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ABSTRACT

Much is yet unknown about Whites who take action for racial equity. This study investigated affective, ideological, and cognitive correlates of antiracist behavior using the recently developed antiracist behavior inventory. The study used cluster analysis to form groups of Whites according to psychosocial costs of racism, color-blind racial ideology, system justification beliefs, and social dominance orientation, and then determine differences in antiracist behavior between clusters. Cluster analysis revealed three types of Whites labeled The Status Quo, The Moderate, and The Beginning Antiracist. Cluster #1, The Status Quo, demonstrated the highest levels of CBRI, SJT, and SDO and the lowest levels of PCRW while Cluster #3, The Beginning Antiracist type endorsed the lowest levels of CBRI, SJT, and SDO, and the highest levels of PCRW. Cluster #2, The Moderate, were about average for the cluster on all variables. Significant differences were found between clusters on antiracist behaviors in a direction consistent with the literature. The Status Quo endorsed the lowest levels of ARBI while The Beginning Antiracist type endorsed the highest levels of antiracism in this sample. Findings indicated significant gender difference between groups where women were overrepresented in all three groups due to sampling bias. However, Cluster 3, The Beginning Antiracist type, was comprised of about equal number of males and females. No age differences were noted. While many studies in the Whiteness literature have explored college samples, this study intentionally recruited community members.
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CHAPTER I
STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Color-Blind Racial Ideology and Antiracist Action

“We need to be clear that there is no such thing as giving up one’s privilege to be ‘outside’ the system. One is always in the system. The only question is whether one is part of the system in a way that challenges or strengthens the status quo. Privilege is not something I take and which therefore have the option of not taking. It is something that society gives me, and unless I change the institutions which give it to me, they will continue to give it, and I will continue to have it, however noble and equalitarian my intentions.” – Harry Brod (1989, p. 280)

With the inequality present in our capitalist system, one would think more social movements would be happening. But since the Civil Rights Movement, collective action to correct racial disparities seemed almost nonexistent until the recent Black Lives Matter movements of the twenty-first century. Instead an era of color-blindness was ushered in and promulgated by all racial and ethnic groups. Defending the status quo in America is the norm, leaving one to wonder about the few: Who are the Americans who have the courage to act on behalf of social justice and equality? This paper specifically investigated Whites’ varying types and levels of antiracist action in order to increase
understanding of what it means to be antiracist, and provide insight into barriers and precursors to activism.

**Critical Consciousness**

Critical consciousness (CC), a construct first developed by Paulo Freire (1970), has helped educators and psychologists to understand disparate levels of awareness of oppression among Whites and PoC. Oppression is defined as “the unjust use of power by one socially salient group over another in a way that creates and sustains inequity in the distribution of coveted resources” (Watts, Griffith, & Abdul-Adil, 199, p. 257). The five characteristics of oppression are that it is pervasive, hierarchical, restricts opportunities of PoC, has complex, multiple, and cross-cutting relationships, and is enacted in the human psyche (i.e., internalized racism).

However REMs are not alone in their internalization of external social structures and norms. Bell (1997) continues that Whites are also socialized into dominance, internalizing these beliefs and enacting White supremacy in their daily lives. Pheterson (1990) stated that while individual Whites rarely say, “I am a racist,” White supremacy and White internalized dominance do not only exist at an individual level, but are more often embedded within social norms and the White human psyche, rendering Whites’ behaviors as rigid and repressed(Fanon, 1968; Freire, 1970; Miller, 1976). Pheterson (1990) defines internalized dominance as the acceptance of prejudices by the dominant group against others, and the incorporation of this worldview into attitudes and behaviors that both oppress subordinate group members and restrict the oppressor’s own humanity. The socialization of Whites into a set of behaviors, thoughts, and feelings that express internalized notions of entitlement and privilege begins at birth, and the rigid stereotyped
schemas that result in deep fear of racial minorities are in place by middle school. Once White children have internalized White dominance, White norms are thought of as unquestionable rights of Whites rather than privileges received through dominance and subjugation. This is evidenced in the White schematic distinction between the White stay-at-home mother and the stereotyped Black welfare queen whose children exist only to receive a larger check. Both receive financial support without working in order to remain home with children, an unquestioned right of White mothers and an indication of the deficiency of Black mothers. Once White dominance is internalized there becomes an absence of need to prove oneself. In other words, the White person’s characteristics, status, talent, and qualifications are unquestioned. This process renders White supremacy and privilege to remain invisible, illusive, abstract, and irrelevant to Whites.

