... 54
	Implications..... 57
	Future Research..... 59
	REFERENCES 61
	APPENDIX A 72
	APPENDIX B..... 74
	APPENDIX C..... 78
	APPENDIX D 82
	APPENDIX E 86
	APPENDIX F 90
	APPENDIX G 91

VITA 99

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	Page
1 Exploratory Factory Analysis of Adjective in Vignettes.....	42
2 Correlations of Scales and Means, Standard Deviations, and Alphas	43
3 Correlations of Exposure of Ethnic Groups, Mexican American Friends, and Teasing Vignettes	46
4 Multiple Regression of Friendship, Empathy, Social Desirability, Prejudice, and White Racial Consciousness	49

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Overview of Teasing and Related Violence

“Andy Williams here. Unhappy kid. Tired of being picked on. Ready to blow. Want to kill some people. Can anybody hear me? How did things get so bad?” (McCarthy, Forster, Ressler, & Roosevelt, p. 30, 2001). At the time, Andy was a 15 year student who reported being constantly bullied and teased by schoolmates and friends. In 2001, he opened fire at his school.

More recently in 2007, Seung-Hui Cho, a student at Virginia Tech opened fire at the university killing 32 people. Reports suggest that Mr. Cho was probably suffering from depression. His history indicates that he was often teased and bullied growing up for being too shy and for the odd way he spoke (Jenson, 2007). And before Virginia Tech there was Columbine. Eric Harris, age 18, and Dylan Klebold, age 17, two Columbine High School students opened fire April 20, 1999 killing 13 people and injuring at least 21. In videotapes the two boys made, they tell of their experience of being teased and ostracized by their peers (Jenson, 2007). Some have suggested that the common thread in school shootings are that the shooters are often taunted, teased, and made to feel like outsiders (Leary, Kowalski, Smith, & Phillips, 2003). Frequently they just don't fit in and consequently suffer chronic and painful teasing.

Leary et al. (2003) reviewed school shootings from January, 1995 to March,

This dissertation follows the style of the *Journal of Counseling Psychology*.

2001, in an effort to understand how interpersonal rejection may influence school violence. In their analysis, Leary et al. (2003) found 12 of the 14 school shootings they reviewed involved persistent patterns of teasing. They found that Barry Lockaitis, age 14, of Moses Lake, Washington, who killed a teacher and injured three others, had been teased by one of the victims. Evan Ramsey, age 16, of Bethel Arkansas, who killed two and injured two, had been teased. Luke Woodham, age 16 from Pearl Mississippi and Mitchell Johnson, age 13 from Jonesboro Arkansas both were part of school shootings at their respective schools. It has been alleged that both boys were teased for being overweight. In one of the fourteen shootings Leary et al. (2003) reviewed, the shooter was female. Catherine Bush, age 14 of Williamsport, Pennsylvania shot and injured one student after she reported being teased and harassed by her peers.

Though the above examples are perhaps extreme cases in which many factors, including teasing, may have lead to the events it seems clear that there is a relationship between teasing and serious emotional and psychological problems. The study of teasing was largely prompted by Dr. Dan Olweus from Scandinavia following the suicide of three young boys from Norway after being persistently teased and taunted by peers (Olweus, 1978). Again, school shootings and suicide might be the most dramatic and publicized effects of teasing, but the implication of the role of teasing on emotional health and well-being and quality of life cannot be easily overlooked.

Teasing is a part of life, part of growing up, and perhaps something that is never outgrown, and despite its common occurrence teasing is something that many worry about. In a study by the Kaiser Family Foundation, it was found that students 8-15 years old believed teasing was a significant problem, a problem even greater than racism,

AIDS, and peer pressure to do drugs (Moultapa, Valente, Gallaher, Rohrbach, & Unger, 2004). Shapiro, Baumeister, and Kessler (1991) also found that many high school students reported that teasing was one of their main fears. These fears do not seem misguided as several studies found that teasing is linked to greater depression and anxiety (Barnett, Burns, Sanborn, Bartel, & Wilds, 2004; Espelage & Holt, 2001; Fontana, 1999; Moultapa et al., 2004).

Moreover, feelings of embarrassment, intimidation, apprehension, loneliness, fear, pain, isolation, and retaliation are all consequences of being teased (Kowalski, 2000; Landau, Milich, Harris, & Larson, 2001; Shapiro et al., 1991). Other psychological problems that have been found to be associated with teasing are adjustment issues, low self-esteem, eating disorders, heightened self consciousness, less satisfaction with school, and a feeling of an uncomfortable and unsafe environment (Espelage & Holt, 2001; Fontana, 1999; Moultapa et al., 2004). The feeling of being unsafe and uncomfortable in an environment of teasing may also be associated with higher absenteeism and reduced academic performance of those students identified as targets of peer teasing (Roberts, Walter, & Coursol, 1996). These concerns are supported by the National Center for Educational Statistics report in which it was found that “29% of schools considered bullying to be the single most problematic disciplinary issue” (Beaty & Alexeyev, p. 3, 2008). Moreover, some have suggested that bullying may be the most frequent form of school violence (Nation, Vieno, Perkins, & Santinello, 2007).

As suggested by the aforementioned cases of school shootings, teasing can lead to a propensity towards violence (Nation et al., 2007). In an effort to create a profile of school shooters, the Secret Service found that 71% of them were targets of teasing and

bullying (Moultapa et al., 2004). Jenson (2007) believes that young violent offenders often do have a past that includes harassment, teasing, and rejection from peers. Furthermore, the incidence of teasing may be greater in the United States than in any other country, yet bullying and teasing have been found and considered a growing concern in many other countries (Seals & Young, 2003). These findings seem to imply that teasing is all too common and worth concern, particularly when it comes to the mental and psychological health of the target of the teasing.

The targets of teasing are often those that are perceived to be different (Sweeting & West, 2001). These differences may be in appearances, race, disability such as sight, hearing, or speech, school performance, family characteristics, and SES (Landau et al., 2001; Sweeting & West, 2001). Additionally, research has found that power has an influence on a person's likelihood of being teased or bullied. Targets of teasing tend to feel powerless and out of control and often exhibit distress, particularly around the bully or the person teasing them (Nation et al., 2007). Pelligrini (1998) has suggested that 2-10% of school aged students are the victims of teasing.

One group that is believed to be vulnerable and often targeted for teasing are people from an ethnic minority group (Sweeting & West, 2001). Race is often an obvious attribute and can be linked to non-mainstream values and beliefs. These differences can make people most vulnerable to teasing (Sweeting & West, 2001). Furthermore, the Department of Education has cited that belonging to a racial or ethnic group that is not the majority is a risk factor for teasing (Sweeting & West, 2001). Also, ethnic minority students report that their ethnicity has made them a likely target for teasing (Sweeting & West, 2001). Ethnic composition correlates with classroom

aggression, revealing that an ethnic majority becomes more aggressive when there is an ethnic minority (Graham & Juvonen, 2002; Hanish & Guerra, 2000; Rowe, Almedia, & Jacobson, 1999). Still, the impression is that most people can become vulnerable. A person can be the next target of teasing, be them too tall, too short, too smart, too quiet, too rich, too poor, simply too different.

Statement of the Problem

The danger of an individual being too different from the norm has its implications for college campuses. As colleges aim towards diversity, particularly ethnic diversity, the chance of being different increases. Though ethnically diverse college campuses are intended to be a good thing there are reasons to believe that this hasn't been all good. For example, one of the reasons that ethnic minority students drop out of college is due to social discomfort, not feeling welcomed, and/or not feeling a sense of belonging, which may be related to racial differences and teasing (Spaights, Dixon, & Nickolasi, 1985).

Solving the issue of teasing about racial differences needs to be addressed, as it not only affects the individual but also the social environment in which teasing occurs. One possible remedy is to examine the benefits of cross cultural/racial/ethnic friendships. Helping minority students feel more comfortable on campus may increase their sense of belonging and help them feel like less of a target of teasing. The premise is based on the concept that "contact between members of different groups reduces existing negative attitudes" (Wright, Aron, McLaughlin-Volpe, & Ropp, p. 74, 1997). This is the basis for the Extended Contact Theory. According to this theory being in contact

with “different” people will help to reduce stereotypes and negative feelings towards that particular group.

Extended Contact Theory

Extended Contact Theory suggests that the contact with out-group members does not have to be direct for it to have benefits (Wright et al., 1997). For example, the racial attitudes of White residents were less anti-Black when their new neighbor was Black when compared to residents that had new White neighbors (Hamilton & Bishop, 1976). These benefits were not dependent on actual direct contact with the new Black neighbors. The explanation for the attitude change was that negative stereotypes or beliefs about Blacks held by the Whites were not confirmed (Hamilton & Bishop, 1976). Wright et al. (1997) also found that knowledge of an in-group-out-group friendship was associated with “less affective prejudice and less overall prejudice toward the target out-group” (p. 78). These changes persisted even after the out-group friend was removed from the equation, thus isolating the vicarious benefits of having a “friend of a friend” of a different race (Wright et al., 1997). The number of out-group friends is also influential in lowering prejudice (Wright et al., 1997). The more similarities that the in-group member perceived in themselves and the out-group member the lower the prejudice (Wright et al., 1997). Moreover, the pattern of results suggest that the greater the intensity of the contact the greater the benefits.

Intergroup Contact Theory

Intergroup Contact Theory suggests that it is not simply the contact that facilitates more positive attitudes among groups but that sometimes the level, intensity, and frequency of contact is also important (Wright et al., 1997). Still, while contact may

help in attitude changes, sometimes contact can actually reinforces faulty and inaccurate stereotypes or the contact is too subtle to have generalized and lasting effects. Therefore, “contact in and of itself is not adequate” (Wright et al., p. 73, 1997). The potency of friendship, which provides a greater level of intensity and frequency of contact, may actually make lasting behavioral and attitudinal changes among groups. “Friendships have been found to help satisfy...intimacy; enhance interpersonal skills, sensitivity, and understanding; and contribute significantly to cognitive and social developments and psychological adjustment” (Way & Pahl, p. 325, 2001).

Pettigrew (1997) found that having a friend from another group, an out-group, predicts lower levels of both subtle and obvious prejudice. Clark and Ayers (1992) also found that a high quality interracial friendship was related to less racial bias. Similarly, having friends from an out-group contributed to greater support for the out-group policies from those in the in-group and he found that these benefits were generalized to the entire out-group and not only to the specific friend from the out-group (Pettigrew, 1997). Pettigrew's (1997) study found that the benefits existed when the contact was with a friend from the out-group and were not found when it was a neighbor or coworker. This seems to highlight the critical nature of the friendship that fosters change, not simply contact. Furthermore, it seems that for the intergroup contact effects to be most beneficial the contact has to have a strong affective tie (Wright et al., 1997). In other words, the friends have to care about each other and be invested in each other. This may be why the same benefits do not always translate from contact with coworkers or neighbors.

There are many other benefits of having cross-racial friends. Eder (1991) found that having friends of different races, in essence out-group friends, was associated with higher educational aspirations and greater leadership skills. Children with cross-racial friends had greater social competence, increased minority acceptance, and less desire for social distance from ethnic minorities (Eder, 1991). Others found greater social competence and multicultural sensitivity among those with friends of a different race (Damico, Bell-Nathaniel, & Green, 1981). All these benefits could translate into better performance for students in school and later to adults in the workforce.

Purpose of This Study

The purpose of this study was to explore how having Mexican American friends influences a person's perception to racial/ethnic (Mexican American) specific teasing. This study sought to extend the research on friendships and prejudice by investigating how friendship influences a person rating of ethnic specific teasing. This study is significant because promoting interracial friendships could be an avenue to alleviate some of the negative effects of racial teasing. Moreover, it may help facilitate and create a more comfortable social environment that might help ethnic minorities excel in school.

Research Questions

The current study attempted to answer the following questions:

1. What relationship exists between participant's report of having Mexican American friendships and how they rate vignettes containing (Mexican American) racial/ethnic specific teasing?
2. Does self report of exposure to different ethnicities (Caucasian, African American, Mexican American/Hispanic, Asian American, and Native American)

influence how participants rate vignettes containing (Mexican American) racial/ethnic specific teasing?

3. What relationship does the reported closeness to a Mexican American friend (Target Person) have on a participant's rating of vignettes containing (Mexican American) racial/ethnic specific teasing, while also considering levels of empathy, social desirability, prejudice, and white racial consciousness?
4. What is the relationship between participant's own ethnicity and rating vignettes containing (Mexican American) racial/ethnic specific teasing?

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

Teasing is ubiquitous. Most people have been teased themselves or have been the teaser at some point in their life. It is likely that each of us has been on both ends, as both the target of the teasing and as the teaser. Researchers have found that teasing can happen unexpectedly within close relationships such as romantic partners, family, friends, even parent child relationships. Often these exchanges of teasing can be deemed as ways of expressing love, connections and, perhaps, simply a laugh (Endo, 2007). Some may have even heard the phrase “I tease you because I like you”.

Moreover, it can be said that teasing is a part of life, part of growing up, and perhaps something that is never outgrown. The motivation for teasing is sometimes lighthearted and innocuous, and often people tease others they like as a way to show affection and comradery. The difficulty in the interpretation of teasing is that the intention of the tease is often ambiguous. Shapiro, Baumeister, and Kessler (1991) define teasing mostly by the presence of its ambiguity. They recognize that the motivation for teasing and its intended interpretation is very often uncertain and unclear. Eder (1991) and Kowalski (2000) also state that teasing is difficult to objectively define and understand and that it's often left to the target of the tease to interpret for him or herself. Further complicating attempts at interpreting teasing behaviors is the possibility that the function and purpose of teasing very likely change as people get older and mature (Kowalski, 2000). People not only have to interpret for themselves what the

tease might mean, in a matter of a moment, they also have to consider the maturity of the person teasing. All this highlights the variability and complexity of teasing.

Defining Teasing

Defining teasing can be tricky. Sharpiro et al. (1991) define teasing as “a personal communication, directed by an agent towards a target that includes three components: aggression, humor, and ambiguity,” (p. 460). Voss (1997) also ascertains the humorous nature of teasing, defining teasing as “humorous taunts” (p. 241). Warm (1997) defines teasing as “a deliberate act designed by the teaser to cause tension in the victim, such as anxiety, frustration, anger, embarrassment, humiliation, etc., and it is presented in such a way that the victims can escape if they ‘catch on’,” (p. 98).

Although, these definitions (Sharpiro et al., 1991; Voss, 1997; Warm, 1997), by and large, agree that teasing includes both humor and aggression, they also are indicative of the difficulty of defining teasing. For example, Warm (1997) suggests that the victim of teasing can be relieved of certain negative feeling if they are able to accurately interpret the tease as jovial and in jest.

For the purpose of this study, teasing is defined as “a deliberate act designed by the teaser to cause tension in the victim, such as anxiety, frustration, anger, embarrassment, humiliation, etc., and it is presented in such a way that the victims can escape if they ‘catch on’,” (Warm, p. 98, 1997).

Defining Teasing as a Type of Bullying

One of the reasons teasing is difficult to conclusively define is because there are many forms of teasing, such as joking, gossiping, and bullying. Teasing and bullying may be considered on the same continuum separated perhaps by the level of

aggression and violence involved. For example, bullying is considered a more aggressive and potentially more physically and emotionally violent form of teasing and is intended to hurt the target of the bullying (Aluede, Adeleke, Omoike, & Afen-Akpaída, 2007), and some define bullying as a “systemic abuse of power” (Naylor, Cowie, Cossin, de Bettencourt, & Lemme, p. 554, 2006). Olweus (1991) identifies the intentional harm and the repetitiveness of bullying and reiterates the imbalance of power that is present in bullying. Others believe that teasing is a “more complex behavior” of bullying (Jankauskiene, Kardelis, Sukys, & Kardeliene, p. 146, 2008). Still, there isn’t a unanimous relationship between teasing and bullying, perhaps again this is a function of the ambiguity that exists in both.

