

Perceptions of Racial Confrontation: The Role of Color Blindness and Comment Ambiguity

Linda X. Zou and Cheryl L. Dickter
College of William and Mary

Because of its emphasis on diminishing race and avoiding racial discourse, color-blind racial ideology has been suggested to have negative consequences for modern day race relations. The current research examined the influence of color blindness and the ambiguity of a prejudiced remark on perceptions of a racial minority group member who confronts the remark. One hundred thirteen White participants responded to a vignette depicting a White character making a prejudiced comment of variable ambiguity, after which a Black target character confronted the comment. Results demonstrated that the target confronter was perceived more negatively and as responding less appropriately by participants high in color blindness, and that this effect was particularly pronounced when participants responded to the ambiguous comment. Implications for the ways in which color blindness, as an accepted norm that is endorsed across legal and educational settings, can facilitate Whites' complicity in racial inequality are discussed.

Keywords: color blind racial ideology, confrontation, prejudice, ambiguity

Although racist attitudes and anti-Black sentiment in the United States appear to have improved in recent decades (e.g., Dovidio & Gaertner, 2000; Wittenbrink, Judd, & Park, 1997), researchers have suggested that they may have merely shifted to a more “ambiguous and nebulous” form (Sue et al., 2007, p. 272). As the traditional racism characterized by Jim Crow, overt discriminatory acts, and beliefs in White supremacy (Bonilla-Silva, Lewis, & Embrick, 2004) has become legally and socially condemned (Dovidio, 2001), this new form of racism is more difficult to pinpoint, and more likely to be expressed when it can be denied to others and to the perpetrators themselves (Sue, 2010). Research increasingly shows that these subtle behaviors may be just as detrimental to minorities as blatant prejudice (Dovidio, 2001). Commonplace experiences of everyday prejudiced slights and insults, or *microaggressions*, can lead to anger, frustration, and reduced self-esteem in targets (Sue, 2007). As opposed to overt racism, where “the clear intentionality makes it easier [for targets] to understand and ignore” (Bennett, Merritt, Edwards, & Sollers, 2004, p. 972), interpreting more ambiguous instances may require greater cognitive and emotional resources and thus have a more negative effect on targets (Bennett et al., 2004; Salvatore & Shelton, 2007). Whites, conversely, appear to be less sensitive to subtle expressions of prejudice (Salvatore & Shelton, 2007) and have been shown to judge more ambiguously offensive comments less harshly than blatant ones (Dickter, Kittel, & Gyurovski, 2012). This trend is clearly worrisome and requires greater understand-

ing, considering the pervasive negative impact of subtle prejudice.

An important strategy for dealing with the consequences of prejudicial behavior is confrontation, the expression of dissatisfaction with prejudicial treatment toward the responsible offender (Shelton, Richeson, Salvatore, & Hill, 2006). Confrontation can raise people's awareness of their biases and inspire successful self-regulation (Ashburn-Nardo, Morris, & Goodwin, 2008). Research shows that confrontation can also be effective in changing subsequent behavior and reducing prejudice levels (Czopp & Monteith, 2003; Czopp, Monteith, & Mark, 2006). However, the perceived consequences of confrontation, such as being disliked, dismissed, or retaliated against, can often prevent people from choosing to confront (Shelton & Stewart, 2004). These concerns appear to be warranted, particularly for minority group members, as a growing body of literature shows that targets who confront sexism or racism risk being perceived negatively (Dodd, Giuliano, Boutell, & Moran, 2001; Czopp & Monteith, 2003; Rasinski & Czopp, 2010), and viewed as overreacting, rude, and complaining (Czopp & Monteith, 2003; Rasinski & Czopp, 2010). Recent work suggests that these evaluations may vary depending on individual beliefs and attitudes; that is, target confronters were perceived more negatively by those with higher self-reported prejudice (Rasinski & Czopp, 2010). More research is needed to examine whether other beliefs affect the evaluation of target confronters as well.