Because of the similar process of indoctrinating Whites and People of Color (PoC) into internalized social dominance and internalized racial oppression, respectively, CC is a relevant construct to help understand the process of Whites in becoming racially conscious and engaging in anti-racist action. The process of CC focuses on challenging White common sense so that the invisible becomes visible. Diemer et al. (2015) provided the following illustration:

[T]he core elements of CC among students at a high school that disproportionately suspends youth of color could be manifested as (a) recognition that school disciplinary policies are being applied disproportionately across racial/ethnic groups, (b) the agency to do something about it, and (c) behaviors such as joining a student diversity group, participating in a protest, or talking with school administrators. In contrast, a less critically conscious youth might fail to
recognize the disproportionate suspensions, ignore or minimize the underlying racism, blame the students, lack interest or feel powerless to do anything about it, or avoid talking about or acknowledging the problem (p. 810).

The most radical expression of White CC is the race traitor. A race traitor is “someone who is nominally classified as white, but who defies the rules of whiteness so flagrantly as to jeopardize his or her ability to draw upon the privileges of the white skin” (Ignatiev, 1997, p. 607). Some of the processes of CC and being a race traitor that Ignatiev highlights include awareness that race is a social construct, awareness of the history behind “people suddenly becoming ‘white’” (p. 608), understanding the current sociopolitical context and ideologies central to the system of social control, building relationships of solidarity with People of Color, opposing unquestioned social structures (i.e., tracking in schools), being willing to be accused and misunderstood, and seeking radical changes to racialized aspects of social life.

Research indicates that for both Whites and PoC, color-blind racial ideology, and justifying the status quo are related to better short term psychological outcomes than those who are critically conscious their world. Unfortunately, while positive effects are transient in PoC, Whites maintain and enjoy long term psychological benefits of believing the system is just and good. This is a barrier to CC. However, Hitchcock (2002) posits that internalized dominance also negatively affects Whites’ as much as internalized oppression affects PoC, albeit in a very different way. It impacts Whites’ relationship to themselves, other Whites, PoC, and the racial structure of society, and blocks understanding of how to achieve the ideals of fairness and equality espoused by
meritocracy and capitalism. Finally, internalizing White supremacist ideology affects one’s relationship to the racial structure of the U.S.

Racism is a system, and we are all its actors. Each of us unconsciously perpetuates a system of oppression through internalized norms and ideologies, as constructed by Whites. Social justice begins with our lived experiences as the basis for developing a critical perspective to guide actions that stop business as usual. Both advantaged and targeted groups have a critical role to play in dismantling oppression and generating alternative visions for a more socially just future. Only by upsetting the system can we change what is happening. This means for Whites as a protected group we must speak up, act up, and question the status quo as much as possible. The antidote to internalized White dominance is critical consciousness. Without critical consciousness, Whites cannot understand the ideologies that uphold the status quo. Critical consciousness is the basis of all antiracism.

**Color-Blind Racial Ideology and Psychosocial Costs of Racism to Whites**

Few White Americans would deny that minorities have historically experienced widespread oppression (Bonilla-Silva, 2006). However many consider the U.S. to be in a postracial period, where racism is no longer a major social problem (Bonilla-Silva & Dietrich, 2011). Yet several decades after the demise of Jim Crow, PoC continue to be economically and socially disadvantaged when compared to Whites (Pager & Shepherd, 2008) and continue to report experiences of racism, even while most Whites report not being racist (Bonilla-Silva, 2006; Feagin, Vera, & Batur, 2001). This contradiction challenges White’s cultural beliefs that racism is no longer a problem. After the 1960s, the old-fashioned style of racism expressed through overt forms of violence and racial
slurs became socially unacceptable, which gave rise to a phenomenon known as modern racism. Modern racism is “the expression in terms of abstract ideological symbols and symbolic behaviors of the feeling that [B]lacks are violating cherished values and making illegitimate demands for changes in the racial status quo” (McConahay & Hough, 1976, p. 38). These ideologies include the Protestant work ethic and conservatism of the late twentieth century (Eberhardt, & Fiske, 1996). At the turning of the century, racism is now expressed as denial of race and racism in order to appear less racist: This is the new ultramodern racism, typified by the dominant racial ideology of color-blindness (Neville et al., 2013).