Moreover, bullying can include verbal and nonverbal actions, such as vulgar and/or nasty threats, pushing, shoving, and fighting (Olweus, 1994). Langevin (2000) adds that bullying is defined by its repeated and purposeful nature and that a power imbalance between the bully and the target must exist. A distinction between direct and indirect bullying is also made. Direct bullying is defined as “open attacks on the victim, while indirect bullying consists of social isolation and exclusion from the group” (Aluede et al., p. 152, 2007). Again, the interpretation of violence, aggression, and negative effects are subjective and difficult to define, and what one person would consider teasing the next might consider bullying and vice versa.

Outcomes of Teasing

Even though there is not complete clarity about the distinction between teasing and bullying, there is some clarity about the effects of teasing. Most researchers identify the potential for both the positive and negative consequences of teasing (Baxer, 1992;

Endo, 2007; Pawluk, 1989; Shapiro et al., 1991; Warm, 1997). For example, “teasing may be mildly irritating, [but] it nevertheless builds social bonds.” (Pawluk, p. 256, 1989). Others state that although teasing can be viewed as aggressive or even hostile it can also create bonds and be in the “spirit of good fun” (Endo, p. 113, 2007). Teasing can also strengthen a bond and friendship, and some have suggested that the motivation for teasing is solidarity (Sharky, 1992). Additionally, other research has found that teasing is more likely among friends and close relationships, once more suggesting that teasing can be a positive and, perhaps, even an intimate interaction (Baxer, 1992). Yet, what are we to make of teasing when its Anglo-Saxon root *taesan* actually means “to tear” and “pull” (Bartholomew, 1989)? Perhaps teasing is ultimately an irony in which its seemingly playful banter or benign social intentions can regularly lead to humiliation, hurt feelings, and confusion (Shapiro et al., 1991).

Teasing and Harmful Consequences

A Kaiser Family Foundation study found that 8-15 year old children believed teasing was a significant problem, a problem even greater than racism, AIDS, and peer pressure to do drugs (Moultapa, et al., 2004). Teasing is also a source of great conflict in adolescence and can often result in withdrawal and avoidance by those being teased (Fontana, 1999). Shapiro, Baumeister, and Kessler (1991) found that many high school students reported that teasing was one of their main fears. Moreover, students that are teased are often unsupported by their peers, even by their peers they once considered friends (Fontana, 1999). Given the precariousness of social mores in school it seems a reasonable, albeit unfortunate, fear to worry about which of your peers are really your friends and if they will end up betraying you in a teasing situation. Furthermore,

according to the National Center for School Safety, students are more nervous and fearful of being bullied than they are about their own academic success (Fontana, 1999). These fears do not seem misguided as several studies have found that teasing is linked to increased depression and anxiety (Barnett et al., 2004; Espelage & Holt 2001; Fontana, 1999; Mouttapa et al., 2004).

The link between teasing and depression is highlighted by a 14-year old boy's suicide. A suicide believed to be fueled by school teasing (Espelage & Swearer, 2003). Another girl killed herself following persistent teasing about her hair (Landau et al., 2001). Additionally, it has been found that victimization in childhood can contribute to adult depression and anxiety, highlighting the longevity of the negative effects of teasing (McCabe, Anthony, Summerfeldt, Liss, & Swinson, 2003). People who are bullied as youths have significant problems forming trusting adult relationships and lack confidence when interacting with adults later in life. They are also more likely to have lower expectations for themselves and others (Schaefer, 2007). Depression and anxiety can also be exacerbated when a person internalizes teasing. Hence, the consequences of teasing can be subtle, covert, and long term.

Also, feelings of embarrassment, intimidation, apprehension, loneliness, fear, pain, isolation, and retaliation are all anticipated consequences of being teased (Landau et al., 2001). Other psychological problems found to be associated with teasing are adjustment issues, low self-esteem, eating disorders, heightened self consciousness, less satisfaction with school, and a feeling of an uncomfortable and unsafe environment (Espelage & Holt, 2001; Fontana, 1999; Mouttapa et al., 2004). Feeling unsafe and uncomfortable in the environment of the teasing may also be associated with higher

absenteeism and reduced academic performance of those students identified as targets of peer teasing (Roberts et al., 1996). Johnston, O'Mally, and Bachman (1993) found that 16% of eighth graders did not go to school at least one day within the previous month because they felt unsafe. Teasing victimization is also related to lower academic achievement, skipping classes, smoking, and alcohol use (Jankauskiene et al., 2008), and 90% of student who reported being teased and/or bullied reported a drop in their grades (Johnston et al., 1993). These concerns are supported by the National Center for Educational Statistics report findings that "29% of schools considered bullying to be the single most problematic disciplinary issue" (Beaty & Alexeyev, p. 3, 2008). Moreover, some have suggested that bullying may be the most frequent form of school violence (Nation et al., 2007) and that constant disrespect and violence is a "severe problem in today's school communities" (Jankauskiene et al., p. 146, 2008).

Teasing in Schools

A study by Mooney, Cresser, and Blatchford (1991) found that 96% of participants, children 7 and 11 years old, reported that teasing occurred in their school. Additionally, it has been found that teasing among 12-18 year olds has increased from 5% in 1999 to 7% in 2004 (Beaty & Alexeyev, 2008) and teasing may also increase throughout adolescence (Jones & Newman, 2005). A positive association between teasing in middle school and teasing in high school has also been noted (Chapell, Hasselman, Kitchin, Lomon, MacIver, & Sarullo, 2006). In another study of U.S. schools, it was found that bullying behaviors, including teasing, were quite frequent and the rate of peer victimization could be up to 10% for this county (Beaty & Alexeyev, 2008; Espelage, Bosworth, & Simon, 2000). Yet a higher and more alarming statistics was

found by the National Center for Education Statistics, in 2005, with a reported 28% of U.S. students ages 12-18 reported being bullied in the past six months (Schaefer, 2007). Schafer (2007) also suggests that this number cannot include all of those students who are unwilling to report and suspects the true incidence number to be higher than reported. In another large study that included 79,492 students from diverse demographics and ranging from middle school to high school, 20.1% reported being bullied within the last year and overall 28.2 % reported being involved in some type of bullying behavior and/or interaction (Carlyle & Steinman, 2007).

Also, the size of school may also play a role in the incidence of teasing. The smaller the school the less likely teasing and bullying occurred (Fontana, 1999). Fontana (1999) has suggested that the larger the school, the greater the anonymity, and the greater the incidence of teasing. It is, therefore, conceivable to assume that as college campuses' population grow, so does the incidence and concern of teasing. Recently, teasing has also been studied in colleges, though the research in this area is limited. In a sample of 1,025 undergraduates, almost 20% reported being teased and 1.1% reported being teased very frequently (Chapell, Casey, De la Cruz, Ferrell, Forman, Lipkin, Newsham, Sterling, & Whitaker, 2004).

Male college students are more likely to tease than are female college students, similar to findings of young boys and girls. Yet, males and females are equally likely to be the targets of teasing from childhood to adulthood (Chapell et al., 2006). Teasing has also been found in adults in the workplace. There is a positive relationship between being teased in school and being teased in the workplace. The relationship is even stronger when considering people who were both a bully and a target of teasing, as they

are the most likely to be teased in the workplace as an adult (Chapell et al., 2006). Yet, there is not much research on how adult teasing in college and work is similar or different from teasing as a child or adolescent, except to say that it does happen. Furthermore, certain assumptions are hard to make given that teasing can change as individuals get older and mature. Still, perhaps a safe assumption is that teasing may be a phenomenon that is never completely outgrown.

Teasing in Other Countries

Teasing has been found to exist in almost every other culture and society, including Scandinavia, New Zealand, England, Japan, China, Ireland, and within aboriginal societies (Olweus, 1991; Fontana, 1999). Olweus (1991) has extensively studied teasing in Scandinavia and found at least 15% of students experienced some type of teasing or bullying. An estimated 11.3% of elementary students in Finland may be involved in school bullying and almost 50% of elementary students in Ireland report school bullying (Jankauskiene et al., 2008). Stephanson and Smith (1989) found that 23% of the students they studied in England reported being teased. Similar results were found in Ireland, Spain, and Japan with the childhood incidence rates of teasing and/or bullying ranging from 8% - 17% (Garcia & Perez, 1989; O'Moore & Hillery, 1989). Still, Seals and Youngs (2003) suggest that the incidence of teasing is greater in the United States than in any other country. Nevertheless, teasing is clearly an issue that people worldwide experience and fear (Endo, 2007).

Teasing and Violence

Additionally, as suggested by the aforementioned cases of school shootings, teasing can lead to a propensity towards more violence (Nation et al., 2007). Some

consider teasing the most prevalent type of violence in school (Fontana, 1999). Greenbaum (1989) found that students in 8th and 10th grade were bringing weapons such as: knives, guns, and/or clubs at a rate of 9% and 10 %, respectively, because they were fearful of being teased and bullied. In 2003, others found that bullies were more likely to carry weapons to school than targets of teasing (Fox, Elliot, Kerlikowske, Newman, & Christeson, 2003). Forty three percent of bullies carried a weapon to school at least once a week and 46% of these students were likely to be injured by their weapon (Fox et al., 2003). Perhaps, they carry weapons for a sense of protection or for the intent to cause harm to others who have wronged them, maybe for both reasons, the intentions aren't always clear. Nevertheless, school violence in the form of student shootings is gaining in popularity and media attention. Even students as young as ten years old are becoming clear examples of the relationship between teasing and school violence. James Osmanson, a ten year old, carried a gun to school because of constant harassment and teasing from his peers. He shot and killed a fellow student by mistake on the playground (Fontana, 1999).

In an effort to create a profile of school shooters The Secret Service found that 71% of them were targets of teasing and bullying (Moultapa et al., 2004). Jenson (2007) believes that young violent offenders often have a past that includes harassment, teasing, and rejection from peers. Also, research has found that bullying is a predictor of violent behavior in young adulthood (Olweus, 1991). Olweus (1991) followed thousands of young boys that were identified as bullies from childhood to adulthood and found these boys were more likely to have a felony-conviction by the age of twenty-four when compared to a control group. Many of the boys actually had three or more convictions

(Olweus, 1991). Additionally, childhood bullies are more likely to become antisocial adults and are more likely to be in abusive interpersonal relationships as adults (Fontana, 1999). Others have found that these adults frequently have children who bully too, perpetuating the cycle of violence (Eron & Huesmann, 1987).

Carlyle and Steinman (2007) also found a positive correlation between teasing victimization and substance abuse and a positive relationship between substance abuse and aggression, suggesting that the violence experienced as teasing begets more violence. This makes schools vulnerable to myriad of problems related to teasing and bullying and can greatly influence the social environment in schools and campuses. One of the consequences of such a school climate is students feeling uneasy and worried. These concerns can affect targets of teasing and also those bystanders that are worried that at any moment they could become the targets. Some have contributed student absenteeism to this unwelcomed school climate and believe that students stay home in an effort to avoid being bullied at school (Carlyle & Steinman, 2007). Clearly, teasing and bullying can contribute to school violence and other academic issues such as truancy.

Targets of Teasing

The targets of teasing are often times those who are perceived to be different (Sweeting & West, 2001). These differences may be in appearances, race, disability such as sight, hearing or speech, school performance, family characteristics, and SES (Landau et al., 2001; Sweeting & West, 2001). "Targets of teasing [are] most frequently described as unpopular, timid, or fat" (Landau et al., p. 336, 2001). Additionally, research that has found that power has an influence on a person's likelihood of being

teased or bullied. Targets of teasing tend to feel powerless and out of control. Often they exhibit distress, particularly around the bully or the person teasing them (Nation et al., 2007). Female victims of teasing tend to react with helplessness, whereas male victims tend not to report the teasing but to in turn react with violence (Salmivalli, Karhunen, & Lagerspetz, 1998). Targets of teasing tend to have poor social skills, negative self images, lack confidence in their situation, and often feel stupid, ashamed, and unattractive (Olweus, 1991; Fontana, 1999). Olweus (1994) found that targets of teasing and bullying tend to be loners with few friends at school.

Moreover, likely targets of teasing are those from an ethnic minority group (Sweeting & West, 2001). Because race can be an obvious attribute and race is often linked to non-mainstream values and beliefs ethnic minority group are vulnerable to become targets of teasing (Sweeting & West, 2001). Fontana (1999) found that racial teasing does exist. In addition, the Department of Education has cited that belonging to a racial or ethnic group that is not the majority is a risk factor for teasing (Sweeting & West, 2001). Also, it seems that ethnic minority students have reported that their ethnicity has made them a likely target for teasing (Sweeting & West, 2001). Furthermore, there is a correlation between ethnic composition in classrooms and classroom aggression, revealing that in these circumstances the ethnic majority becomes more aggressive and the ethnic minority becomes the victim (Graham & Juvonen, 2002; Hanish & Guerra, 2000; Rowe et al., 1999).

Characteristics of Those Who Tease

Most people agree that teasing is about an imbalance of power. When considering the characteristics of those that tease this premise is clear, such that people

who tease or bully tend to be strong and tend to dominate others (Olweus, 1991). They are often impulsive and explosive. Not surprisingly, they also have a positive attitude about aggression and are comfortable picking on others they deem as weaker than themselves, while also lacking empathy and an ability to recognize or concern themselves with the suffering of the target of their teasing/bullying (Olweus, 1991). Bullies often feel an ego boost when they pick on others they see as weaker than themselves, which in a behavioral sense can keep their bullying behaviors reinforced.

Contrary to reasonable belief, people who tease and bully actually have significant social skills. Unfortunately, they use these skills in an antisocial capacity and cannot be mistaken for prosocial skills. Moreover, they use these skills to gain the support of bystanders and to avoid punishment or consequences (Olweus, 1991).

Racial Differences

In this country it has been established as popular belief that the White culture has been the dominant culture (Cobas & Feagin, 2007). The Anglo-Saxon race had been used as a barometer for judging other cultures (Cobas & Feagin, 2007). As a consequence, minority groups are regularly evaluated more negatively than Whites (Smith, 1990). One of the ways that White culture demonstrates its dominance and power is by the very language that is spoken. English is considered the norm and other languages are often considered deviant and/or suspicious (Cobas & Feagin, 2007). Latinos and Hispanics, in this respect, are often found with less power than their White counterparts due to language barriers. Moreover, White Americans are considered more independent, self-sufficient, and self-motivated (Carter, Yeh, & Mazzula, 2008). Using the term "White privilege" is one way of recognizing the power differences

between races and ethnic groups. Note that “Black privilege” or “Hispanic privilege” and other similar concepts do not exist or have not been recognized and labeled as such.

Other ethnic groups and cultures are therefore often bound by the established norms set by the more dominant and more powerful White culture, this is not only true for language, but also for how people interact, dress, live, get educated, communicate, and celebrate (Carter et al., 2008). Because of power differences, the dominant White culture has been established and maintained as mainstream and the norm. Moreover, White culture has permeated and often dictates how most others live and operate within a culture.