Among the wave of post-Civil Rights racial attitudes is color-blind ideology, a set of beliefs that is central in contemporary racial dynamics (Bonilla-Silva, 2002). People who endorse color blindness believe that “race should not and does not matter” (Neville, Lilly, Duran, Lee, & Browne, 2000, p. 60). Though this attitude appears admirable, in its effort to move beyond race, it overlooks or even denies the fact that race does regularly shape people's experiences (Neville, Spanierman, & Doan, 2006). Color

Linda X. Zou and Cheryl L. Dickter, Department of Psychology, College of William and Mary.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Linda X. Zou, Department of Psychology, College of William and Mary, PO Box 8795, Williamsburg, VA 23187-8795. E-mail: lxzou@email.wm.edu

blindness is conceptually distinct from racism, as it does not necessarily indicate negative attitudes toward minorities (Neville et al., 2000); however, accepting color blindness's inaccurate view of race relations fosters inaction, which preserves structural racism and inequality (Bonilla-Silva, 2002). For example, students high in color blindness were more likely to inaccurately perceive their campus climate as racially accepting (Worthington, Navarro, Loewy, & Hart, 2008) and to accept and support offensive racial behavior (Tynes & Markoe, 2010). Thus, although noble on the surface, color blindness has important consequences for interracial interactions and the perpetuation of racism that should be further explored.

In the current study, we examined whether perceptions of a racial minority group member who confronts a majority group member would be moderated by White participants' color blindness ideology and the ambiguity of the prejudicial statement. The current study thus presented White participants with a vignette depicting a White character making an ambiguously or blatantly prejudiced remark toward a Black target, after which the target confronted the commenter about the remark. It was hypothesized that participants high in color blindness would judge the confronter more negatively as compared to those low in color blindness, because the confrontation of prejudice deliberately calls attention to an instance of racism (Ashburn-Nardo et al., 2008), which color-blind participants may prefer to deny or ignore as having occurred (Neville et al., 2000). In addition, we expected that the confronter of the ambiguous comment would be rated more harshly than that of the unambiguous comment, in line with previous work (Dickter et al., 2012). Finally, we expected an interaction between color blindness and ambiguity in perceptions of the confronter. Although color blindness facilitates the minimization of prejudiced events (Neville et al., 2006), events that are blatantly prejudiced may contain a racial element too obvious to overlook. However, it was expected that more ambiguous expressions of prejudice would lead individuals higher in color blindness to perceive a confrontation more negatively, as the ambiguity provides justification for dismissing racism. Importantly, these effects were expected to occur above and beyond the effects of self-reported racial prejudice.

Pilot Studies

Two pilot tests were conducted to create an appropriate vignette. For the first, 13 (5 male) White participants, sampled from the same population as the current study, read 19 short dialogue vignettes, each depicting a White character making a prejudiced comment toward the target racial minority. Each remark was derived from Sue and colleagues' (2007) research on microaggressions or from anecdotal experiences shared by people of color on the website www.microaggressions.com. Characters' races were not stated explicitly but referenced in the dialogue as well as manipulated by the characters' given names, which were taken from lists of common baby names among various ethnic groups. On a scale from 1 (*not at all*) to 7 (*extremely*), participants rated the extent to which they found each remark racist, and the extent to which they found each remark ambiguous. Four were then selected for scoring higher than the average of all the vignettes on ambiguity.

For each of these four selected vignettes, a less ambiguous version of the original comment was created. To ensure that the two versions were significantly different, a second pilot test was conducted. One group of participants ($n = 21$) responded to two of the low ambiguity and two of the high ambiguity vignettes, once again rating how racist and ambiguous they perceived the remark to be. A second group ($n = 11$) responded to the remaining four vignettes. The vignette that was chosen for the current study earned significantly higher racism ratings between participants who read the low ambiguity version ($M = 6.27$, $SD = 1.01$) and participants who read the high ambiguity version ($M = 5.00$, $SD = 1.45$); $t(30) = 2.60$, $p = .015$.