Frankenberg (1993) and Neville et al. (2013) propose two dimensions of racial color-blindness. The first dimension, color-evasion, emphasizes sameness in order to deny White racial superiority through the strategy of simply not seeing race. Research has shown that Whites who use the color-evasion strategy appear less friendly (Apfelbaum, Pauker, Ambady, Sommers, & Norton, 2008) and make less eye contact with PoC (Norton et al., 2006), engage in more racially insensitive behaviors (Apfelbaum, Sommers, & Norton, 2008; Holoien & Shelton, 2012; Norton et al., 2006), express higher levels of implicit prejudice (but not explicit prejudice) toward PoC than those who use a multicultural strategy (Correll, Park & Smith, 2008), and are less likely to identify and report overt acts of racial discrimination (Apfelbaum, Pauker, Sommers & Ambady, 2010). Although not seeing race is thought to be more equitable than acknowledging race, research is clear that color-blindness is detrimental to achieving racial equity, and that color-consciousness is more accurate and equitable.
The second dimension, power-evasion, encompasses the broader societal discourse of equal opportunity (i.e., meritocracy) so that any failure to compete by racial minorities is construed as personal and cultural deficiency (Frankenberg, 1993; Neville et al., 2013). The key strategy of power-evasion is denying power relationships in society, including denial of racism. CBRI constructs a view of PoC that is isolated from the context of the racialized social system in which they live. This allows Whites to assume that PoC have an equal opportunity to access resources and an equal opportunity to succeed. The racial minority who fails to secure a job with a living wage is viewed as deficient. However, systemic injustice experienced by PoC has been extensively documented, including being constrained to low-wage fields, which is compounded by a wage gap (Grodsky & Pager, 2001; Kane-Williams, 2014), exposure to higher levels of pollution and other environmental risks (Mohai, Pellow & Roberts, 2009), poorer quality of health care (Schneider, Zaslavsky, & Epstein, 2002), excessive rates of incarceration that disproportionately impacts men of color (Glaze & Parks, 2011), and residential segregation which has both created and perpetuated racial inequality (Williams & Collins, 2001). These are just a few examples of the power dynamics at work in the U.S. that often go unnoticed in Whites.

**CBRI, PCRW, and Social Action**

CBRI is often viewed as a compassionate, liberal, and fair-minded stance (Locascio, 2014; Zuriff, 2014); therefore, one might naturally conclude that color-blindness would be a worldview held by people who value social justice. But research reveals the opposite. Lower color-blind attitudes in college students significantly predicted higher social justice orientation and affirmative action beliefs (Awad, Cokley,
lower fear of racial minorities (Spanierman & Heppner, 2004), lower racial intolerance (Neville et al., 2000) and less racially insensitive behavior (Apfelbaum, Sommers, & Norton, 2008; Holoien & Shelton, 2012; Norton, Sommers, Apfelbaum, Pura & Ariel, 2006). Also, findings indicate that Whites who are higher in CBRI endorse more negative views of PoC who challenge racism, and see them as responding inappropriately, especially when racist comments are more ambiguous (Zou & Dickter, 2013). Greater fear of minorities is also related to lower racial awareness, cultural sensitivity, and understanding of White privilege (Spanierman, Poteat, Beer, Armstrong, 2006; Spanierman, Todd, & Anderson, 2009).

Finally, in a sample of 60 elementary school students, Apfelbaum et al. (2010) found that students who were primed with CBRI at school were less likely to recognize discrimination and, therefore, were less likely to report racist infractions to teachers. This pattern of socialization through government sanctioned education and indoctrination is highly problematic. Lack of racial awareness due to color-blindness precludes people from recognizing White racism in the first place. University students with higher levels of color-blindness endorsed higher levels of support for social dominance and also perceived the campus climate more positively than those with lower levels of color-blindness (Worthington, Navarro, Loewy, & Hart, 2008). If Whites are unable to recognize racism—even criticizing PoC who confront racism—they cannot act against (and inadvertently promote) racial injustice.

Racism is not simply overt acts of violence and racist slurs targeting minority individuals. Although CBRI appears outwardly caring, beneficent and just, it enables Whites to leave their negative attitudes toward other races unacknowledged. Lack of
awareness is neither innocent nor passive; instead, it perpetuates injustice. In fact, CBRI has been implicated in the perpetuation of White racism because Whites who hold color-blind views are unable to accurately perceive racism, which leads to an inability to act to correct injustice (Apfelbaum, et al., 2008). Recognition of race and racism is the impetus that may allow some Whites to “break out” and become agents of racial justice.

There are several reasons why Whites embrace racial colorblindness. For some Whites, racial colorblindness is appealing for benevolent reasons. They have good intentions when endorsing racial colorblindness (Knowles, et al., 2009) and believe that CBRI is “a way to prevent the kind of blatant discrimination that accompanied Jim Crow segregation—separate water fountains, separate schools, abusive governance, and vastly unequal job opportunities” (Babbitt, Toosi, & Sommers, 2016, p. 55), a way to protect minorities from harm, or simply a default approach of “inherited silence” (p. 61). Other Whites are motivated by their interest in maintaining the benefits received through unfair allocation of resources. Babbitt et al. suggest that this is due to investment in the status quo and a way to protect their privilege.