Racial Attitudes Toward Mexican Americans

One such group that has often suffered due to the power difference established by the dominant White culture is Mexican Americans. As the US Latino population is steadily increasing, it has been said that it is causing “the browning of America” and that it has compromised “American values” and the “core culture” (Cobas & Feagin, p. 390, 2007). Furthermore, some of the images and attitudes that are commonly held of Mexican Americans and Hispanic populations are related to immigration issues and language. For example, some say that Mexican Americans have too heavy an accent, which is in turn a sign of lower intelligence and less education (Weaver, 2005). Other images include describing Mexican Americans and Hispanics as inferior, less intelligence, untrustworthy, uneducated, lower status, too dark, prone to violence, lazy, poor, and reliant on welfare (Carter et al., 2008; Smith, 1990; Weaver, 2005). These are all characteristics for which Mexican Americans and Hispanic are frequently

harassessed, threatened, taunted, and teased about (Dixon, 2006; Marx, 2008; Smith, 1990).

White Racial Consciousness and Empathy

Still, a mediating factor that can often ameliorate the negative interaction between races is white racial consciousness. White racial consciousness is important to consider when exploring the relationship between interracial groups, specifically when the group majority is White. "White racial consciousness simply classifies commonly held racial attitudes that White people have towards person of color" (LaFleur, Rowe, & Leach, p. 148, 2002). The construct of white racial consciousness is the awareness of one's own racial group membership, underlying race related culture values, and an understanding of the sociopolitical implications resulting from one's membership to white racial group (Helms, 1990). Furthermore, white racial consciousness is based on differing levels of clustered attitudes within statuses (Helms, 1990). The contact status characterizes by an individual with naïve understanding about racial group differences. These individuals are inclined to ignore or not recognize differences between racial groups. The reintegration status describes a person who reports feelings of anger and resentment towards ethnic minorities and tends to see them as inferior to Whites. Pseudo Independence is the status describing an individual who begins to become more aware of White dominance and privilege and how these issues contribute to racist attitudes. The last status behavior is autonomy. This is when racial similarities and differences are appreciated and a non-racist White identity is established.

The concept of white racial consciousness suggests that the more developed and closer to autonomy a person's white racial consciousness is the more accepting

and appreciative a person will be of different groups. The assumption is that the more accepting a person is of different groups the more sensitive a person might be to those differences and feel more positively about these differences instead of threatened, insecure, or indifferent.

Thus, white racial consciousness will be measured in this study since it is suggested that person's individual level within white racial consciousness, influences them to be more likely they are to support racial fairness and equality and less likely to accept inferior and/or negative treatment of minorities.

Empathy is another factor that has to be considered when exploring racial teasing. Empathy is the sharing and understanding of another person's emotional state and experience. Empathetic people can generally consider and anticipate how others might feel and often conduct themselves in a matter that minimizes the negative feelings of others. People with high empathy do not like to profit or benefit at the cost of others' feelings (Gini, Albiero, Benelli, & Altoe, 2007). Furthermore, empathy is positively related to helping behaviors, and it has been suggested that empathy is a possible moderator for aggression and other social behaviors (Gini et al., 2007). Moreover, it has been found that empathy is negatively related to bullying and negatively related to positive attitudes towards bullying. Also people who score high on measures of empathy are also more likely to intervene in a bullying situation as a way to protect the victim of the bullying. Given the findings, it is important to measure empathy in this study as it is quite likely to be related to how participants might perceive the racial/ethnic teasing.

Extended Contact Theory

Given the research, there are clear reasons to be concerned about teasing, including the short and long term effects. Furthermore, there is much to be invested in possible solutions to ameliorate those effects. The present study considers the possibility of integrating the value of contact and friendships to reduce occurrence of racial teasing. According to this theory just being in contact with “different” people will help to reduce stereotypes and negative feelings towards that particular group, arguably reducing prejudice and racism. The Extended Contact Theory also proposes that interracial contact can facilitate positive and tolerant attitudes. The benefits of being in contact with people who are different also include challenging erroneous beliefs by being exposed to more direct information about that particular group (Powers & Ellison, 1994). Some believe that these benefits can easily be transferred to the whole group, magnifying the effect of contact (Powers & Ellison, 1994).

The Extended Contact Theory states that when people of “different” groups have contact with each other benefits can be expected. Moreover, contact with out-group members does not have to be direct for it to have benefits (Wright et al., 1997). One study found the racial attitudes of White residents were less anti-Black sentiment when their new neighbor was Black versus residents that had new White neighbors (Hamilton & Bishop, 1976). Moreover, these benefits were not dependent on actual direct contact with the new Black neighbors. It is believed that, although there may not have been any direct contact, one possible explanation for the attitudinal changes were that negative stereotypes or beliefs about Blacks held by the Whites were not confirmed (Hamilton & Bishop, 1976). Wright et al. (1997) also found that knowledge of an in-group-out-group

friendship was associated with “less affective prejudice and less overall prejudice toward the target out-group” (p. 78). These findings persisted even after an out-group friend was removed from the equation, isolating the vicarious benefits of having a “friend of a friend” be of a different race (Wright et al., 1997). It was also found that the number of out-group friends is also important. The greater the number of out-group friends the lower the prejudice (Wright et al., 1997). Lastly, they found the more the in-group member perceived an overlap in themselves with the out-group member the lower the prejudice (Wright et al., 1997). Again this suggests that the greater the intensity and frequency of the contact the greater the benefits.

Intergroup Contact Theory

Intergroup Contact Theory, formalized by Gordon Allport, purports that it is not simply the contact that facilitates more positive attitudes among groups but that sometimes the level, intensity, and frequency of contact is also important (Allport, 1954). The premise is based on the concept that “contact between members of different groups reduces existing negative intergroup attitudes” (Wright et al., 1997). This is the basis for the Intergroup Contact Theory and asserts that changes can happen among people when relationships are: equal in status, have similar goals, supportive, and when the groups forming the relationships have support of authorities. This theory has been used and researched for over 50 years and has been influential when considering prejudice and racism.

In Pettigrew’s (1998) reformulation of Allport’s Intergroup Contact Theory, he suggested that the missing factor is the *friendship potential* because, although contact may help in attitude changes, sometimes contact can actually reinforces faulty and

inaccurate stereotypes or the contact is too subtle to have generalized and lasting effects. Therefore, “contact in and of itself is not adequate” (Wright et al., p. 73, 1997). Perhaps it is, in fact, as Pettigrew (1998) suggested, friendship, a greater level, intensity, and frequency of contact that is adequate to make lasting behavioral and attitudinal changes among groups and it is friendship potential that has a prejudice-reducing role (Wright et al. 1997). “Friendships have been found to help satisfy...intimacy; enhance interpersonal skills, sensitivity, and understanding; and contribute significantly to cognitive and social developments and psychological adjustment” (Way & Pahl, p. 325, 2001).

One study by Pettigrew (1997) found that having a friend from another group, an out-group, predicts lower levels of both subtle and obvious prejudice. Clark and Ayers (1992) also found that high quality interracial friendship was related to less racial bias. Powers and Ellison (1994) had similar results when they found that Blacks who reported having White friends also reported more positive attitudes towards race relations. Pettigrew (1997) found that having friends from an out-group contributed to greater support for the out-group policies from those in the in-group. He found that these benefits were generalized to the entire out-group and not only to the specific friend from the out-group. Still, these benefits were dependent on having a friend from the out-group and similar findings were not found when it was a neighbor or coworker (Pettigrew, 1997). This seems to highlight the concept that it is not just contact that fosters change but that the nature of the contact is also important. Furthermore, it seems that for the intergroup contact effects to be most effective the contact has to have a strong affective tie and the group membership of all those involved has to be

salient (Wright et al., 1997). In other words, the friends have to care about each other and be invested in each other. This may be why the same benefits don't always translate from contact with coworkers or neighbors.

Ellers and Abrams (2004), tested Pettigrew's intergroup contact model and found "beneficial effects" when English and French students spent more time together (p. 251). They found similar results and benefits among American and Mexican employees. The authors noted that these benefits were greatest when the interactions ultimately grew into friendships and "affective ties" were central (Ellers & Abrams, p. 251, 2004). Pettigrew (1998) explains that when friendships are made people learn about each other, behaviors begin to change and bonds are created. Friends can review what they thought they knew about the outgroup and can challenge previously held stereotypes and misconceptions. Findings also supported the Extended Contact Theory, reiterating that the quality of the interaction is supremely important (Ellers & Abrams, 2004). Again, suggesting that those characteristics that are related to friendships, like caring and investment, are critical in changes that are lasting and positive.

One early and popularly recognized flaw of the Intergroup Contact Theory was that a causal relationship could not be made. Perhaps it is a certain type of person that sought these particular contacts. However, Powers & Ellison (1995) found support for the Intergroup Contact Theory and that selection bias did not account for racial attitude changes. Nevertheless, a second flaw is that most of the early research was largely based on white racial attitudes and when more recent studies have looked at other ethnicities the results are sometimes mixed (Powers & Ellison, 1995). Nonetheless, it

has opened the door wide open for investigating how contact among different groups of people can facilitate positive change.

Benefits of Friendship

Largely, the Intergroup Contact Theory's premise is that the level, intensity, and frequency are critical for change seem to resemble the construct of friendship, in that most people define friends as the people they spend the most quality time with.

Moreover, people would probably say that their friendships have influenced them in positive ways.

Friendships often facilitate equal status, common goals, and cooperation (Ellers & Abrams, 2004). When people form friendships those bonds can include deep care and appreciation for the other person. This may be particularly true when people's differences are salient. An example of how forming relationship can change perceptions and facilitate growth is, *Another Level*, a group of men involved in a 20 year long running group of Caucasian and African American men. They decided to get together and meet so that they could discuss men's issues, including issues related to their ethnicity. These men often found themselves changing their misconceptions of the other men and adopted a more open and generous attitude towards the men that were of a different ethnicity. Additionally, the men agreed that the group would not have been successful if the men were unable to change racist beliefs, again citing that as they learned more about each other the more inclined they were to be have positive racial attitudes (Peterson, 2007). It was also suggested that as strong social networks are formed, such as friendship, what people discover is that there are more similarities than differences, perhaps contributing to empathy for the other person.

Moreover, Eder (1991) found that having friends of different races, in essence out-group friends, was associated with higher educational aspirations and greater leadership skills. Among children with cross-racial friends it was found greater social competence, increased minority acceptance, and less desire for social distance from ethnic minorities was found (Eder, 1991). Others have found greater social competence and multicultural sensitivity among those with friends of a different race (Damico, Bell-Nathaniel, & Green, 1981). Also, people who have interracial friends tend to be more comfortable in interracial environments and seek out these environments, which may give them an advantage in the increasingly diverse school and work arenas (Emerson, Kimbro & Yancey, 2002).

Present Study

The purpose of this study is to explore how having Mexican American friends influences a person's perception to racial/ethnic (Mexican American) specific teasing. This study sought to extend the research on friendships and prejudice by investigating how friendship influences a person rating of ethnic specific teasing. This study is significant because promoting interracial friendships could be an avenue to alleviate some of the negative effects of racial teasing. Naylor and Cowie (1999) have already found promise in befriending strategies to help reduce bullying in schools. Moreover, it may help facilitate and create a more comfortable social environment that might help ethnic minorities in school.

Looking back, one of the elements that Allport thought important in the value of intergroup contact was to have the support of authorities. In this case, if the authority that is represented by school officials can support befriending interventions it would

seem that the benefits could be maximized. Naylor and Cowie (1999) reviewed the effectiveness of some befriending strategies, similar to the one suggested in this study, and found that the strategies implemented positively influenced school bullying and engendered positive classroom sentiment.

The idea is to capitalize on the positive impact that friends can have on each other. One study has found that the long terms benefits of having reciprocated friendships is that it can protect against victimization of teasing (Boulton, Trueman, Chau, Whitehand, & Amatya, 1999). Friends can also help after the fact as several have found that friendship can help reduce the negative impacts of teasing such as loneliness and depression (Moultapa, et al., 2004). It has repeatedly been suggested that friends can influence each other more than parents do and that friends indeed offer a unique learning experience to each other (Moultapa, et al., 2004). It is believed that with the proposed benefits more ethnic minority student will feel comfortable in school, stay in school, and ultimately excel, while also avoiding some of the negative effects of teasing.

Research Questions

The current study attempted to answer the following questions:

1. What relationship exists between participant's report of having Mexican American friendships and how they rate vignettes containing (Mexican American) racial/ethnic specific teasing?

1a.) H_0 : There is no relationship between having Mexican Americans friends and perception of racial/ethnic teasing.

1b.) H_0 : There is no relationship between the number of reported Mexican Americans friends and perception of racial/ethnic teasing.

2. Does self report of exposure to different ethnicities (Caucasian, African American, Mexican American/Hispanic, Asian American, and Native American) influence how participants rate vignettes containing (Mexican American) racial/ethnic specific teasing?

2.) H_0 : There is no relationship between exposure to different ethnicities and perception of racial/ethnic teasing.

3. What relationship does the reported closeness to a Mexican American friend (Target Person) have on a participant's rating of vignettes containing (Mexican American) racial/ethnic specific teasing, while also considering levels of empathy, social desirability, prejudice, and white racial consciousness?

3a.) H_0 : There is no relationship between empathy, social desirability, prejudice, and racial consciousness and how participants perceive racial/ethnic teasing.

3b.) H_0 : Closeness to a Mexican American friend will not predict perception of racial/ethnic teasing.

3c.) H_0 : Empathy, social desirability, prejudice, and racial consciousness will not predict perception of racial/ethnic teasing.

4. What is the relationship between participant's own ethnicity and rating vignettes containing (Mexican American) racial/ethnic specific teasing?

4.) H_0 : There is no relationship between participant's own ethnicity and perception of racial/ethnic teasing.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Participants

Caucasian ($n = 40$), Mexican American ($n = 32$) attending four universities in Texas participated in this study. Eighty-eight participants completed the survey. Twenty were male and 68 were female, 40 were Caucasian, 32 Mexican American/Hispanic, 6 African American, 5 Asian American, 2 Native American, and 3 identified as Other. Most participants were either 18 or 19 years old; the average age was 22, and the age range of 17-52. Forty-four identified as freshman, 12 as sophomores, 12 as juniors, 10 as seniors, and 10 as graduate students.

Procedure

Professors listed in their school website as teaching instructors in their respective college of liberal arts and social sciences were emailed with information about this study and were sent a recruitment letter. If they allowed their students to participate they were asked to forward the recruitment letter to their students. The survey was available online using questionpro.com as the server. A group of four college students was used to determine the average amount of time to complete the survey. The average time for completion was 30 minutes. Students who were given the recruitment letter and agreed to participate were directed to a link. After giving some basic demographic information, they completed 6 different instruments. After they completed the survey they were directed to a separate page in which they could register for a raffle for the possibility of winning one of two ipods, as inducements to participate.

Instruments

Demographic Information Sheet. A demographic questionnaire asked questions regarding age, gender, major, and number of semester in college. Participants were also asked about the diversity within their hometown, high school, and neighborhood. Lastly, they were also asked to estimate how many Mexican American friends they have, if any.

White Racial Consciousness Development Scale-Revised (WRCDS-R). The Revised White Racial Consciousness Development Scale (WRCDS-R; Lee, Puig, Pasquarella-Daley, Denny, Rai, Dallape, & Parker, 2007) is a measure of white racial consciousness. It is based on an earlier version of the inventory (WRCDS; Clancy & Parker, 1989). The inventory is designed to assess four White racial identity schemas or statuses (contact, reintegration, pseudo independence, and autonomy) described by Helms (1990).