Method

Participants

One hundred thirteen (43 male) White undergraduate students from the College of William and Mary participated in the study, with a mean age of 18.77 ($SD = 1.45$). Participants were given partial course credit in exchange for participation. All procedures were approved by the William and Mary Protection of Human Subjects Committee, and informed consent was obtained from each participant. Participants were recruited, without any knowledge as to why they were selected, based on their score on the CoBRAS scale that was administered during mass testing at the beginning of the semester, as well as their self-reported race (i.e., White). Participants were recruited from the top and bottom thirds of the CoBRAS distribution; however, scores were analyzed as a continuous variable. Participants from the lowest third ($n = 57$) had scores ranging from 30 to 64 ($M = 53.12$, $SD = 6.74$), and participants from the highest third ($n = 56$) had scores ranging from 74 to 111 ($M = 87.14$, $SD = 9.62$).

Measures

Color-blind racial attitudes scale. The CoBRAS (Neville et al., 2000; $\alpha = .86$) was used to measure color blind ideology based on three dimensions: awareness of racial privilege, institutional discrimination, and blatant racial issues. The CoBRAS consists of 20 items, each of which is rated on a scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 6 (*strongly agree*). Higher scores indicate a greater level of support for color blind racial ideology.

Attitudes toward Blacks scale. Explicit attitudes toward Blacks were measured using the ATB (Brigham, 1993; $\alpha = .88$), which contains 20 statements rated on a 7-point scale (1 = *strongly disagree*, 7 = *strongly agree*). The ATB was administered during a mass testing session that occurred at the beginning of the semester and was included in the study to address the overlap between color blindness and racial prejudice.

Materials and Procedure

Before arriving, each participant was randomly assigned to either the high or low ambiguity condition. Care was taken to ensure that each experimental group would have a comparable number of individuals who scored high and low on the CoBRAS. Participants were seated at individual computers and given instructions stating that they would be completing an online survey about

perceptions of conflicts that occurred among college students. Participants were asked to read and evaluate three vignettes, each involving a conflict between two individuals that ended with one character (i.e., the confronter) confronting the other (i.e., the commenter). The first two vignettes were irrelevant to race and included as fillers to obscure the study's specific purpose. Both used race-neutral names. The first described two females discussing a friend's contentious spending habits, and the second described two males arguing over their choice of female partners.

The third vignette, the vignette of interest, was chosen based on the results of the pilot tests. The situation was introduced as follows for participants in both conditions:

Heather is driving her friend, Fatima, to the salon to get a haircut.

Heather: I think I need a haircut too. My bangs are getting out of control.

Fatima: You should do it. Maybe you could try something new and go really short. Get one of those pixie cuts.

Heather: Oh my God, can you imagine? I would look like a 12-year-old boy.

At a stoplight, Heather reaches over to touch Fatima's hair.

The ambiguity of the comment was manipulated as follows:

High Ambiguity Condition:

Heather: I feel bad for you. Your hair will always feel like a bad perm.

Low Ambiguity Condition:

Heather: I feel so bad for you people. Your hair will always feel like a bad perm.

Finally, the following confrontation was presented:

Fatima: Wow, that was really offensive. The subject of natural black hair is still super political, you know that right? Seriously, go easy on the racism there.