Whites in the U.S. experience many benefits of living in a racist society, however, these benefits may come at some cost. Whites can experience distress, loss or other negative consequences as a result of benefiting from White privilege (Spanierman & Heppner, 2004). These costs include White empathy, guilt, and fear. White empathy includes anger, sadness, frustration, disgust, and helplessness in response to societal racism and White supremacy. Spanierman and Heppner (2004) found that White empathy was positively associated with higher levels of racial awareness, attitudes toward racial diversity and ethnocultural empathy suggesting that increased empathic
reactions may co-occur with increased awareness of the structural and ideological nature of racism, which are necessary precursors to critical consciousness. White Guilt includes guilt and shame regarding personal Whiteness and the receipt of White privilege. Whites who endorsed higher levels of guilt also endorsed pro-minority attitudes, moderate levels of understanding of institutional racism, and lack of commitment to racism. White fear includes fear and distrust of other races and feeling unsafe in their presence. Higher White fear was related to lower levels of racial awareness and ethnocultural empathy, negative attitudes toward personal contact with other races, a negative image of PoC, higher commitment to racial attitudes, and reliance on the opinions of others. Because feelings elicited by racial issues are likely an integral component of racial attitudes, these three factors are promising steps toward understanding White antiracist allies (Kordesh et al., 2013; Poteat & Spanierman, 2008; Spanierman & Heppner, 2004).

Color-blindness and costs of racism to Whites have been studied together with mixed findings. Spanierman and Heppner (2004) noted relationships between PCRW and two of the three subscales of the CoBRAS (excluding institutional discrimination; Spanierman & Heppner, 2004). However, Spanierman et al. (2009) found no correlation between the unawareness of privilege subscale of CoBRAS (the only subscale used) and White Fear, although unawareness of privilege was related to empathy and guilt. In a longitudinal study of the trajectory of PCRW throughout college, Todd, Spanierman and Poteat (2011) found that PCRW over time was moderated by pre-college CoBRAS score. In students with higher awareness of racism at admission, guilt decreased, empathy increased and fear remained about the same over time whereas in students with lower awareness of racism, guilt increased, empathy decreased and fear decreased over time.
This suggests that childhood socialization is important to future racial attitudes and behaviors. Further study of the nuances of the relationship between CBRI and PCRW would be helpful in understanding these findings.

CBRI and PCRW have also been studied to understand White antiracist allies. Spanierman, Poteat, Beer, and Armstrong (2006) cluster analyzed PCRW, CBRI, and prejudicial attitudes toward PoC and women in 230 White college students in order to understand the different reactions of Whites to racial issues. Spanierman et al. identified five different clusters—or “types”—of White college students. Of primary interest, the “antiracist type” reacted to racial issues with informed empathy (displaying the lowest CBRI and the highest cultural sensitivity of the five groups), and accountable guilt (as indicated by their reported high racial diversity in friendships). These findings echo Goodman (2001) who found that empathy about racism is crucial in White antiracist behaviors and predictive of support for equal opportunity policies, whereas guilt does not predict antiracist behaviors (Iyer, Leach & Crosby, 2003). The next study in their line of research of the antiracist type replicated the results of the original cluster analysis (Spanierman et al., 2009), and added post survey focus groups to deepen understanding of White antiracist allies. Interviews with 5 antiracist participants and 5 non-antiracist participants were conducted. Antiracists reported awareness of old-fashioned and modern racism (CBRI), did not express either form of racism, and engaged in frequent, active opposition to racism, which included intentional crossing of racial boundaries (Kordesh et al., 2013). Hence, the low CBRI, high cultural sensitivity, high empathy, and moderate guilt of the “antiracist type” may indicate enough awareness of injustices in society to stimulate antiracist action. This study continued this line of research by measuring
antiracist action in relation to group differences in CBRI, PCRW—along with other variables—in both students and community members. Since Spanierman et al. (2009) found that changes in PCRW type can be predicted over the course of the academic year, looking at the patterns of results with additional constructs may help to generate questions about why these changes can happen. Therefore, adding thicker description to this line of inquiry is likely to encourage further research and understanding of antiracism.

Spanierman and colleagues have made a significant contribution to the literature. However there are some key shortcomings to this line of research. First, the generalizability is limited due to overreliance on college student samples. Second, although an antiracist type was identified, there were no behavioral indicators of antiracism utilized in the studies. Thus, although the attitude might be antiracist, behaviors are key to antiracism. Third, the shifts in PCRW types in a less desirable direction (Spanierman et al., 2009) need clarification. The shift may be due to system justification and/or social dominance orientation which increase with perceived threat to resources (Jost, Banaji & Nosek, 2004). Therefore, using a scale that measures antiracist behaviors in college students, community members, and activists, this study will increase understanding of different types of White antiracists’ levels of CC, PCRW, CBRI, and system justification tendencies as related to their antiracist behaviors.