The (WRCDS-R) consists of 40 items. 8 Contact items, 14 Reintegration items, 9 Pseudo-Independence items, and 9 Autonomy items. Lee et al. (2007) report good construct validity. The measure demonstrates good construct validity as it differentiates a group of counselors and a group of undergraduate students. Additionally, alpha coefficients for the subscales Contact, Reintegration, Pseudo-Independence, and Autonomy were .81, .86, .84, and .71, respectively (Lee, et al., 2007). For this study, alphas for each subscale were .79, .87, .74, .80, respectively.

Acquaintance Description Form F-2 (ADF-F2). The Acquaintance Description (ADF; Wright, 1997) is a 70 item self report measure designed to assess the salient characteristic of a personal or close relationship. The form consists of 14 scales that

measure dimensions of friendship quality. The scales are Voluntary Independence, Person-qua-person, Utility Value, Stimulation Value, Ego Support Value, Self-affirmation Value, Security Value, Maintenance Difficulty-Personal, Maintenance Difficulty-Situational, General Favorability, Exclusiveness, Permanence, Social Regulation, and Emotional Expression. The instrument asks participants to think of a Target Person (TP). In this study, parameters ask the participant to think of their closest Mexican American friend, as the Target Person. Participants are asked to what extent each statement is applicable to their Target Person. Participants rate the statement on a scale of Never (0) to Always (6) and Definitely Not (0) to Definitely (6). Because of the wording of the statements, 43 statements asked the participants to respond on a scale of Never (0) to Always (6) and 7 asked the participants to respond on a scale of Definitely (6) to Definitely Not (0).

Because of the validity issues with the four Relationship Differential Scales, these scales from this study were omitted. Wright (1997) reports irrelevant scales can be omitted without affecting the validity and reliability of the instrument. Moreover, he states that when an investigator is not trying to differentiate romantic relationships (married, engaged, dating) it is recommended to remove those scales that tend to measure romantic relationships. Wright (1977) warns that an investigator should ONLY eliminate entire scales not single questions. Therefore, scales Exclusiveness, Permanence, Social Regulation, and Emotional Expression have been omitted, and scales Voluntary Interdependence, Person-qua-person, Utility Value, Stimulation Value, Ego Support Value, Self-affirmation Value, Security Value, Maintenance Difficulty-Personal, Maintenance Difficulty-Situational, and General Favorability were used.

Ultimately for this study, only 50 questions were used. The greater the score the closer the participant is reporting to be friends with their Target Person and the greater the intensity of friendship with that person. For this study, only the total score was used to assess the friendship variable. The alpha for the remaining scales range from .62 to .86 with an average of .754 and test-retest correlations ranging from .78 to .97 with an average of .905. For this study alpha was .97.

Balanced Emotional Empathy Scale (BEES). BEES (Mehrabian, 1997) is a measure of emotional empathy. It consists of 30 items which contain 15 positively-worded and 15 negatively-worded items and is rated on a very strong disagreement (-4) to very strong agreement (+4) scale. Higher scores indicate greater emotional empathy. The BEES had been used to assess the effectiveness of an empathy training class for medical students. BEES scores increased significantly from pre to post tests after empathy training sessions (Shapiro, Morrison, & Boker, 2004). Similarly, Farkas (2002) also used the BEES to measure the effectiveness of empathy training towards Holocaust victims and also found that BEES scores increased with the empathy training classes. Macaskill, Maltby, and Day (2002) also used the BEES and found that participants with higher BEES scores were more likely to find it easier to forgive others. Previous research reports an alpha of .87 (Caruso & Mayer, 1998). For this study, alpha was .89.

Blatant and Subtle Prejudice Scale (BSPS). The BSPS (Pettigrew & Meertens, 1995) was used to measure racial attitudes towards Mexican Americans. It is a 16 item measure. Item 15 is made up of four questions and item 16 is made up of two questions. Higher scores indicate greater prejudice and less tolerance. Although the

measure was originally designed to assess for prejudice towards Dutch, the authors have stated that this measure can be used for different races. In this study, the measure was revised to measure prejudice towards Mexican Americans. This measure has been revised to measure prejudice of British about West Indians, British about Asians, Dutch about Turk, Dutch about Surinamers, French about North Africans, French about Asians, Germans about Turks, and Whites about Blacks and “adequate reliabilities across all samples” were found (Pettigrew & Meertens, p. 64, 1995). This measure has been found to be significantly correlated with ethnocentrism, racist movement approval, intergroup friends, political conservatism, group relative deprivation, national pride, and political interest. Pettigrew and Meertens (1995) cite three indications of internal validity. First, they found great “strength and consistency of both prejudice scales’ [Blatant and Subtle scales] relationships with the ethnocentrism measure” finding a large effect size for the Blatant Prejudice scale and Subtle Prejudice scale with $d = .72$ and $d = .54$, respectively (p. 68). Moreover, it was found that ethnocentrism was a “major predictor” of prejudice (Pettigrew & Meertens, p. 67, 1995). Secondly, when looking at the data the authors divided participants according to their two scores (Blatant Prejudice score and Subtle Prejudice score) into three groups: Bigots, scored high on both scores, Equalitarians scored low on both scales, and Subtles scored high on Subtle and low in Blatant. Then these groups were compared on their response on the Right of Immigrants question. “Highly significant and consistent relationships are found in all samples” (Pettigrew & Meertens, p. 69, 1995). Bigots wanted to be stricter and more restrictive towards immigrants, equalitarians wanted more liberal rights towards immigrants, and subtles were caught right in the middle and more indifferent (Pettigrew

& Meertens, 1995). Lastly, on the question regarding immigrant policy a similarly strong relationship was found. Alpha for this instrument ranges from .73 to .81 and alpha ranges from .84 to .89 for the Blatant scale and .70 to .81 for the Subtle scale (Pettigrew & Meertens, 1995). For this study alpha was .82.

Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (M-C 2(10)). The M-C 2(10) (Strahan & Gerbasi, 1972) was used to measure social desirability. This measure is designed as a construct of a participant's need to respond in a favorable way for social approval (Crowne & Marlowe, 1964). It is a 33 item instrument made of true and false questions.

The M-C 2(10) includes 10 of the original 33 items of the M-C Scale (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960). These ten items are unmodified and it is reported that when the investigator is concerned about keeping measures short this form can be used without compromising reliability and is recommended. Higher scores indicate greater need for responding in a socially desirable way.

The MCSD has been correlated with other measures of social desirability, such Edwards Social Desirability Scale ($r = .37$) and the Lie Scale on the MMPI ($r = .54$) (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960; Tanaka-Matsumi & Kameoka, 1986).

Moreover, one study analyzed the relationship of social desirability, as measured by a short version of Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale, and Pettigrew and Meertens' Blatant and Subtle Prejudice Scale (BSPS) and found neither the Blatant or Subtle scale scores were correlated with participants' tendency for giving socially desirable responses (Rattazzi & Volpato, 2003).

Crowne and Marlowe (1960) have reported an alpha of .88 and a test-retest value of $r = .89$. For this study alpha was .66.

Vignettes. Vignettes were used as the stimuli to measure perception of racial/ethnic teasing. Vignettes were designed by the investigator and a focus group. The group was made of college students of both Mexican American/Hispanic and Caucasian ethnicities. They discussed some of the stereotypical things Mexican Americans get teased about based on personal experience, experiences of others, and the media. The members of the group were asked: What do you feel Mexican Americans are teased about, Can you recall jokes or teases that you have heard directed about Mexican Americans, about their race/ethnicity/culture, what kind of jokes or teases have you made towards Mexican American friends or family? Themes from the discussion within the focus group were: Mexican Americans are teased about word pronunciation, about how they dress, foods they eat, darker complexion, their larger family size, where they live, immigration status, and the menial labor they are often associated with. The investigator also searched the internet for anecdotes of people reporting teasing due to their Mexican American/Hispanic ethnicity. An expert in teasing and racial and ethnic relations reviewed the vignettes and established its face validity.

Vignettes were written to resemble a script and only basic background information was given to the participants before they read each script (ethnicity of the characters in the vignettes). The focus group was then asked to look over the vignettes again. Input from the focus group was incorporated into the final vignettes. The vignettes were written in script form resembling a script for a play or performance so that the reader could more easily envision the vignette. The scenario was to be as real and believable as possible without being influenced by any other information provided by the investigator.

Participants were asked to read each vignette and then rate them on 12 adjectives using a 5 point Likert scale, from 1= don't agree, 3= somewhat agree, 5= definitely agree. For example the first statement is: The vignette was aggressive. The second: The vignette was funny. There are 12 adjectives to rate the vignettes eight are positive: funny, jolly, friendly, humorous, witty, goodhearted, amusing, and cheerful and four are considered negative: aggressive, mean, cruel, and argumentative. These adjectives were selected from a previous study that also explored teasing (Conoley, Hershberger, Gonzalez, Rinker, & Crowley, 2008). Each is rated on the 5 point Likert scale. Lower scores indicate a more disapproving perception of racial teasing, conversely higher scores indicate a more positive or approving perception.

The ratings for each adjective were averaged across the six vignettes to create 12 composite adjective ratings indicating each person's overall tendency to view the teasing vignettes as aggressive, funny, jolly, etc. An exploratory factor analysis using a principle component analysis, PCA, with varimax rotation was conducted on these 12 adjective ratings to determine the way in which the adjective ratings varied with one another.

The PCA provided evidence for a two-factor structure (see Table 1), suggesting that variation in responses on the 12 adjective ratings are best characterized as varying along two separate factors. The first rotated factor, with an eigenvalue of 6.75, accounted for 56.2% of the variance in the adjective ratings. The second extracted factor, with an eigenvalue of 3.07, accounted for an additional 25.6% of the variance. The eigenvalues of all other extracted factors were less than 1, indicating that a two-factor structure is optimal for accounting for variation in the adjective ratings.

There was a consistent and interpretable pattern of loadings on the two rotated factors. All positively valenced adjectives—funny, jolly, friendly, humorous, witty, good hearted, amusing, and cheerful—had strong loadings on the first factor (all exceeded .80) but not on the second. All negatively valenced adjectives—aggressive, mean, cruel, and argumentative—had strong loadings on the second factor (all exceeded .65) but not on the first. Only two adjectives—friendly and argumentative—had loadings of .30 or greater on both factors.

According to the pattern of factor loadings, then, the two extracted factors seem to represent the extent to which people viewed the teasing behavior in an overall positive fashion (indexed by their scores on the first factor) and in an overall negative fashion (indexed by their scores on the second factor).

Table 1

Exploratory Factor Analysis of Adjectives in Vignettes

Adjectives	Component	
	1	2
aggressive		.893
funny	.922	
jolly	.946	
friendly	.860	.318
humorous	.920	
mean		.847
witty	.808	
cruel		.911
goodhearted	.815	
argumentative	-.417	.660
amusing	.964	
cheerful	.929	

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Mean, standard deviations, scale alphas, and correlations of the study variables are presented on Table 2. Statistical significance was determined when $p < .05$.

Correlation results indicate racial/ethnic teasing vignettes were most strongly correlated with prejudice and two of the statuses of white racial consciousness, reintegration and autonomy.

Table 2

Correlations of Scales and Means, Standard Deviations, and Alphas

Scales	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	α
1. ADF									1.68	1	.97
2. BEES	-.411*								6.83	1.13	.89
3. SD	-.379*	.301*							3.37	.48	.66
4. BSPS	.440*	-.241	-.200						2.41	.47	.82
5. CONTACT	.144	-.306*	-.123	.364*					2.22	.67	.79
6. REINT.	.356*	-.053	-.283*	.580*	.326*				2.84	.64	.87
7. INDEPED.	-.212	.157	.121	-.217	-.085	-.276			2.80	.58	.74
8. AUTON.	-.435*	.425*	.349*	-.497*	-.446*	-.445*	.294*		3.54	.68	.8
9. TEAS	.358*	-.280*	-.079	.437*	.142	.474*	-.340*	.417*	2.37	.7	.97

Note. 2-tailed correlations, * $p < .01$; (ADF) Acquaintance Description Form; (BEES) Balanced Emotional Empathy Scale; (SD) Social Desirability; (BSPS) Blatant and Subtle Prejudice Scale; Contact, Reintegration, Pseudo-Independence, and Autonomy are the four subscales of White Racial Consciousness; (Teas) Teasing Vignettes.

Question One

Question 1: What relationship exists between participant's report of having Mexican American friendships and how they rate vignettes containing (Mexican American) racial/ethnic specific teasing?

1a.) H_0 : There is no relationship between having Mexican Americans friends and perception of racial/ethnic teasing.

1b.) H_0 : There is no relationship between the number of reported Mexican Americans friends and perception of racial/ethnic teasing.

In addition to the five scales (ADF, BEES, SD, BSPS, and WRC), a number of additional predictor variables were examined—these variables were designed to assess participant's experience and familiarity with Hispanic or Mexican American populations. One variable was simply a dichotomous (yes/no) measure of whether participants have any Mexican American friends (henceforth MXFRND) with yes = 1 and no = 0. A second variable asked participants how many such friends they had (henceforth NUMFRND). Some participants provided nonspecific responses to this question (e.g., "15-20" or "25 or more"), so responses were classified into one of five categories: 0 friends, 1-2 friends, 3-5 friends, 6-10 friends, and 11 or more friends. Those who indicated nonspecific response greater than 10 were put into the 5th category, i.e. 11 or more friends.

There was a statistically significant correlation between the dichotomous question of "Do you have a Mexican American friend" and the rating of racial teasing

vignettes $r=.226$, $p=.034$. To double check Spearman rho was also done with similar results, $r=.254$, $p=.017$. Thus the Null was rejected in Hypothesis 1a.

No significant correlation was found between the specific number of reported Mexican American friends a person has and the perception of racial/ethnic teasing vignettes, and a decision to fail to reject the null was made for Hypothesis 1b.

Question Two

Question 2: Does self report of exposure to different ethnicities (Caucasian, African American, Mexican American/Hispanic, Asian American, and Native American) influence how participants rate vignettes containing (Mexican American) racial/ethnic specific teasing?

H_0 : There is no relationship between exposure to different ethnicities and perception of racial/ethnic teasing.

Participants provided information regarding the ethnic composition of their 1) hometown, 2) neighborhood, and 3) school, indicating the percentage of Caucasians, African Americans, Hispanics, Asian Americans, and Native Americans (as well as an “other” category) that constituted each of these categories. These responses were averaged, providing a single index for each participant’s exposure to each of the five ethnic categories. Responses indicated that across settings (i.e., averaging the percentages from the “hometown,” “neighborhood,” and “school” questions), participants were exposed primarily to Caucasians (PER_CAUC: 47.8%), followed by Hispanics (PER_HISP: 34.9%), African Americans (PER_AFAM: 11.4%), Asian Americans (PER_ASAM: 3.7%), and Native Americans (PER_NATAM: 1.1%) (see Table 3).