Afterward, participants completed a questionnaire evaluating their perceptions of the two characters. All questions for each of the three vignettes were identical, with only the characters' names differing. First, participants were asked, on a scale from 1 (*not at all*) to 7 (*very much*): "Was it difficult to determine the level of offensiveness of Heather's underlined statement?" Participants' responses served as a manipulation check of the remark's differing ambiguity level across the two vignette conditions. To assess participants' perceptions of the specific confrontation, participants were presented with the following item, which they answered on a 7-point scale from 1 (*not at all*) to 7 (*very much*): "How appropriate was Fatima's response to Heather?" Participants' negative perceptions of the confronter were measured by the extent to which they found her hypersensitive, argumentative, emotional, complaining, abrasive, rude, and irritating. Responses were aggregated into a single dependent variable ($\alpha = .95$). Their positive perceptions of the confronter were measured by how likable, friendly, honest, easy to get along with, intelligent, respectable, considerate, and moral they found her; these were combined into a single dependent variable ($\alpha = .94$). All individual items were rated on a 7-point scale, ranging from 1 (*not at all*) to 7 (*very much*).

Results

Manipulation Check

An independent samples *t* test showed that participants rated the remark's offensiveness in the high ambiguity condition ($M = 2.98$, $SD = 1.97$) as more difficult to determine than that of the remark in the low ambiguity condition ($M = 1.93$, $SD = 1.47$); $t(111) = 3.22$, $p = .002$, ensuring that the comments' ambiguity varied between conditions.

Perceptions of the Confronter

Linear regression analyses were performed to determine the extent to which the independent variables, comment ambiguity and color blindness, predicted participants' perceptions of the confronter. In addition, because responses on the CoBRAS scale and the ATB scale were found to be significantly correlated ($r = .60$, $n = 113$, $p < .001$), ATB scores were also entered as an independent variable to account for shared variance between ATB and color blindness. To examine the interaction between comment ambiguity and color blindness, an interaction term was created between comment ambiguity and the mean-centered color blindness scores. The main effects were entered in the first step of the regression and the interaction term was entered in the second.

The model predicting participants' judgments of the appropriateness of the target's response from the above factors was significant, $R^2 = .25$, $F(4, 108) = 8.78$, $p < .001$, with both comment ambiguity ($\beta = 1.50$, $t = 4.53$, $p < .001$) and color blindness ($\beta = -0.08$, $t = -2.57$, $p = .01$) as significant predictors. These main effects revealed that participants in the high ambiguity condition perceived the confronter's response as less appropriate ($M = 4.36$, $SD = 2.15$) than participants in the low ambiguity condition ($M = 5.81$, $SD = 1.49$), and that participants with higher CoBRAS scores also had more negative judgments of the confrontation's appropriateness. ATB was not a significant predictor ($\beta = -0.01$, $t = -1.01$, $p = .32$). The expected interaction between ambiguity and color blindness was significant, $\beta = 0.04$, $t(108) = 2.08$, $p = .04$. This interaction revealed that for the low ambiguity comment, color blindness did not predict participant responses (*simple slope* = -0.01 , $t(109) = -0.68$, *ns*). However, for the high ambiguity comment, higher color blindness was associated with lower ratings of the confrontation's appropriateness (*simple slope* = -0.05 , $t(109) = -3.78$, $p < .001$).

The model predicting negative perceptions of the confronter was significant, $R^2 = .27$, $F(4, 107) = 9.99$, $p < .001$, with both comment ambiguity ($\beta = -1.18$, $t = -4.43$, $p < .001$) and color blindness ($\beta = 0.07$, $t = 2.81$, $p = .01$) as significant predictors. Participants in the high ambiguity condition perceived the confronter more negatively ($M = 3.78$, $SD = 1.67$) than participants in the low ambiguity condition ($M = 2.64$, $SD = 1.35$), and higher CoBRAS scores also predicted more negative perceptions of the confronter. ATB was not a significant predictor ($\beta = 0.06$, $t = 0.73$, $p = .47$). There was also a significant interaction between ambiguity and color blindness, $\beta = -0.03$, $t(107) = -1.98$, $p = .05$. For the low ambiguity comment, color blindness did not predict negative perceptions (*simple slope* = 0.01 , $t(108) = 1.46$, *ns*) but for the high ambiguity comment, higher color blindness scores were associated with more negative perceptions (*simple slope* = 0.04 , $t(108) = 4.34$, $p = .001$).