**System Justification Theory and Social Dominance Orientation**

System justification (SJ) is the “process by which existing social arrangements are legitimiz[ed], even at the expense of personal and group interest” (Jost & Banaji, 1994, p. 2). System justification theory (SJT) postulates that, to varying degrees, people are
motivated (often unconsciously) to defend and reinforce current economic, social, and political arrangements (Jost & van der Toorn, 2011). SJT is used to explain stereotypes, prejudice, intergroup relations, ideologies, and perceptions of the fairness and legitimacy of inequitable social arrangements (Jost & van der Toorn, 2011). Often unconscious, SJT needs can be triggered by the presence of others who defend the current social system (Cheung, Noel & Hardin, 2011), by implicit activation of ideologies through symbols (i.e., the American flag; Carter, Ferguson, & Hassin, 2011), by a threat to the system (9-11), and by perceived dependence upon the system (receiving welfare; Jost & van der Toorn, 2011). People are motivated to justify the system because confronting injustice and initiating change create unpredictability, uncertainty, and the potential for disorder. This may explain why people choose to blame PoC for failures to compete rather than indicting the system. SJT posits that people do not passively accept dominant ideology; instead, defense of the status quo is motivated behavior that gives validity to the current socially constructed ideology and reality. This suggests that ideologies may be constructed to ensure the perpetuation of existing social arrangements in order to assuage cognitive dissonance, uncertainty, and threat.

Color blindness as the current dominant racial ideology, legitimates and justifies systemic social inequities experienced by PoC in the U.S. (Knowles, Lowery, Hogan, & Chow, 2009) and protects White group interest (Neville, Coleman, Falconer, & Holmes, 2005). While SJ has short-term benefits to both high- and low-status group members (Jost & Hunyady, 2002; Napier & Jost, 2008; Napier & Jost, 2008; Tomaka & Blascovich, 1994; Lambert, Burroughs, & Nguyen, 1999; Kay, Gaucher, Napier, Callan, & Laurin, 2008; Wakslak, Jost, Tyler, & Chen, 2007), which endure for high-status groups (Jost &
Thompson, 2000), low-status group members demonstrate reduced long-term psychological well-being (Jost & Thompson, 2000). But even to high-status groups, this short-term psychological gain has ancillary negative consequences of subduing the motivation to act against injustice, strengthening resistance to social change, perceiving resistance as greater threat (Jost & van der Toorn, 2011; Wakslak et al., 2007), and adjusting preferences to rationalize outcomes (Jost, Banaji, & Nosek, 2004). To overcome resistance to change, the need for personal justice and/or group justice must be greater than the need for system stability (Jost et al., 2004). Overcoming social apathy may be facilitated by increasing racial identity in Whites (O’Brien & Major, 2005; Wakslak et al., 2007) and raising consciousness of inequality (Zimmerman & Reyna, 2013). The cost of believing that there is equal opportunity for all people of all races in the U.S. is that people are less likely to strive to improve the status quo, which prolongs the current system (Jost & Hunyady, 2005). Research must further elucidate how Whites break through their system-justifying indifference to overcome social apathy regarding the system of racism in place in the U.S.

One barrier to overcoming SJ is a commitment to social dominance orientation (SDO). SDO is the general tendency to prefer hierarchical, non-egalitarian relationships between groups (Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994). It is a way of thinking about groups’ various roles and outcomes. SDO is related to endorsement of hierarchy-enhancing ideologies and self-selection into social roles; lower concern for others, communality, tolerance, and altruism; beliefs in sexism, equal opportunity, patriotism, cultural elitism, conservatism, miscegeny, and just world beliefs; opposition to social programs, racial policies, gay and lesbian rights, environmental programs and women's
rights; support for military programs, chauvinism, and law-and-order policies; and Republican party identification (Sidanius, Pratto, van Laar, & Levin, 2004). SDO predicts support for hierarchy-enhancing policies and programs, likely including CBRI, although research has not yet identified this specific relationship. While SJT emphasizes the tendency to justify the system by both high- and low-status groups (Jost, 1995; Jost & Banaji, 1994; Jost, Glaser, Kruglanski, & Sulloway, 2003), SDO focuses on the tendency to rationalize group dominance in dominant group members (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999), which in this study is Whites. SJ and SDO may obstruct both large and small scale social action by preventing the perception of systemic unfairness toward PoC necessary to compel action. Inability to perceive racial injustice reduces the need to act to improve racial equity at the group and system level. SJT and SDO must be researched alongside antiracist action to uncover these relationships.

**Antiracist Action**

Antiracists are “persons who have committed themselves, in thought, action, and practice, to dismantling racism . . .”Rather than trying to minimize the significance of racism in the United States, for themselves and others, antiracists make it a point to notice and address racism” (O’Brien, 2001, p. 4). The terms “antiracist,” “White ally,” and “racial ally” will be used interchangeably in this paper. Racial allies have three primary roles as explicated by Roades and Mio (2000): (1) recognition of the oppression of People of Color PoC; (2) recognition of White privilege; and, (3) standing up for others in a way that challenges the status quo. Therefore, antiracist action is any intentional behavior with the goal of upsetting the status quo and shifting dominant discourse toward racial equity. Researchers have described antiracism as levels of action
that are self-directed and self-reflective, other-directed and responsive, or collaborative actions that challenge societal structures (Nagda et al., 2003, 2004); and, intrapersonal, interpersonal, social, political, or global (Reason, Scales, & Roosa Milar’s, 2005).