Table 3

Correlations of Exposure of Ethnic Groups, Mexican American Friends, and Teasing Vignettes

	PER_ CAUC	PER_ AFAM	PER_ HISP	PER_ ASAM	PER_ NATAM	MXFRND	NUMFRND
PER_CAUC							
PER_AFAM	.016						
	.871						
PER_HISP	-.877	-.429					
	.000	.000					
PER_ASAM	-.064	.110	-.210				
	.510	.256	.029				
PER_NATAM	-.195	.044	.049	.162			
	.042	.651	.615	.092			
MXFRND	.320	-.107	-.228	-.084	-.057		
	.001	.266	.017	.384	.556		
NUMFRND	-.282	-.135	.364	-.160	-.037	-.222	
	.014	.244	.001	.168	.749	.026	
TEAS	.178	-.273	.005	-.155	-.115	.226	-.064
	.149	.025	.971	.211	.355	.034	.618

Note. 2-tailed correlations, $p < .05$

There was only one significant correlation between participant's exposure to different ethnicities and how they rated the vignettes, PER_AFAM ($r = -.27$ $p = .025$). Such that the greater a person's exposure to African Americans the lower the TEAS score, indicating a more disapproving attitude toward teasing. For this reason, the null for Hypothesis 2 was rejected.

A multiple regression was examined in which the two ethnic exposure variables that exhibited significant zero-order correlations with TEAS (i.e., MXFRND and PER_AFAM) were entered as predictors. This regression was not statistically significant, $R^2 = .09$, $F(2, 64) = 3.05$, $p < .06$. PER_AFAM was the only statistically

significant predictor, $\beta = -.26$, $t(64) = -2.19$, $p < .05$, indicating that the greater one's exposure to African Americans, the more disapproving one is of teasing behavior.

A power analysis was conducted on this reduced regression model. The power analysis revealed that this regression model, with a sample size of 67 (as not all the 88 participants completed both of these instruments), had a power of .59 to predict variation in TEAS at a significant level. A post hoc analysis indicated that the predictive ability of the two-predictor model would have reached significance with a sample size of 69 (mean square = .429 instead of .443; $F = 3.145$ instead of 3.046; $p = .0496$ instead of .054). To replicate the study and find a significant combined effect of MXFRND and PER_AFAM on TEAS with a Type I error rate alpha of .05 and a power .80, a sample size of 105 would be needed.

Question Three

Question 3: What relationship does the reported closeness to a Mexican American friend (Target Person) have on a participant's rating of vignettes containing (Mexican American) racial/ethnic specific teasing, while also considering levels of empathy, social desirability, prejudice, and white racial consciousness?

3a.) H_0 : There is no relationship between empathy, social desirability, prejudice, and white racial consciousness and how participants perceive racial/ethnic teasing.

3b.) H_0 : Closeness to a Mexican American friend will not predict perception of racial/ethnic teasing.

3c.) H_0 : Empathy, social desirability, prejudice, and white racial consciousness will not predict perception of racial/ethnic teasing.

The correlations among all scale variables—ADF, BEES, SD, BSPS, WRC (including subscales Contact, Reintegration, Pseudo Independence, and Autonomy) and TEAS—are shown below (see Table 2). Three of the four subscales of the WRC were significantly correlated with the dependent variable, TEAS. Specifically, higher scores on the Pseudo-Independence and Autonomy subscales were associated with a disapproving attitude toward teasing (i.e., lower TEAS scores), $r = -.34$, $p = .002$ and $r = -.42$, $p = .000$, respectively, whereas higher scores on the Reintegration subscale were associated with more favorable attitudes toward teasing, $r = .47$, all $ps < .01$. Hence, the decision was to reject the null for Hypothesis 3a.

Variables ADF, BEES, SD, and BSPS and WRC's 4 subscales- contact, reintegration, pseudo-independence, and autonomy, were run in a regression model as predictors of TEAS (see Table 4). The overall model was significant, $R^2 = .39$, $F(8,74) = 5.97$, $p < .001$. In the current model, the Reintegration subscale of the WRC was the only statistically significant predictor ($\beta = .34$, $t = 2.76$, $p < .01$). Because the ADF scale was not a significant predictor, the decision was to fail to reject the null for Hypothesis 3b. Furthermore, since BEES, SD, and Contact- a subscale of WRC were not significant predictors the decision was to fail to reject the null for Hypothesis 3c.

Table 4

Multiple Regression of Friendship, Empathy, Social Desirability, Prejudice, and White Racial Consciousness

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	16.445	8	2.056	5.973	.000
Residual	25.466	74	.344		
Total	41.910	82			

	B	Std. Error	Beta	T	Sig.
(Constant)	2.122	.998		2.126	.037
ADF	.060	.085	.082	.708	.481
BEES	-.126	.070	-.203	-1.793	.077
SD	.286	.152	.194	1.880	.064
BSPS	.202	.189	.132	1.072	.287
Contact	-.165	.113	-.156	-1.451	.151
Reintegrate	.381	.138	.343	2.757	.007
Independence	-.196	.120	-.158	-1.633	.107
Autonomy	-.177	.130	-.169	-1.360	.178

Note. Contact, Reintegrate, Independence, and Autonomy are subscales of White Racial Consciousness. $p < .05$

Given that BSPS and ADF were nonsignificant predictors in the regression model, a reduced regression model was run in which these variables were excluded. This reduced model accounted for a significant amount of variation in TEAS, $R^2 = .38$, $F(6,77) = 7.70$, $p < .001$. Higher scores on the Reintegration subscale were associated with a more favorable attitude toward teasing, $\beta = .43$, $t = 3.95$, $p < .001$, whereas higher scores on BEES were associated with a more disapproving attitude toward teasing, $\beta = -.25$, $t = -2.32$, $p < .05$.

Question Four

Question: 4 What is the relationship between participant's own ethnicity and rating vignettes containing (Mexican American) racial/ethnic specific teasing?

H_0 : There is no relationship between participant's own ethnicity and perception of racial/ethnic teasing.

The relationship between people's own ethnicity and their scores on TEAS was examined. Only Caucasian ($N = 40$) and Hispanic ($N = 32$) participants were included in this analysis because there were too few participants of any other ethnicities to provide reliable estimates (all other N s less than 7). Although there was a moderate-sized difference in TEAS scores between Hispanic ($M = 2.26$) and Caucasian participants ($M = 2.51$), $d = -.36$, such that Hispanics were more disapproving of teasing behavior, the difference was not statistically significant, $F(1, 70) = 2.28, p > .10$. Thus, the decision for Hypothesis 4 was to fail to reject the null.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

This study had a main goal to explore the influence friendships have on how teasing is perceived. Much of the research on friendship indicates that friendships have positive effects on many areas of our lives. There is the old adage that “friends divide your sorrows and multiple your joys”. Friends can also help and protect us from the ill treatment of others, perhaps this is the “dividing sorrows” part. Furthermore, it has been found that friends can reduce each others’ vulnerable to teasing (Lemarche, Brendgen, Vitaro, Perusse, & Dionne, 2006).

There were four main hypothesis and questions.

Question 1: What relationship exists between participant’s report of having Mexican American friendships and how they rate vignettes containing (Mexican American) racial/ethnic specific teasing?

Congruent with the Extended Contact Theory, the hypothesis states that having Mexican American friends will be correlated with how participants perceive and rate the vignettes, such that those who report having Mexican American friends will rate the vignettes less positively. A significant correlation was found between these two variables, to the extent that the simple answer of “yes” or “no” to the question “Do you have a Mexican American friends?” is positively related to how participants rate the vignettes. Therefore, the data supports the Extended Contact Theory and supports, at least, part of Question 1.

The second part to Question 1 went a step further to explore if the number of Mexican American friends influenced the rating of racial/ethnic teasing vignettes.

Participants were asked a closed ended question; if they responded with a “yes” to the question “Do you have Mexican American friends?” they were then asked to give a number/estimate of how many Mexican American friends they had.

The number of reported Mexican American friends was not related to how participants perceived and rated the vignettes. So, to some degree the Extended Contact Theory was supported by the data, such that having friends that are Mexican American influence how participants perceive and rate the racial teasing vignettes, but the actual number of friends was irrelevant. Thus, having one friend was as good as having 5, 10, or more.

Question 2: Does self report of exposure to different ethnicities (Caucasian, African American, Mexican American/Hispanic, Asian American, and Native American) influence how participants rate vignettes containing (Mexican American) racial/ethnic specific teasing?

Question 2 also explores how consistent the data fits the Extended Contact Theory, by exploring participant's exposure/contact with different ethnic groups. Participants were asked to estimate the ethnic percentage breakdown of their neighborhood, school, and hometown. Results indicated that the only relationship between exposure and rating of vignettes existed for participant's exposure to African Americans, so that participants who were most exposed to African Americans were more likely to rate the vignettes in less positive ways.

This finding is somewhat surprising and unanticipated as it was speculated that the exposure to Mexican Americans would prime participants to respond in a particular way, but that was not supported in the data.

A possible explanation is that throughout history African Americans have been the racial group that has been most closely identified as vulnerable to racial prejudice and racism. For example, the efforts of Martin Luther King Jr., the Rodney King beatings, Rosa Parks, Brown vs. the Board of Education are all popular examples of African Americans experiencing racism prejudice and/or advocating for equality. So, being exposed to more African Americans might make a person more sensitive towards racial issues and more considerate for groups that are mistreated, such as the Mexican Americans in the racial teasing vignettes of this study.

Question 3: What relationship does the reported closeness to a Mexican American friend (Target Person) have on a participant's rating of vignettes containing (Mexican American) racial/ethnic specific teasing, while also considering levels of empathy, social desirability, prejudice, and white racial consciousness?

The hypothesis for question 3 is congruent with the Intergroup Contact Theory, such that participants who report a closer relationship with their Target Person, a Mexican American friend, the less positive they will rate the vignettes. This effect was expected to maintain while also accounting for a participant's level of empathy, social desirability, prejudice, and white racial consciousness. A multiple regression was conducted. Reintegration was the only statistically significant predictor of perception of racial/ethnic teasing. This indicates that participants who resent ethnic minorities and view them as inferior to White, as indicated by lower scores on reintegration, report a more positive perception of racial/ethnic teasing. This supports previous research that

individual's White racial consciousness status is related to their perceptions of racial/ethnic minorities (Helms, 1990).

Correlation results showed that prejudice was highly correlated with three of the four subscales of white racial consciousness: contact, reintegration, and autonomy. Therefore, a reduced regression model, in which prejudice and friendship scores were eliminated as predictors, was done. This reduced model accounted for a significant amount of variation of how participants rated the racial/ethnic teasing vignettes. Higher scores on the Reintegration subscale were associated with a more favorable attitude toward teasing, whereas higher scores on empathy were associated with a more disapproving attitude toward teasing. Given the small sample size (84 participants) and the large number of predictor variables, the model had limited power to detect a significant effect for any particular variable, so it is not surprising that many of the effects did not reach the traditional significance level.

Question: 4 What is the relationship between participant's own ethnicity and rating vignettes containing (Mexican American) racial/ethnic specific teasing?

Lastly, the relationship between participant's own ethnicity and how they rated the vignettes was examined. Ultimately, the tendency for Mexican Americans/Hispanics disapproving of teasing behavior was not statistically supported, and there was no difference between how Mexican Americans/Hispanic and Caucasians perceived and rated the racial teasing vignettes.

Limitations

A limitation in this study is the relatively small N. For example, in the full regression model that included all five scale predictors: friendship, empathy, social

desirability, prejudice, and white racial consciousness, friendship explained only 2.3% of unique variance in the teasing vignettes, a nonsignificant increase ($p = .13$) in the 22.6% of variance explained by the other four predictors, as discussed earlier. A G power analysis revealed that the regression model, with a sample size of 83, had a power of .35 to detect a significant effect of friendship on teasing vignettes. A post hoc analysis indicated that the effect of friendship on teasing vignettes in the five-predictor regression model would have reached significance with a sample size of 137 (standard error = .069 instead of .09; $t = 1.986$ instead of 1.525; $p = .049$ instead of .131). To replicate the study and find a significant effect of friendship on teasing vignettes with a Type I error rate (α) of .05 and a power .80, a sample size of 260 would be needed. With a less stringent α level of .10, a sample size of 205 would be needed to reach significance (again with a power of .80).

In another instance, a G power analysis was conducted on the reduced regression model—the one in which having a Mexican American friend and exposure to African Americans were entered as predictors of teasing vignettes. This model explained 8.7% of the variance in teasing vignette scores, nearly a significant amount ($p < .06$). The power analysis revealed that this regression model, with a sample size of 67, had a power of .59 to predict variation in teasing vignette scores at a significant level. A post hoc analysis indicated that the predictive ability of the two-predictor model would have reached significance with a sample size of 69 (mean square = .429 instead of .443; $F = 3.145$ instead of 3.046; $p = .0496$ instead of .054). To replicate the study and find a significant combined effect of having a Mexican American friend and

exposure to African Americans on teasing vignette scores with a Type I error rate (α) of .05 and a power .80, a sample size of 105 would be needed.

Secondly, given the demographic of the participants in this study, 77% female and 23% male and that the sample was taken from universities in Texas, generalizability may be limited. Nonetheless, it would be fair to generalize to similar universities in the region.

Also, given the considerable difference between the number of men and women participants, 68 and 20, respectively, results may be more indicative of the gender differences between men and women. Research has already suggested that males and females teasing behaviors are different and it is possible that they perceive teasing differently too (Mooney, et al., 1991; Mouttapa, et al., 2004; Olweus, 1994). This may also be an area for future research to look at possible gender effect on how racial teasing is perceived, and thus how intervention may also differ.

As with many other studies, a limitation lies in the true validity of each measurement, in which the concern of measuring what I was hoping to measure may be a real limitation. This is especially true for the racial teasing vignettes, as reading vignettes may be quite different from watching the interaction in vivo, though in vivo also presents unique limitations. Moreover, it is difficult to know what was salient in each vignette for each participant. For example, some of the vignettes might be more subtle in their teasing than others. Some participants might perceive the content of each vignette differently within the disapproving- approving continuum. Therefore, an additional limitation may be the difference within the vignettes.

Implications

Despite the limitations, the results are promising and are in the direction predicted. The results partially supported the Extended Contact Theory. The results add to the literature that predicts that when groups can have contact with each other some benefits can be expected. In addition, some of the results support the Intergroup Contact Theory, suggesting that perhaps the greatest benefits can be expected when members of different groups can begin to consider each other as friends, thus gaining the positive influences friends often have on each other.

Given these results and Allport's (1954) assumption that in order to reap the greatest benefits of intergroup contact authorities need to support the contact, implications can be made for how school and university administrators might proactively intervene. Because one of the benefits of contact is that people will be less likely to perceive ethnic specific teasing in a positive way, perhaps campus living facilities, student organizations, freshman classes etc. could negotiate and facilitate the opportunity for greater interracial friendship interaction and contact. First, university administrators can get people who are different together and then encourage longer relationships e.g. tutoring groups, roommate assignments, student organization, classroom diversity etc.

An important implication can also be made for the value of white racial consciousness, as several of the subscales were not only correlated but were the strongest predictors of perception of racial/ethnic teasing. In fact, the reintegration subscale had the strongest correlation with perceptions of the racial teasing vignettes. Consider that the reintegration status describes a person who generally has feelings of

anger and resentment towards ethnic minorities and tends to see them as inferior to Whites and that individuals who scored higher in this subscale were also more likely to rate the vignettes in an approving way. Moreover, consider that the only subscale of white racial consciousness that was negatively correlated with perception of racial teasing vignettes was the pseudo-independence status. Again, the pseudo-independence status describes an individual who is beginning to become more aware of White dominance and privilege and how these issues contribute to racist attitudes. So, it can be suggested that as individuals gain a greater understanding and appreciation of racial difference it has an influence on how people rate teasing vignettes in a desired way.