The model predicting positive perceptions of the confronter was significant, $R^2 = .13$, $F(4, 106) = 4.06$, $p = .004$, with comment ambiguity ($\beta = 0.54$, $t = 2.47$, $p = .02$) as a significant predictor. Participants in the high ambiguity condition perceived the confronter less positively ($M = 4.36$, $SD = 2.15$) than participants in the low ambiguity condition ($M = 5.81$, $SD = 1.49$). No other significant effects were found ($ps > .05$).

Discussion

The current research is the first to examine color blindness in relation to Whites' perceptions of a target who confronts a prejudicial comment. Our findings support the extant research that links racial color blindness with the acceptance and perpetuation of racial structures and prejudiced behavior, particularly in the case of more ambiguous behaviors (e.g., Awad, Cokley, & Ravitch, 2005; Bonilla-Silva, 2002; Neville et al., 2000; Tynes & Markoe, 2010). As predicted, after an ambiguously prejudicial comment, participants who aligned more strongly with color blind ideology tended to perceive a target confronter more negatively and as responding more inappropriately. Color blindness did not seem to affect positive judgments of the target confronter, only negative ones, supporting previous work suggesting that targets who confront tend to be viewed as overreacting and complaining (Czopp & Monteith, 2003; Rasinski & Czopp, 2010). Importantly, this effect was significant when controlling for participants' level of explicit racial bias as measured by the ATB. As expected, the relationship between color blindness and perceptions was not significant for the unambiguous prejudicial comment.

Thus, color blindness appears to facilitate Whites' minimization of target confronters and their concerns, especially in the face of ambiguous prejudicial behavior. This may be based on a false sense of racial egalitarianism that leads them to resist recognizing the role of race even in prejudiced events and interactions. Overall, that a higher degree of color blindness was associated with more negative perceptions of the target confronter in an ambiguous situation supports the hypothesis that although confronting a blatantly prejudiced statement is more clearly warranted and thus may not garner as negative reactions, a more ambiguously prejudiced comment such as a microaggression makes it easier for color blind individuals to view racism as irrelevant to the situation, and thus negatively judge a target confronter's attempt to call attention to it. Indeed, the literature has indicated that ambiguous situations can easily enable Whites to act on their prejudices (Brief, Dietz, Cohen, Pugh, & Vaslow, 2000), or reject a person of color's claims that racism has occurred (Sue et al., 2007). Whites in general may also lack the ability to register ambiguous forms of prejudice as well as blatant ones (Salvatore & Shelton, 2007). This insensitivity may prevent Whites from recognizing when a prejudicial comment should be challenged.

Furthermore, the findings from the current study suggest that the relationship between color blindness and perceptions of minorities who confront occurs over and above the effects of racial prejudice. That is, the effects of color blindness were significant while controlling for ATB in the regression equations. Although color blindness and ATB were correlated, this finding suggests that color blindness accounts for a unique portion of the variance in the perceptions of the confronter. This work supports previous contentions that color blindness is conceptually distinct from racial prejudice (Neville et al.,

2000). In addition, ATB was not a significant predictor of perceptions of the confronter in the current study. This is in contrast to previous research that linked high ATB scores with more negative responses to a target confronter (Rasinski & Czopp, 2010). Further correlational analyses demonstrated that ATB was indeed predictive of more negative perceptions of the confronter ($r = .25$, $p = .009$); when controlling for color blindness, however, the relationship was nonsignificant. This evidence, as well as the significant correlation between ATB and color blindness, suggests that previous findings by Rasinski and Czopp (2010) may have been mostly attributable to the overlap between color blindness and prejudice. However, there were important differences between the current study and this previous work, such as the medium in which the situations were presented and the genders of the characters involved, and thus future research must further examine these relationships before conclusions can be drawn.