Antiracist behaviors can range from low- to high-risk and include becoming a racial ally (Ayvazian, 2004). These behaviors include understanding the role of the White ally in relation to PoC (Kivel, 2002), forming ties with the communities of color and displaying symbols of support (Worthington, Dillon, & Becker, 2005), exposing one’s alliance with racial minorities to Whites and standing alongside them when they experience racism (Alimo, 2012), purposefully educating and challenging White peers about racism and White privilege (Alimo, 2012; Smith & Redington, 2010), recruiting other Whites into action (Broido & Reason, 2005), challenging racist jokes and assumptions, writing letters, involvement in the political process, speaking at rallies, and leading special projects or groups (Alimo, 2012; Corning & Myers, 2002; Kivel, 2002; Mallinckrodt, Miles, Bhaskar, Chery, Choi, & Sung, 2014; O’Brien, 2001, Reason et al., 2005). In other words, action is not just protests and lobbying a congressperson: It is a process that can look very different between allies and contexts given their geographical and social location and their developmental progress.

While there is a modest literature of antiracist behaviors in qualitative, mixed and social-experimental methods, there are no published quantitative studies of antiracist behavior primarily because there has not been an antiracist survey instrument. However, Pieterse, Utsey, and Miller (2015) recently developed the Antiracist Behavior Inventory (ARBI). Because it is new, evidence of psychometric stability is needed. This research provides psychometric data for the ARBI.
Purpose of the Study

This study examined within group differences of White participants’ awareness of oppression (CC), perceived entitlement to default high social location (SDO), awareness of the privilege of being White (CBRI), and the uncomfortable feelings they experience as Whites in a racist society (PCRW). Rather than continuing to explore the attributes of racial allies in isolation, this investigation examined characteristic patterns of allies and non-allies White characteristics to better capture the nuances in racial allies’ behaviors and attitudes.

Thus, the primary purpose of this investigation is to use cluster analysis to explore and describe characteristics of Whites who have broken through their White cultural socialization to act in pursuit of racial justice. Cluster analysis is an effective analytic technique to help researchers examine multiple constructs of interest while identifying groups of similar individuals (Borgen & Barnett, 1987). In this study different clusters of White individuals were formed based upon their patterns of scores on CCI, PCRW, CBRI, SJ, and SDO. Once the cluster groups were determined, the differences between the profiles are then described in terms of their antiracist action (ARBI).

Based upon previously discussed research, the following research questions are proposed for this study:

(1) What are the psychometric properties of the ARBI in this sample?

(2) What clusters of Whites will emerge in this sample, specifically related to perception of the system (SJT), awareness of racial discrimination (CoBRAS), level of entitlement to social location (SDO), and the affective costs of being part of a racialized society (PCRW).
(3) Are there significant differences in ARBI subscales between cluster groups?

(4) Are there significant differences between clusters on demographic variables?
CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

Critical Consciousness

Critical consciousness (CC) is a construct that was first developed by Paulo Freire (1970). Initially labeled conscientizacao, this construct was developed to explain the varying degrees of understanding by Brazilian students in matters related to the reality of oppression. Since then, many educators and some psychologists have incorporated CC into their understanding of the awareness of oppression among students and marginalized groups, and, to a lesser extent, the awareness of racial oppression by White individuals. This paper defines CC, considers the theory and research behind CC, and discusses its relation to antiracist action by Whites.

Oppression is defined as “the unjust use of power by one socially salient group over another in a way that creates and sustains inequity in the distribution of coveted resources” (Watts, Griffith, & Abdul-Adil, 199, p. 257). There are five key characteristics (Bell, L.A., 1997) of oppression. First, it is pervasive. Oppression is not only enacted at the individual level of personal bias and bigotry, but is held up and maintained by a web of structures endemic to the system of American culture. As an example, Bell posits that over time “immigrants of color are racialized and subordinated
through history, law, foreign and economic policy, social custom, and educational practice” (p. 3).

Second, oppression is restrictive, meaning that systemic constraints are built that significantly affect marginalized groups’ opportunities in life (Bell, L.A., 1997). For example, the 114th Congress, our nation’s “most diverse ever” (Pew, 2015), boasts only six racial or ethnic minorities (REM) in its 100 Senate leaders even while REM make up 31 percent of our nation’s population (Krogstad, J.M., 2015). Bell states that the third characteristic of oppression is that it is hierarchical. Dominant groups are privileged because they benefit from access to coveted resource not equally accessible to all racial groups. Fourth, oppression has complex, multiple, and cross-cutting relationships, indicating that individuals may experience oppression because of their race while receiving privilege because of being male. Finally, oppression is not merely enacted through social norms and institutions but also in the human psyche, where oppressive messages are internalized in the belief systems of marginalized individuals.