Still, perhaps, even more interesting is what happens when individuals score high on the autonomy scale. The correlation between autonomy and perception of racial teasing was the third highest, after reintegration and prejudice (see Table 2). The autonomy status is indicative of when racial similarities and differences are appreciated and a non-racist White identity is established, yet in this study this subscale had a very similar correlation to perception of racial teasing as did the reintegration subscale. It seems that something interesting may happen when participants are either high in the reintegration or autonomy status. Moreover, whatever may be happening may not be similar, as is it is counter-indicative of the description of each of these statuses, but both of these statuses seem to produce similar correlations. Perhaps, the interpretation of the teasing is what changes, such that individuals high in the reintegration status find the teasing in positive ways while laughing at the target of the teasing. So these individuals might find a greater alliance to the teaser. Maybe, those high on the

autonomy status find the teasing in positive ways as they laugh with the target in the jovial and in jest manner that has been suggested can strengthen bonds and friendships. This may be a case of “I’m laughing with you not at you”. These individuals might be focusing more the jovial teasing experience as a whole versus the teaser or the target of the tease individually. Nevertheless, one thing seems clear; white racial consciousness is a complex construct that has implication for how participants in this study perceive racial/ethnic specific teasing.

Future Research

Research still needs to be done using college students, as little research exists. Most of the research has considered elementary, middle school, and high school, and has basically stopped there. It is important to gain more information about the nature of teasing in college, as some have suggested that teasing often changes as people get older and mature. Moreover, the implications for violence on college campuses highlights the need to get a temperature reading for how college students are treating each other in terms of ethnic and racial differences and how that might be related to teasing behaviors, which can perpetuate violence.

Also, future research may investigate how participants rated each vignette differently, as some of the racial teasing vignettes may be more aggressive or lighthearted or blatant than others. As the data showed, those who reported greater exposure to African Americans were more disapproving of racial teasing, and a possible reason has been hypothesized that this may be influenced by the overt racial discrimination of African Americans, then it would be interesting to see if the vignettes that were more blatant were rated differently.

Future research may also benefit from understanding how white racial consciousness influences friendships and teasing, as subscales of white racial consciousness were the best predictors in this study and produced interesting correlations. Perhaps learning more about how white racial consciousness is established and maintained and the subsequent effects it has on how people who identify as White interact with other racial groups, especially racial groups that are in a minority or often marginalized by the dominant White group.

Additionally, finding that there are certain predictors that influence less approving attitudes towards teasing the next step maybe to investigate whether less positive feelings translate into less likelihood of actually teasing. Moreover, bystander accountability may be an area to consider in reference to teasing. For example, will people who perceive teasing less positively not only refrain from engaging in teasing behavior but will they also intervene when they see others being teased? The effort is to stop the cycle of violence and improve the social environment in which we learn, work, and play.

REFERENCES

- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Aluede, O., Adeleke, F., Omoike, D., & Afen-Akpaide, J. (2007). A review of the extent, nature, characteristics and effects of bullying behaviour in schools. *Journal of Instructional Psychology, 35* (2), 151-158.
- Barnett, M. A., Burns, S. R., Sanborn, F. W., Bartel, J. S., & Wilds, S. J. (2004). Antisocial and prosocial teasing among children: Perceptions and individual differences. *Social Development, 13*, 292-310.
- Bartholomew, J. (Ed.). (1989). *Webster's encyclopedic unabridged dictionary of the English language* (8th ed., vol. 1). New York: Portland House.
- Baxter, L. A. (1992). Forms and function of intimate play in personal relationships. *Human Communication Research, 18*, 336-363.
- Beatty, L. A., & Alexeyev, E. B. (2008). The problem of school bullies: What the research tell us. *Adolescence, 43* (169), 1-11.
- Boulton, M. J., Trueman, M., Chau, C., Whitehand, C., & Amatya, K. (1999). Concurrent and longitudinal links between friendship peer victimization: Implications for befriending interventions. *Journal of Adolescence, 22*, 461- 466.
- Carlyle, K. E., & Steinman, K. J. (2007). Demographic differences in the prevalence, co-occurrence, and correlates of adolescent bullying at school. *Journal of Social Health, 77* (9), 623-629.
- Carter, R. T., Yeh, C. J., & Mazzula, S. L. (2008). Cultural values and racial identity status among Latino students. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Science, 30* (1), 5-23.

- Caruso, D. R., & Mayer, J. D. (1998). A measure of emotional empathy for adolescents and adults. Unpublished manuscript.
- Chapell, M. S., Casey, D., De la Cruz, C., Ferrell, J., Forman, J., Lipkin, R., Newsham, M., Sterling, M., & Whitaker, S. (2004). Bullying in college by students and teachers. *Adolescence*, 39, 53-64.
- Chapell, M. S., Hasselman, S. L., Kitchin, T., Lomon, S. N., MacIver, K. W., & Sarullo, P. L. (2006). Bullying in elementary school, high school, and college. *Adolescence*, 41 (164), 633-648.
- Claney, D., & Parker, W. M. (1989). Assessing white racial consciousness and perceived comfort with Black individuals: A preliminary study. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 67 (8), 449-452.
- Clark, M.L., & Ayers, M. (1992). Friendship similarities during early adolescence: Gender and racial patterns. *Journal of Psychology*, 126, 393-405.
- Cobas, J. A., & Feagin, J. R. (2007). Language oppression and resistance: The case of middle class Latinos in the United States. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 31 (2), 390-410.
- Conoley, C. W., Hershberger, M., Gonzalez, L., Rinker, S., & Crowley, A. (2008). Responding to interpersonal teasing. *Journal of Emotional Abuse*, 7 (4), 27-41.
- Crowne, D. P., & Marlowe, D. (1960). A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 24, 349-354.
- Crowne, D. P., & Marlowe, D. (1964). The approval motive: Studies in evaluative Dependence. New York: Wiley.
- Damico, S. B., Bell-Nathaniel, A., & Green, C. (1981). Effects of school organizational

- structure on interracial friendships in middle schools. *Journal of Educational Research*, 74, 388-393.
- Dixon, J.C. (2006). The ties that bind and those that don't: Toward reconciling group threat and contact theories of prejudice. *Social Forces*, 84 (4), 2179-2204.
- Eder, D. (1991). The role of teasing in adolescent peer group culture. *Sociology Studies of Child Development*, 4, 181-197.
- Ellers, A., & Abrams, D. (2004). Come together: Longitudinal comparisons of Pettigrew's reformulated intergroup contact model and the common ingroup identity model in Anglo-French and Mexican-American context. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 34 (3), 229-256.
- Emerson, M. O., Kimbro, R. T., & Yancey, G. (2002). Contact theory extended: The effects of prior racial contact on current social ties. *Social Science Quarterly*, 83 (3), 745-761.
- Endo, Y. (2007). Division in subjective construction of teasing incidents: Role and social skill level of the teasing function. *Japanese Psychological Association*, 49 (2), 111-120.
- Eron, L. D., & Huessmann, R. L. (1987). Aggression and its correlates over 22 years. In D. Corwell, I. M. & C. R. O'Connell (Eds.), *Childhood aggression and violence*. New York: Plenum.
- Espelage, D. E., Bosworth, K., & Simon, T. R. (2000). Examining the social context of bullying behaviors in early adolescence. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 78 (3), 326-334.
- Espelage, D. E., & Holt, M. K. (2001). Bullying and victimization during early

- adolescence: Peer influences and psychological correlates. *Journal of Emotional Abuse*, 2 (3), 123-142.
- Espelage, D. E., & Swearer S. M. (2003). Research on school bullying and victimization: What have we learned and where do we go from here? *School Psychology Review*, 32, 234-248.
- Farkas, R. D. (2002). Effect(s) of traditional versus learning-styles instructional methods on seventh-grade students' achievement, attitudes, empathy, and transfer of skill through a study of the Holocaust. *Dissertation Abstracts International, Section A: Humanities & Social Sciences*, 63, (4-A), 1243-1258.
- Fontana, J. (1999) Bullying in Montana's K-8 schools. *Dissertation Abstracts International, Section A: Humanities & Social Sciences*, 34, (6-B), 105-210.
- Fox, J. A., Elliot, D. S., Kerlikowske, R. G., Newman, S. A., & Christeson, W. (2003). Bullying Prevention is Crime Prevention: A report by Fight Crime: Invest in Kids.
- Garcia, I. F., & Perez, G. Q. (1989). Violence, bullying and counseling in the Iberian Peninsula: Spain. In Roland, E. & Munthe, E. (Eds.). *Bullying: An international perspective* (pp. 41-52). London: David Fulton.
- Gini, G., Albiero, P., Benelli, B., & Altoe, G. (2007). Does empathy predict adolescents' bullying and defending behavior? *Aggressive Behavior*, 33, 467- 476.
- Graham, S., & Juvonen, J. (2002). Ethnicity, peer harassment, and adjustment in middle school: An exploratory study. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 22, 173-199.
- Greenbaum, S. (1989). *Set straight on bullies*. Malibu, CA: National School Safety Center.
- Hamilton, D. L., & Bishop, G. D. (1976). Attitudinal and behavioral effects of initial

- integration of White suburban neighborhoods. *Journal of Social Issues*, 32, 47-67.
- Hanish, L. D., & Guerra, N. G. (2000). The roles of ethnicity and school context in predicting children's victimization by peers. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 28, 201-223.
- Helms, J. E. (1990). *Black and White racial identity: Theory, research, and practice*. New York: Greenwood Press.
- Jankauskiene, R., Kardelis, K., Sukys, S., & Kardeliene, L. (2008). Associations between school bullying and psychosocial factors. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 36 (2), 145-162.
- Jenson, J. M. (2007). Aggression and violence in the United States: Reflections on the Virginia Tech shootings. *Social Work Research*, 31 (3), 131-134.
- Johnston, L. D., O'Malley, P. M., & Bachman, J. G. (1993). Monitoring the future study for goal 6 of the national education goals: A special report for the National Education Goals Panel. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan's Institute for Social Research.
- Jones, D. C., & Newman, J. B. (2005). A three-factor model of teasing: The influence of friendship, gender, and topic on expected emotional reactions to teasing during early adolescence. *Social Development*, 14, 421- 439.
- Kowalaski, R. M. (2000). "I was only kidding!": Victims' and perpetrators' perceptions of teasing. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 26 (2), 231-241.
- LaFleur, N. K., Rowe, N., & Leach, M. M. (2002). Reconceptualizing white racial

- consciousness. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, 30, 148-152.
- Landau, S., Milich, R., Harris, M. J., & Larson, S. E. (2001). "You really don't know how much it hurts:" Children's and preservice teachers' reactions to childhood teasing. *School Psychology Review*, 30, 329- 344.
- Langevin, M. (2000). Teasing and bullying: Helping children deal with teasing and bullying: For parents, teachers and other adults. Retrieved on August 30, 2008 from http://www.stutterisa.org/CDRom/teasing/tease_bully.htm.
- Leary, M. R., Kowalski, R. M., Smith, L., & Phillips, S. (2003). Teasing, rejection, and violence: Case studies of school shootings. *Aggressive Behavior*, 29 (3), 202-214.
- Lee, S. M., Puig, A., Pasquarella-Daley, L., Denny, G., Rai, A. A., Dallape A., & Parker, W. M. (2007). Revising the white racial consciousness development scale. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development*, 39, 194-209.
- Macaskill, A., Maltby, J., & Day, L. (2002). Forgiveness of self and others and emotional empathy. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 142, 663-665.
- Marx, S. (2008). "Not blending in": Latino students in a predominately white school. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 30 (1), 69-88.
- McCabe, R. E., Anthony, M. M., Summerfeldt, L. J., Liss, A., & Swirlson, R. P. (2003). Preliminary examination of the relationship between anxiety disorders in adults and self-reported history of teasing or bullying experiences. *Cognitive Behaviour Therapy*, 32 (4), 187-193.
- McCarthy, T., Forster, P., Ressler, J., & Roosevelt, M. (2001). Warning. *Time Europe*,

157 (11), 30-35.

Mehrabian, A. (1997). Relations among personality scales of aggression, violence, and empathy: Validation evidence bearing on the risk of eruptive scale. *Aggressive Behavior*, 23, 433-445.

Mooney, A., Creeser, R., & Blatchford, P. (1991). Children's views on teasing and fighting in junior schools. *Educational Research*, 33, 103-112.

Mouttapa, M., Valente, T., Gallaher, P., Rohrbach, L. A., & Unger, J. B. (2004). Social network predictors of bullying and victimization. *Adolescence*, 39, 315-336.

Nation, M., Vieno, A., Perkins, D., & Santinello, M. (2007). Bullying in school and adolescent sense of empowerment: An analysis of relationships with parents, friends, and teachers. *Journal of Community and Applied Psychology*, 18 (3), 211-232.

Naylor, P., & Cowie, H. (1999). The effectiveness of peer support systems in challenging school bullying: The perspective and experiences of teachers and pupils. *Journal of Adolescence*, 22, 467-479.

Naylor, P., & Cowie, H., Cossin, F., de Bettencourt, R., & Lemme, F. (2006). Teachers' and pupils' definitions of bullying. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 76, 553-576.

Olweus, D. (1978). *Aggression in schools: Bullying and whipping boys*. Washington, DC: Hemisphere.

Olweus, D. (1991). Bullying/victim problems among school children: Basic effects of a school based intervention programs. In D. Pepler & K. Rubin (Eds.). *The development and treatment of childhood aggression* (p. 411-448), New Jersey:

Erlbaum.

- Olweus, D. (1994). Annotation: Bullying at school: Basic facts and effects of a school based intervention program. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 3, 1171-1190.
- O'Moore, A. M., & Hillery, B. (1989). Bullying in Dublin Schools. *Irish Journal of Psychology*, 10, 426- 441.
- Pawluk, C. J. (1989). Social construction of teasing. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 19, 145-167.
- Pelligrini, A. D. (1998). Bullies and victims in school. A review and call for research. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 20, 177-190.
- Peterson, T. J. (2007). Another level: Friendships transcending geography and race. *The Journal of Men's Studies*, 15 (1), 71-82.
- Pettigrew, T. F. (1997). Generalized intergroup contact effects on prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 23, 173-185.
- Pettigrew, T. F. (1998). Reactions to the new minorities of Western Europe. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 24, 77-103.
- Pettigrew, T. F., & Meertens, R. W. (1995). Subtle and blatant prejudice in western Europe. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 15, 3-13.
- Powers, D. A., & Ellison, C. G. (1994). The contact hypothesis and racial attitudes among black Americans. *Social Science Quarterly*, 72 (2), 385-400.
- Powers, D. A., & Ellison, C.G. (1995). Interracial contact and black racial attitudes: The contact hypothesis and selectivity bias. *Social Forces*, 74 (1), 205- 226.
- Rattazzi, A. M., & Volpato, C. (2003). Social desirability of subtle and blatant prejudice

- scales. *Psychological Reports*, 92 (1), 241-251.
- Roberts, J., Walter, B., & Coursol, D.H. (1996). Strategies for intervention with childhood and adolescent victims of bullying and intimidation in school settings. *Elementary School Guidance & Counseling*, 30, 204-213.
- Rowe, D. C., Almedia, D. M., & Jacobson, K. C. (1999). School context and genetic influences on aggression in adolescence. *Psychological Sciences*, 10, 277-280.
- Salmivalli, C., Karhunen, J., & Lagerspetz, K. (1998). Aggression and sociometric status among peers: Do gender and type of aggression matter? *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 41, 17-24.
- Schaefer, M. (2007). Stopping the bullies. *Scientific American Special Edition: Child Development*, 17 (2), 48-53.
- Seals, D., & Young, J. (2003). Bullying and victimization: Prevalence and relationship to gender, grade level, ethnicity, self-esteem, and depression. *Adolescence*, 38, 735-748.
- Shapiro, J., Baumeister, R. F., & Kessler, J. W. (1991). A three-component model of children's teasing: Aggression, humor, and ambiguity. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 10, 459-472.
- Shapiro, J., Morrison, E. H., & Boker, J. R. (2004). Teaching empathy to first year medical students: Evaluation of an elective literature and medical course. *Education for Health: Change in Learning & Principle*, 17, 73-84.
- Sharky, W. F. (1992). Uses and responses to intentional embarrassment. *Communication Studies*, 43, 257-275.