The current research was limited in that the situation presented revolved around the subject of natural black hair, which is both very specific as well as a particularly gendered issue. We did not test for gender effects, as the study's disproportionate female content would not have allowed for comparable experimental group sizes, as men were underrepresented in all conditions. Future research should examine these gender effects, as both participant and confronter genders have been shown to affect perceptions of confrontation (Kittel, Dickter, & Zou, 2012).

The current work extends previous findings in the literature and reiterates the importance of further studying the ways in which racial attitudes can influence Whites' perceptions of targets who confront prejudice, as these attitudes have bearing on both spontaneous and deliberate social behavior (e.g., Dovidio, Kawakami, Johnson, Johnson, & Howard, 1997; McConnell & Leibold, 2001; Stepanikova, Triplett, & Simpson, 2011), and thus can contribute to the consequences of confronting often faced by racial minorities. Color blindness is of particular significance, being regularly socialized as a norm among White Americans and endorsed across a range of domains (Lewis, Chesler, & Forman, 2000; Pollock, 2004). Research has optimistically indicated that color blindness may be effectively reduced with education (Neville et al., 2000; Steinfeldt & Wong, 2010); therefore, researchers and educators should continue exploring methods of sensitizing Whites to the ways in which racism and subtle prejudice persists, so that they may contribute to the improvement of interracial relations rather than the preservation of inequality.

References

- Ashburn-Nardo, L., Morris, K. A., & Goodwin, S. A. (2008). The confronting prejudiced responses (CPR) model: Applying CPR in organizations. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 7, 332–342. doi:10.5465/AMLE.2008.34251671
- Awad, G. H., Cokley, K., & Ravitch, J. (2005). Attitudes toward affirmative action: A comparison of color-blind versus modern racist attitudes. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 35, 1384–1399. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2005.tb02175.x
- Bennett, G. G., Merrit, M. M., Edwards, C. L., & Sollers III, J. J. (2004). Perceived racism and affective responses to ambiguous interpersonal interactions among African American men. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 47, 963–976. doi:10.1177/0002764203261070
- Bonilla-Silva, E. (2002). The linguistics of color blind racism: How to talk nasty about Blacks without sounding "racist". *Critical Sociology*, 28, 41–64. doi:10.1163/156916302320277592