However REMs are not alone in their internalization of external social structures and norms. Bell (1997) continues that Whites are also socialized into dominance, internalizing these beliefs and enacting White supremacy in their daily lives. Pheterson (1990) suggests that Whites most often view White supremacy and White dominance as conscious acts of hatred that harken back to slavery and Jim Crow racism, which allows most Whites to say, “I am not a racist.” However, White supremacy and White dominance exist not just in individual, conscious acts of violence, but within social institutions and norms, and the human psyche (Fanon, 1968; Freire, 1970; Miller, 1976). These norms include feelings of superiority, normalcy, and self-righteousness.
Internalizing these norms alienates Whites from themselves when they deny their own sense of common humanity (Pheterson, 1990). What this means is that Whites become internally restricted in their empathy, trust, love, and openness to others and to life-enhancing work. Internalized White supremacy makes Whites rigid and repressed.

Pheterson (1990) defines internalized dominance as the acceptance of prejudices by the dominant group against others, and the incorporation of this worldview into attitudes and behaviors that both oppress subordinate group members and restrict the oppressor’s own humanity. The author states that the socialization of Whites into a set of behaviors, thoughts, and feelings that express internalized notions of entitlement and privilege begins at birth. The rigid stereotyped schemas that result in deep fear of racial minorities are in place by middle school. Once the White child has internalized White dominance, White norms are thought of as unquestionable rights of Whites rather than privileges received through dominance and subjugation. This is evidenced in the White schematic distinction between the White stay-at-home mother and the stereotyped Black welfare queen whose children exist only to receive a larger check. Both receive financial support without working in order to remain home with children, an unquestioned right of White mothers and an indication of the deficiency of Black mothers. Once White dominance is internalized there becomes an absence of need to prove oneself—that the White person’s characteristics, status, talent, and qualifications above the REM is not questioned. This process renders White supremacy and privilege to remain invisible, illusive, abstract, and irrelevant to Whites. For example, White college students often protest Arab, Asian, Black, and Native American groups on campus unless they get their own White
American group. What White students fail to recognize is the default White content, structure, and focus of campus groups.

Because of the similar process of indoctrinating Whites into internalized social dominance and indoctrinating REM into internalized racial oppression, CC is a relevant construct to help understand the process of Whites in becoming racially conscious and engaging in anti-racist action. The process of CC focuses on acceptance of prejudices by the dominant group against others, and the incorporation of this worldview into attitudes and behaviors that both oppresses subordinate group members and restricts the oppressor’s own humanity on highlighting and challenging White common sense. So what does critical consciousness look like? Diemer et al. (2015) provide the following illustration:

The core elements of CC among students at a high school that disproportionately suspends youth of color could be manifested as (a) recognition that school disciplinary policies are being applied disproportionately across racial/ethnic groups, (b) the agency to do something about it, and (c) behaviors such as joining a student diversity group, participating in a protest, or talking with school administrators. In contrast, a less critically conscious youth might fail to recognize the disproportionate suspensions, ignore or minimize the underlying racism, blame the students, lack interest or feel powerless to do anything about it, or avoid talking about or acknowledging the problem (p. 810).

The most radical expression of White CC is the race traitor. A race traitor is “someone who is nominally classified as white, but who defies the rules of whiteness so flagrantly as to jeopardize his or her ability to draw upon the privileges of the white skin” (Ignatiev, 1997, p. 607). Some of the processes of CC and being a race traitor that Ignatiev
highlights include awareness that race is a social construct, awareness of the history behind “people suddenly becoming ‘white’” (p. 608), understanding the current sociopolitical context and ideologies central to the system of social control, building relationships of solidarity with People of Color, opposing unquestioned social structures (i.e., tracking in schools), being willing to be accused and misunderstood, and seeking radical changes to racialized aspects of social life.

Research indicates that for both Whites and PoC, color-blind racial ideology, and justifying the status quo are related to better short term psychological outcomes than those who are critically conscious their world. Unfortunately, while positive effects are transient in PoC, Whites maintain and enjoy long term psychological benefits of believing the system is just and good. So why would a White person want to open their eyes and see systemic racial injustices?