- Smith, T. W. (1990). Ethnic images. *GSS Topical Report*, 19, 1-14.
- Spaights, E. Dixon, H. E., & Nickolasi, S. (1985). Racism in higher education. *College Student Journal*, 19, 19-22.
- Strahan, R., & Gerbasi, K. C. (1972). Shorter, homogenous versions of the Marlowe-Crowne social desirability scale. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 28, 191-193.
- Stephanson, P., & Smith, D. (1989). Bullying in the Junior School. In D.P. Tattum & D.A. Lane (Eds.). *Bullying in schools* (pp.45-57). Stokes-on Trent, England: Trentham Books.
- Sweeting, H., & West, P. (2001). Being different: Correlates of the experience of teasing and bullying at age 11. *Review Papers of Education*, 16, 225-247.
- Tanaka-Matsumi, J., & Kameoka, V.A. (1986). Reliabilities and concurrent validities of popular self-report measures of depression, anxiety, and social desirability. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 54, 328-333.
- Voss, L.S. (1997). Teasing, disputing, and playing: Cross-gender interactions and space utilization amount first and third-graders. *Gender and Society*, 11, 238-256.
- Warm, T.R. (1997). The role of teasing in development and vice-versa. *Developmental and Behavioral Pediatrics*, 18, 97-101.
- Way, N., & Pahl, K. (2001). Individual and contextual predictors of perceived friendship quality among ethnic minority, low-income adolescents. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 11, 325-349.
- Weaver, C. N. (2005). The changing image of hispanic Americans. *Hispanic Journal of*

Behavioral Sciences, 27 (3), 337-354.

Wright, S. C., Aron, A., McLaughlin-Volpe, T., & Ropp, S. A. (1997). The extended contact effect: Knowledge of cross-group friendships and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73, 73-90.

APPENDIX A
DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SHEET

Age: _____

Gender: Male Female

Classification: Freshman Sophomore Junior Senior Graduate Student

Number of semesters in college? _____

Did your parents go to college? Yes _____ No _____; How many _____

Did any of your grandparents go to college? Yes _____ No _____; How many _____

Father/male parental figure's highest level of education? _____

Mother/female parental figure's highest level of education? _____

What is your parents' estimated income? _____

What is your father/male parental figure's profession? _____

What is your mother/female parental figure's profession? _____

Ethnic Identity: Caucasian African American

Hispanic/ Latino Asian American

Native American Other: _____

How long did/have you reside in your hometown? _____

What was the racial makeup of your *hometown*, estimate in percentage?

Caucasian _____ African American _____

Hispanic/ Latino _____ Asian American _____

Native American _____ Other _____

What was the racial makeup of your *neighborhood*, estimate in percentage?

Caucasian _____ African American _____

Hispanic/ Latino _____ Asian American _____

Native American _____ Other _____

What was the racial makeup of your *high school*, estimate in percentage?

Caucasian _____ African American _____

Hispanic/ Latino _____ Asian American _____

Native American _____ Other _____

How often to you think racial/ethnic teasing occurs here at Texas A&M?

Never Seldom Sometimes Frequently Always

Do you have any Mexican American friends?

If yes, how many?

APPENDIX B

WHITE RACIAL CONSCIOUSNESS DEVELOPMENT SCALE, REVISED
(WRCDS-R)

Choose the intensity that most fits you or your experience.

1 = Strongly Disagree (SD); 2 = Disagree; 3 = Neutral; 4 = Agree; and, 5 = Strongly Agree (SA).

1. I have had little or no contact with Black people other than seeing them on campus.

SD 1 2 3 4 5 SA

2. Blacks should not be allowed to continue in school unless able to perform at the same level as Whites.

SD 1 2 3 4 5 SA

3. White people think they are better than everyone else just because they are White.

SD 1 2 3 4 5 SA

4. Whenever I witness it, I confront people who make racist comments.

SD 1 2 3 4 5 SA

5. I greatly enjoy cross-racial (involving Blacks and Whites together) activities and I try to participate in them often.

SD 1 2 3 4 5 SA

6. Reversed discrimination is a big problem for Whites in America.

SD 1 2 3 4 5 SA

7. I support the idea of restitution for Blacks based on the history of slavery and oppression.

SD 1 2 3 4 5 SA

8. I do not understand why Blacks are so resentful of White people.

SD 1 2 3 4 5 SA

9. As a White person, I feel it is my responsibility to help eradicate racism and discrimination in our society.

SD 1 2 3 4 5 SA

10. I am afraid that minorities are taking over American society.

SD 1 2 3 4 5 SA

11. I have lived in close proximity to black people.

SD 1 2 3 4 5 SA

12. My family would disown me if I married a Black person.

SD 1 2 3 4 5 SA

13. Dominance over others is a characteristic of White culture.

SD 1 2 3 4 5 SA

14. Black people have brought many of their problems on themselves.

SD 1 2 3 4 5 SA

15. I would feel comfortable dating a Black person.

SD 1 2 3 4 5 SA

16. I have Black friends.

SD 1 2 3 4 5 SA

17. Black people are responsible for their lot in life.

SD 1 2 3 4 5 SA

18. White people should provide some form of restitution to Black people.

SD 1 2 3 4 5 SA

19. Slavery stopped a long time ago, Black people should just get over it.

SD 1 2 3 4 5 SA

20. I have never had much contact with Black people.

SD 1 2 3 4 5 SA

21. Racism continues because Black people dwell on the past.

SD 1 2 3 4 5 SA

22. My family would support me if I married a Black person.

SD 1 2 3 4 5 SA

23. Throughout history, White people have been the dominant oppressor.

SD 1 2 3 4 5 SA

24. In America, people pretty much decide their own fate.

SD 1 2 3 4 5 SA

25. None of my friends would look down on me for having an interracial relationship.

SD 1 2 3 4 5 SA

26. I would feel uncomfortable living near Black people.

SD 1 2 3 4 5 SA

27. If Black people weren't so lazy, they wouldn't be in the position they're in.

SD 1 2 3 4 5 SA

28. If the media portrayed Black people more positively, racial tensions would end.

SD 1 2 3 4 5 SA

29. When I hear a racist joke, I say something to show my disapproval.

SD 1 2 3 4 5 SA

30. There are more Black people on welfare than Whites.

SD 1 2 3 4 5 SA

31. I do not have any Black friends.

SD 1 2 3 4 5 SA

32. White people are responsible for putting an end to racism.

SD 1 2 3 4 5 SA

33. I would feel comfortable with a Black physician.

SD 1 2 3 4 5 SA

34. Affirmative action is just reverse discrimination.

SD 1 2 3 4 5 SA

35. I am ashamed of what my Whiteness represents.

SD 1 2 3 4 5 SA

36. When I hear someone make racist comments, I say something to them to show my disapproval.

SD 1 2 3 4 5 SA

37. If Black people wanted to change things, they could take action themselves.

SD 1 2 3 4 5 SA

38. I feel comfortable when I am in close contact with Black people.

SD 1 2 3 4 5 SA

39. I think White people should work hard to give up their advantages.

SD 1 2 3 4 5 SA

40. Blacks must get over the issue of slavery so that we can move on.

SD 1 2 3 4 5 SA

APPENDIX C

ACQUAINTANCE DESCRIPTION FORM

(ADF-F2)

This form lists 50 statements about your relationship with the TP (Target Person). **Think of the closest Mexican American friend you may have or have had, this person is your TP.** Each statement is followed by a scale ranging from 6 down to 0. Please decide which of the scale numbers best describes your reaction to that statement, and record your answer by circling that number.

You will notice that some of the statements are best answered in terms of "how often" and some are best answered in terms of "how likely." This will not be confusing. Simply read the following codes carefully and use them as guides in circling your choices.

6 = Always. Invariably; Without Exception -or-	6 = Definitely; No Doubt About It
5 = Almost Always	5 = Extremely Likely; Almost No Doubt About It
4 = Usually	4 = Probably
3 = About Half the Time	3 = Perhaps
2 = Seldom	2 = Probably Not
1 = Almost Never	1 = Extremely Unlikely
0 = Never	0 = Definitely Not

Statements

- | | |
|---|---------------|
| 1. TP can come up with thoughts and ideas that give me new and different things to think about. | 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 |
| 2. If I were short of cash and needed money in a hurry, I could count on TP to be willing to loan it to me. | 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 |
| 3. TP makes it easy for me to express my most important qualities in my everyday life. | 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 |
| 4. TP's ways of dealing with people make him/her rather difficult to get along with. | 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 |
| 5. If I accomplish something that makes me look especially competent or skillful, I can count on TP to notice it and appreciate my ability. | 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 |
| 6. TP is a genuinely likeable person. | 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 |
| 7. I can converse freely and comfortably with TP without worrying about being teased or criticized if I unthinkingly say something pointless, inappropriate, or just plain silly. | 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 |
| 8. If I hadn't heard from TP for several days without knowing why, I would make it a point to contact him/her just for the sake of keeping in touch. | 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 |
| 9. If TP were to move away or "disappear" for some reason, I would really miss the special kind of companionship (s)he provides. | 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 |
| 10. TP and I both have life situations that make our relationship convenient and easy to keep up. | 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 |
| 11. When we get together to work on a task or project, TP can stimulate me to think of new ways to approach jobs and solve problems. | 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 |

12. TP seems to really enjoy helping me out and doing favors for me. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0
13. TP is the kind of person who makes it easy for me to express my true thoughts and feelings. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0
14. I can count on having to go out of my way to do things that will keep my relationship with TP from "falling apart." 6 5 4 3 2 1 0
15. If I am in an embarrassing situation, I can count on TP to do things that will make me feel as much at ease as possible. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0
16. If I were asked to list a few people that I thought represented the very best in "human nature," TP is one of the persons I would name. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0
17. TP is the kind of person who likes to "put me down" or embarrass me with seemingly harmless little jokes or comments. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0
18. If TP and I could arrange our schedules so that we each had a free day, I would try to arrange my schedule so that I had the same free day as TP. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0
19. TP expresses so many personal qualities I like that I think of her/him as being "one of a kind," a truly unique person. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0
20. Because of circumstances that neither TP nor I can do anything about, there is quite a bit of tension and strain in our relationship. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0
21. TP can get me involved in interesting new activities that I probably wouldn't consider if it weren't for him/her. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0
22. If I were short of time or faced with an emergency, I could count on TP to help with errands and chores to make things as convenient for me as possible. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0
23. TP treats me in ways that encourage me to be my "true self." 6 5 4 3 2 1 0
24. I have to be very careful about what I say if I try to talk to TP about topics that (s)he considers controversial or touchy. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0
25. If I have some success or good fortune, I can count on TP to be happy and congratulatory about it. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0
26. TP has the kind of personal qualities that would make almost anyone respect and admire her/him if they got to know her/him well. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0
27. I feel free to reveal private or personal information about myself to TP because (s)he is not the kind of person who would use such information to my disadvantage. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0
28. If I had decided to leave town on a certain day for a leisurely trip or vacation and discovered that TP was leaving for the same place a day later, I would strongly consider waiting a day in order to travel with him/her. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0
29. "False sincerity" and "phoniness" are the kinds of terms that occur to me when I am trying think honestly about my relationship with TP. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0
30. Through no fault of our own, TP and I have to work hard to keep our relationship

- from falling apart. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0
31. When we discuss beliefs, attitudes and opinions, TP introduces viewpoints that help me see things in a new light. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0
32. TP is willing to spend time and energy to help me succeed at my own personal tasks and projects, even if (s)he is not directly involved. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0
33. TP understands the personal goals and ideals that are most important to me and encourages me to pursue them. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0
34. When we have a disagreement or misunderstanding, I can count on TP to listen to my side of the story in a patient and understanding way. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0
35. TP has a way of helping me "play up" my successes and not take my failures too seriously. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0
36. TP is a pleasant person to be around. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0
37. When I am with TP, I feel free to "let my guard down" completely because (s)he avoids doing and saying things that might make me look inadequate or inferior. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0
38. When I plan for leisure time activities, I make it a point to get in touch with TP to see if we can arrange to do things together. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0
39. When TP and I get together, I enjoy a special kind of companionship that I don't get from any of my other acquaintances. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0
40. Because of outside complications than neither TP nor I can change, I come close to feeling that keeping up our relationship is more trouble than it is worth. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0
41. I can count on TP to be ready with really good suggestions when we are looking for some activity or project to engage in. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0
42. If I were sick or hurt, I could count on TP to do things that would make it easier to take. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0
43. Doing things with TP seems to bring out my more important traits and characteristics. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0
44. I can count on communication with TP to break down when we try to discuss things that are touchy or controversial. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0
45. TP has a way of making me feel like a really worthwhile person, even when I do not seem to be very competent or skillful at my more important activities. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0
46. It is easy to think of favorable things to say about TP. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0
47. TP is quick to point out anything that (s)he sees as a flaw in my character. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0
48. I do things with TP that I may not be particularly interested in simply because I enjoy spending time with her/him. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0
49. TP is the kind of person I would miss very much if something happened to interfere with our acquaintanceship. 6 5 4 3 2 1 0

50. Because our different roles and responsibilities create competition and conflict between us, TP and I experience quite a bit of strain in our relationship.

6 5 4 3 2 1 0

APPENDIX D
BALANCED EMOTIONAL EMPATHY SCALE
(BEES)

Circle the number that most fits how you feel.