- Bonilla-Silva, E., Lewis, A., & Embrick, D. G. (2004). "I did not get that job because of a Black man. . .": The story lines and testimonies of color-blind racism. *Sociological Forum, 19*, 555–581. doi:10.1007/s11206-004-0696-3
- Brief, A. P., Dietz, J., Cohen, R. R., Pugh, S. D., & Vaslow, J. B. (2000). Just doing business: Modern racism and obedience to authority as explanations for employment discrimination. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 81*, 72–97. doi:10.1006/obhd.1999.2867
- Brigham, J. C. (1993). College students' racial attitudes. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 23*, 1933–1967. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.1993.tb01074.x
- Czopp, A. M., & Monteith, M. J. (2003). Confronting prejudice (literally): Reactions to confrontations of racial and gender bias. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29*, 532–544. doi:10.1177/0146167202250923
- Czopp, A. M., Monteith, M. J., & Mark, A. Y. (2006). Standing up for a change: Reducing bias through interpersonal confrontation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90*, 784–803. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.90.5.784
- Dickter, C. L., Kittel, J. A., & Gyurovski, I. I. (2012). Perceptions of non-target confronters in response to racist and heterosexist remarks. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 42*, 112–119. doi:10.1002/ejsp.855
- Dodd, E. H., Giuliano, T. A., Boutell, J. M., & Moran, B. E. (2001). Respected or rejected: Perceptions of women who confront sexist remarks. *Sex Roles, 45*, 567–577. doi:10.1023/A:1014866915741
- Dovidio, J. F. (2001). On the nature of contemporary prejudice: The third wave. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*, 829–849. doi:10.1111/0022-4537.00244
- Dovidio, J. F., & Gaertner, S. L. (2000). Aversive racism and selection decisions: 1989 and 1999. *Psychological Science, 11*, 315–319. doi:10.1111/1467-9280.00262
- Dovidio, J. F., Kawakami, K., Johnson, C., Johnson, B., & Howard, A. (1997). On the nature of prejudice: Automatic and controlled processes. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 33*, 510–540. doi:10.1006/jesp.1997.1331
- Kittel, J. A., Dickter, C. L., & Zou, L. X. (2012). *Consequences for confronting: Negative perceptions of females who confront male perpetrators of racist and heterosexist comments*. Manuscript under review.
- Lewis, A. E., Chesler, M., & Forman, T. A. (2000). The impact of "colorblind" ideologies on students of color: Intergroup relations at a predominantly White university. *Journal of Negro Education, 69*, 74–91.
- McConnell, A. R., & Leibold, J. M. (2001). Relations among the Implicit Association Test, discriminatory behavior, and explicit measures of racial attitudes. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 37*, 435–442. doi:10.1006/jesp.2000.1470
- Neville, H. A., Lilly, R. L., Duran, G., Lee, R. M., & Browne, L. (2000). Construction and initial validation of the Color-Blind Racial Attitudes Scale (CoBRAS). *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 47*, 59–70. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.47.1.59
- Neville, H., Spanierman, L., & Doan, B. (2006). Exploring the association between color-blind racial ideology and multicultural counseling competencies. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 12*, 275–290. doi:10.1037/1099-9809.12.2.275
- Pollock, M. (2004). *Colormute: Race talk dilemmas in an American school*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Rasinski, H. M., & Czopp, A. M. (2010). The effect of target status on witnesses' reactions to confrontations of bias. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 32*, 8–16.
- Salvatore, J., & Shelton, J. N. (2007). Cognitive costs of exposure to racial prejudice. *Psychological Science, 18*, 810–815. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9280.2007.01984.x
- Shelton, J. N., Richeson, J. A., Salvatore, J., & Hill, D. M. (2006). Silence is not golden: The intrapersonal consequences of not confronting prejudice. In S. Levin, & C. Van Laar (Eds.), *Social stigma and group inequality: Social Psychological Perspectives* (65–81). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Shelton, J. N., & Stewart, R. E. (2004). Confronting perpetrators of prejudice: The inhibitory effects of social costs. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 28*, 215–223. doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.2004.00138.x
- Steinfeldt, J. A., & Wong, Y. J. (2010). Multicultural training on American Indian issues: Testing the effectiveness of an intervention to change attitudes toward native-themed mascots. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 16*, 110–115. doi:10.1037/a0018633
- Stepanikova, I., Triplett, J., & Simpson, B. (2011). Implicit racial bias and prosocial behavior. *Social Science Research, 40*, 1186–1195. doi:10.1016/j.ssresearch.2011.02.004
- Sue, D. W. (2010). *Microaggressions in everyday life: Race, gender, and sexual orientation*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Sue, D. W., Capodilupo, C. M., Torino, G. C., Bucceri, J. M., Holder, A. M. B., Nadal, K. L., & Esquilin, M. (2007). Racial microaggressions in everyday life: Implications for clinical practice. *American Psychologist, 62*, 271–286. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.62.4.271
- Tynes, B. M., & Markoe, S. L. (2010). The role of color-blind racial attitudes in reactions to racial discrimination on social network sites. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 3*, 1–13. doi:10.1037/a0018683
- Wittenbrink, B., Judd, C. M., & Park, B. (1997). Evidence for racial prejudice at the implicit level and its relationship with questionnaire measures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 72*, 262–274. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.72.2.262
- Worthington, R. L., Navarro, R. L., Loewy, M., & Hart, J. (2008). Color-blind racial attitudes, social dominance orientation, racial-ethnic group membership and college students' perceptions of campus climate. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 1*, 8–19. doi:10.1037/1938-8926.1.1.8