1. I cry easily when watching a sad movie.

Very Strong Disagreement	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4	Very Strong Agreement
---------------------------------	----	----	----	----	---	---	---	---	---	------------------------------

2. Certain pieces of music can really move me.

Very Strong Disagreement	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4	Very Strong Agreement
---------------------------------	----	----	----	----	---	---	---	---	---	------------------------------

3. Seeing a hurt animal by the side of the road is very upsetting.

Very Strong Disagreement	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4	Very Strong Agreement
---------------------------------	----	----	----	----	---	---	---	---	---	------------------------------

4. I don't give others' feelings much thought.

Very Strong Disagreement	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4	Very Strong Agreement
---------------------------------	----	----	----	----	---	---	---	---	---	------------------------------

5. It makes me happy when I see people being nice to each other.

Very Strong Disagreement	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4	Very Strong Agreement
---------------------------------	----	----	----	----	---	---	---	---	---	------------------------------

6. The suffering of others deeply disturbs me.

Very Strong Disagreement	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4	Very Strong Agreement
---------------------------------	----	----	----	----	---	---	---	---	---	------------------------------

7. I always try to tune in to the feelings of those around me.

Very Strong Disagreement	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4	Very Strong Agreement
---------------------------------	----	----	----	----	---	---	---	---	---	------------------------------

8. I get very upset when I see a young child who is being treated meanly.

Very Strong Disagreement	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4	Very Strong Agreement
---------------------------------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	------------------------------

9. Too much is made of the suffering of pets or animals.

Very Strong Disagreement	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4	Very Strong Agreement
---------------------------------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	------------------------------

10. If someone is upset I get upset, too.

Very Strong Disagreement	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4	Very Strong Agreement
---------------------------------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	------------------------------

11. When I'm with other people who are laughing I join in.

Very Strong Disagreement	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4	Very Strong Agreement
---------------------------------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	------------------------------

12. It makes me mad to see someone treated unjustly.

Very Strong Disagreement	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4	Very Strong Agreement
---------------------------------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	------------------------------

13. I rarely take notice when people treat each other warmly.

Very Strong Disagreement	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4	Very Strong Agreement
---------------------------------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	------------------------------

14. I feel happy when I see people laughing and enjoying themselves.

Very Strong Disagreement	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4	Very Strong Agreement
---------------------------------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	------------------------------

15. It's easy for me to get carried away by other people's emotions.

Very Strong Disagreement	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4	Very Strong Agreement
---------------------------------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	------------------------------

16. My feelings are my own and don't reflect how others feel.

Very Strong Disagreement	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4	Very Strong Agreement
---------------------------------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	------------------------------

17. If a crowd gets excited about something so do I.

Very Strong Disagreement	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4	Very Strong Agreement
---------------------------------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	------------------------------

18. I feel good when I help someone out or do something nice for someone.

Very Strong Disagreement	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4	Very Strong Agreement
---------------------------------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	------------------------------

19. I feel deeply for others.

Very Strong Disagreement	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4	Very Strong Agreement
---------------------------------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	------------------------------

20. I don't cry easily.

Very Strong Disagreement	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4	Very Strong Agreement
---------------------------------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	------------------------------

21. I feel other people's pain.

Very Strong Disagreement	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4	Very Strong Agreement
---------------------------------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	------------------------------

22. Seeing others smiles makes me smile.

Very Strong Disagreement	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4	Very Strong Agreement
---------------------------------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	------------------------------

23. Being around happy people makes me feel happy, too.

Very Strong Disagreement	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4	Very Strong Agreement
---------------------------------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	------------------------------

24. TV or news stories about injured or sick children greatly upset me.

Very Strong Disagreement	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4	Very Strong Agreement
---------------------------------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	------------------------------

25. I cry at sad parts of the books I read.

Very Strong Disagreement	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4	Very Strong Agreement
---------------------------------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	------------------------------

26. Being around people that are depressed brings my mood down.

Very Strong Disagreement	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4	Very Strong Agreement
---------------------------------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	------------------------------

27. I find it annoying when people cry in public.

Very Strong Disagreement	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4	Very Strong Agreement
---------------------------------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	------------------------------

28. It hurts to see another person in pain.

Very Strong Disagreement	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4	Very Strong Agreement
---------------------------------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	------------------------------

29. I get a warm feeling for someone if I see them helping another person.

Very Strong Disagreement	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4	Very Strong Agreement
---------------------------------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	------------------------------

30. I feel other people's joy.

Very Strong Disagreement	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4	Very Strong Agreement
---------------------------------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	------------------------------

APPENDIX E
BLATANT AND SUBTLE PREJUDICE SCALE
(BSPS)

Choose the best answer for each question.

1. Mexican Americans have jobs Whites should have.

- (1) Strongly disagree
- (2) Disagree
- (3) Not sure
- (4) Agree
- (5) Strongly agree

2. Most Mexican Americans who receive support from welfare could get along without it if they tried.

- (1) Strongly disagree
- (2) Disagree
- (3) Not sure
- (4) Agree
- (5) Strongly agree

3. Whites and Mexican Americans can never really be comfortable with each other, even if they are close friends.

- (1) Strongly disagree
- (2) Disagree
- (3) Not sure
- (4) Agree
- (5) Strongly agree

4. Most politicians care too much about Mexican Americans and not enough about the average White person.

- (1) Strongly disagree
- (2) Disagree
- (3) Not sure
- (4) Agree
- (5) Strongly agree

5. Mexican Americans come from a less able race and this explains why they are not as well off as most White people.

- (1) Strongly disagree
- (2) Disagree
- (3) Not sure
- (4) Agree
- (5) Strongly agree

6. How different and similar do you think Mexican Americans are to White people- in how honest they are?

- (1) Very similar
- (2) Somewhat similar
- (3) Somewhat different
- (4) Very different

7. Suppose that a child of yours had children with a person of a very different color and physical characteristics than your own. How bothered do you think you would be if your grandchildren did not physically resemble the people on your side of the family?

- (1) Not bothered at all
- (2) Bothered a little
- (3) Bothered
- (4) Very bothered

8. I would be willing to have sexual relationships with a Mexican American.

- (1) Strongly disagree
- (2) Disagree
- (3) Not sure
- (4) Agree
- (5) Strongly agree

9. I would not mind if a suitably qualified Mexican American were appointed as my boss.

- (1) Strongly disagree
- (2) Disagree
- (3) Not sure
- (4) Agree
- (5) Strongly agree

10. I would not mind if a Mexican American who had a similar economic background as mine joined my close family by marriage.

- (1) Strongly disagree
- (2) Disagree
- (3) Not sure
- (4) Agree
- (5) Strongly agree

11. Mexican Americans should not push themselves where they are not wanted.

- (1) Strongly disagree
- (2) Disagree
- (3) Not sure
- (4) Agree
- (5) Strongly agree

12. Many other groups have come to America and overcome prejudice and worked their way up. Mexican Americans should do the same without special favor.

- (1) Strongly disagree
- (2) Disagree
- (3) Not sure
- (4) Agree
- (5) Strongly agree

13. It is just a matter of some people not trying hard enough. If Mexican Americans would only try harder they could be as well off as White people.

- (1) Strongly disagree
- (2) Disagree
- (3) Not sure
- (4) Agree
- (5) Strongly agree

14. Mexican Americans teach their children values and skills different from those required to be successful in America.

- (1) Strongly disagree
- (2) Disagree
- (3) Not sure
- (4) Agree
- (5) Strongly agree

15. How different or similar do you think Mexican Americans are to White people:

(a) in the values they teach their children?

- (1) Very similar
- (2) Somewhat similar
- (3) Somewhat different
- (4) Very different

(b) in their religious beliefs and practices?

- (1) Very similar
- (2) Somewhat similar
- (3) Somewhat different
- (4) Very different

(c) in their sexual values and sexual practices?

- (1) Very similar
- (2) Somewhat similar
- (3) Somewhat different
- (4) Very different

(d) in the language that they speak?

- (1) Very similar
- (2) Somewhat similar

- (3) Somewhat different
- (4) Very different

16. Have you ever felt the following ways about Mexican Americans and their families?

(a) How often have you felt sympathy for Mexican Americans?

- (1) Never
- (2) Not too often
- (3) Fairly often
- (4) Very often

(b) How often have you felt admiration for Mexican Americans?

- (1) Never
- (2) Not too often
- (3) Fairly often
- (4) Very often

APPENDIX F

MARLOW-CROWNE SOCIAL DESIRABILITY SHORT FORM

	STRONGLY DISAGREE	DISAGREE	UNDECIDED OR UNSURE	AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE
1. No matter who I'm talking to, I'm always a good listener.	1	2	3	4	5
2. I have sometimes taken unfair advantage of another person.	1	2	3	4	5
3. I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable.	1	2	3	4	5
4. I sometimes try to get even, rather than forgive and forget.	1	2	3	4	5
5. I am quick to admit a mistake.	1	2	3	4	5
6. I sometimes feel resentful when I don't get my own way.	1	2	3	4	5
7. I am always willing to admit when I make a mistake.	1	2	3	4	5
8. There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone.	1	2	3	4	5
9. I would never think of letting someone else be punished for my wrongdoing.	1	2	3	4	5
10. At times, I have wished that something bad would happen to someone I disliked.	1	2	3	4	5
11. I am always attentive to the person I am with.	1	2	3	4	5
12. There have been times when I felt like rebelling against people in authority even though I knew they were right.	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX G
TEASING VIGNETTES

Vignette 1: *Imagine watching Peter and Alex (who are Caucasian) talking with Jessica (who is Mexican American).*

Peter: Hi Jessica! Alex and I were just talking about the big parade last weekend.

Alex: Yeah, I was really frustrated because I couldn't get into my neighborhood because of the big crowds. Did you experience the same problem Jessica?

Peter: Oh she didn't have trouble getting home because you probably live across town in the barrio, right?

Regarding this vignette rate *how much you agree* with the statement, ratings are based on 1-5

1= don't agree

3=somewhat agree

5=definitely agree

This vignette was aggressive.

1 2 3 4 5

This vignette was funny.

1 2 3 4 5

This vignette was jolly.

1 2 3 4 5

This vignette was friendly.

1 2 3 4 5

This vignette was humorous.

1 2 3 4 5

This vignette was mean.

1 2 3 4 5

This vignette was witty.

1 2 3 4 5

This vignette was cruel.

1 2 3 4 5

This vignette was good hearted.

1 2 3 4 5

This vignette was argumentative.

1 2 3 4 5

This vignette was amusing.

1 2 3 4 5

This vignette was cheerful.

1 2 3 4 5

Vignette 2: *John and Mike (both Caucasian) are visiting with Melissa (Mexican American) about their weekend.*

John: Hey, guys how were your weekends?

Mike: Great! I got together with my family and had a surf and turf barbecue.

Melissa: Sounds yummy. I love barbecue!

John: I'm surprised to hear that.

Melissa: Why are you surprised?

John: I've always heard that Hispanics don't like to barbecue because the beans fall through the grill!

Regarding this vignette rate *how much you agree* with the statement, ratings are based on 1-5

1= don't agree

3=somewhat agree

5=definitely agree

This vignette was aggressive.

1 2 3 4 5

This vignette was funny.

1 2 3 4 5

This vignette was jolly.

1 2 3 4 5

This vignette was friendly.

1 2 3 4 5

This vignette was humorous.

1 2 3 4 5

This vignette was mean.

1 2 3 4 5

This vignette was witty.

1 2 3 4 5

This vignette was cruel.

1 2 3 4 5

This vignette was good hearted.

1 2 3 4 5

This vignette was argumentative.

1 2 3 4 5

This vignette was amusing.

1 2 3 4 5

This vignette was cheerful.

1 2 3 4 5

Vignette 3: *Ruben (Mexican American) and David (Caucasian) are getting ready to go to a game.*

Ruben just picked up David from home to go to a football game. David has a distressed look on his face and practically runs out of the house.

Ruben: David, man you looked stressed out, what's up?

David: Grace is nagging about how the house work never gets done and how no one helps her, she is totally losing it!

Ruben: Wow that's tough man.

David: If you could just send me one of your Mexican cousins, Grace could have a housekeeper.

Regarding this vignette rate *how much you agree* with the statement, ratings are based on 1-5

1= don't agree

3=somewhat agree

5=definitely agree

This vignette was aggressive.

1 2 3 4 5

This vignette was funny.

1 2 3 4 5

This vignette was jolly.

1 2 3 4 5

This vignette was friendly.

1 2 3 4 5

This vignette was humorous.

1 2 3 4 5

This vignette was mean.

1 2 3 4 5

This vignette was witty.

1 2 3 4 5

This vignette was cruel.

1 2 3 4 5

This vignette was good hearted.

1 2 3 4 5

This vignette was argumentative.

1 2 3 4 5

This vignette was amusing.

1 2 3 4 5

This vignette was cheerful.

1 2 3 4 5

Vignette 4: *Oscar and Juan (both Mexican American) and Liz and Greg (both Caucasian) are getting ready to go out together.*

Juan, Greg, Liz and Oscar were excited about going to the opening of the newest scary movie. Juan is the only person with transportation.

Juan: Hey guys, I can't take everyone. I only have a small pickup. We won't fit!

Greg: Come on Juan, you guys are Mexican. You are used to cramming lots of people into small spaces.

Regarding this vignette rate *how much you agree* with the statement, ratings are based on 1-5

1= don't agree**3=somewhat agree****5=definitely agree**

This vignette was aggressive.

1 2 3 4 5

This vignette was funny.

1 2 3 4 5

This vignette was jolly.

1 2 3 4 5

This vignette was friendly.

1 2 3 4 5

This vignette was humorous.

1 2 3 4 5

This vignette was mean.

1 2 3 4 5

This vignette was witty.

1 2 3 4 5

This vignette was cruel.

1 2 3 4 5

This vignette was good hearted.

1 2 3 4 5

This vignette was argumentative.

1 2 3 4 5

This vignette was amusing.

1 2 3 4 5

This vignette was cheerful.

1 2 3 4 5

Vignette 5: *Mark (Caucasian) and Miguel (Mexican American) are just leaving track practice.*

After track practice Mark and Miguel find themselves famished.

Mark: Let's grab something to eat; I'm starving!

Miguel: Sure I could definitely go for a burger or two right now!

Mark: Where to?

Miguel: *MackDonald's*

Mark: (Shaking his head) You people have a funny way of saying some words.

Regarding this vignette rate *how much you agree* with the statement, ratings are based on 1-5

1= don't agree

3=somewhat agree

5=definitely agree

This vignette was aggressive.

1 2 3 4 5

This vignette was funny.

1 2 3 4 5

This vignette was jolly.

1 2 3 4 5

This vignette was friendly.

1 2 3 4 5

This vignette was humorous.

1 2 3 4 5

This vignette was mean.

1 2 3 4 5

This vignette was witty.

1 2 3 4 5

This vignette was cruel.

1 2 3 4 5

This vignette was good hearted.

1 2 3 4 5

This vignette was argumentative.

1 2 3 4 5

This vignette was amusing.

1 2 3 4 5

This vignette was cheerful.

1 2 3 4 5

Vignette 6: *Kassie, Jill (both Caucasian) and Maria (Mexican American) are heading out to enjoy the beach.*

It's a hot Sunday afternoon, Kassie, Maria, and Jill head to the beach with their lounge chairs, big floppy straw hats, and books.

Jill: Looks like a great spot to park it girls. What do you think?

Maria and Kassie: Yeah, this will work!

All three girls sit on their chairs and Jill pulls out her sunscreen and lathers herself up and passes the sunscreen to Kassie.

Jill: Let's not bake out here, Kassie!

Maria: Hey, can I borrow some too!

Jill: Maria, don't be silly you don't need protection from the sun.

1= don't agree 3=somewhat agree 5=definitely agree

This vignette was aggressive.

1 2 3 4 5

This vignette was funny.

1 2 3 4 5

This vignette was jolly.

1 2 3 4 5

This vignette was friendly.

1 2 3 4 5

This vignette was humorous.

1 2 3 4 5

This vignette was mean.

1 2 3 4 5

This vignette was witty.

1 2 3 4 5

This vignette was cruel.

1 2 3 4 5

This vignette was good hearted.

1 2 3 4 5

This vignette was argumentative.

1 2 3 4 5

This vignette was amusing.

1 2 3 4 5

This vignette was cheerful.

1 2 3 4 5

VITA

Lorena Lisa Gonzalez
University of South Carolina
Student Health Center
1409 Devine St.
Columbia, SC 29208
(803) 777-8248

EDUCATION

Ph.D., Counseling Psychology, Texas A&M University, 2009
M.A., Clinical Psychology, University of Houston-Clear Lake, 2003
B.S., Psychology, The University of Texas Pan-American, 2001