Hitchcock (2002) posits that internalized dominance actually negatively affects Whites’ as much as internalized oppression affects PoC, albeit in a very different way. First it impacts Whites’ relationship to themselves by necessitating rigidity; engendering defenses such as denial, projection, and transference of blame; and, blocking understanding of how to achieve the ideals of fairness and equality espoused by meritocracy and capitalism. Internalized dominance also affects Whites’ relationships with other Whites. Pretending to be unaffected by racism, assuming other Whites are racist, espousing a unique relationship with People of Color, and focusing on one’s seats of oppression instead of White privilege breeds competition between Whites to be the least racist and precludes Whites from even naming themselves as White. This effectively distances Whites from other Whites. Internalized domination also affects
Whites’ relationships with PoC, where Whites fear PoC and feel superior to PoC; live physically and psychologically isolated from PoC; feel the need and ask for their approval, affirmation and exemption from guilt; fear saying the wrong thing and being perceived as racist; and, discount the abilities and misjudge the intentions of PoC. Finally, internalizing White supremacist ideology affects one’s relationship to the racial structure of the U.S. Whites view Whites as normal and good and PoC as abnormal and, at best, culturally deficient; retain the ability to be ignorant and unaware of racism; feel dull, plain, and like they have no culture; feel inadequate about effecting change; accept what textbooks say about race without question; remain unaware of how racial structures are perpetuated in White relationships; and, open themselves to manipulation by media and political leaders who use race as a wedge

Racism is a system, and we are all its actors. Each of us unconsciously perpetuates a system of oppression through internalized norms and ideologies, as constructed by Whites. Social justice begins with our lived experiences as the basis for developing a critical perspective to guide actions that stop business as usual. Both advantaged and targeted groups have a critical role to play in dismantling oppression and generating alternative visions for a more socially just future. Only by upsetting the system can we change what is happening. This means for Whites as a protected group we must speak up, act up, and question the status quo as much as possible. The antidote to internalized White dominance is critical consciousness. Without critical consciousness, Whites cannot understand the ideologies that uphold the status quo. Critical consciousness is the basis of all antiracism.
**Color-Blind Racial Ideology**

Most White Americans agree that minorities have historically experienced widespread oppression, but few Whites express conscious awareness of the pervasiveness of current racism (Bonilla-Silva, 2006). The U.S. is often considered to be in a postracial period, where racism is no longer a major social problem (Bonilla-Silva & Dietrich, 2011). While Jim Crow American social norms approved of the explicit expression of White superiority, post-Civil Rights legislation and thought has rendered overt expressions of racism to be socially unacceptable and at times illegal. Dovidio and Gaertner (1986) labeled this Jim Crow explicit style of racism as old fashioned racism. Several decades after the demise of Jim Crow in America, PoC continue to be economically and socially disadvantaged when compared to Whites (Pager & Shepherd, 2008). Systemic injustice experienced by PoC has been extensively documented, including exposure to higher levels of pollution and other environmental risks (Mohai et al., 2009), poorer quality of care than Whites who also receive Medicaid (Schneider et al., 2002), excessive rates of incarceration that disproportionately impacts men of color (Glaze, 2011), and residential segregation which has both created and perpetuated racial inequality in the U.S. (Williams & Collins, 2001). These are just a few examples of the racial power dynamics that continue in the U.S. in spite of legislative ideals. While PoC continue to experience racism, most Whites report not being racist (Bonilla-Silva, 2006; Feagin, Vera, & Batur, 2001). This commonplace lack of awareness of how systemic racial injustice and personal racial prejudices effect PoC is a fundamental barrier to White action for uprooting racism.
Changing social norms have altered expressions of racism, which leads many to believe that racism is no longer a problem. Old-fashioned racism—prototypically present during the eras of the slave trade and Jim Crow—is racism that is expressed through overt forms of violence and racial slurs (Bonilla-Silva, 2001). After the Civil Rights movement and consequent legislation, overt displays of prejudice are currently seen as socially unacceptable behaviors; therefore, racist attitudes must be masked through rationalizing discrimination (e.g., stereotypes) and avoiding all discussions about racial topics (Neville et al., 2013), a phenomenon known as modern racism. Modern racism expresses the belief that PoC demands for changing oppressive systems is illegitimate and that Blacks violate cherished American values (McConahay & Hough, 1976). The expression of modern racism, however, is through abstract symbols (e.g., ideologies such as Protestant work ethic, conservatism) and symbolic (indirect) behaviors. Modern racism can be subtle, indirect, and often passes as reasonable and rational. According to Dovidio and Gaertner (1986), this new socially acceptable form of racism is just as insidious as overt racism. Although CBRI appears outwardly caring, beneficent and just, it enables Whites to leave their negative attitudes toward other races unacknowledged. Whites communicate ultramodern racism by denying race and racism in order to appear less racist, which is grounded in the dominant racial ideology of color-blindness (Neville et al., 2013). Just because social norms that govern expressions of racism have changed to preclude overt expression does not mean racism is no longer a problem. Racism has simply morphed.

Racial color-blindness, as defined by Frankenberg (1993) and extended by Neville et al. (2013), is comprised of two dimensions. The first dimension, color-
evasion, emphasizes sameness in order to deny White racial superiority. The key strategy of color-evasion is not seeing race. Research has shown that Whites who use the color-evasion strategy appear less friendly (Apfelbaum et al., 2008), make less eye contact with PoC (Norton et al., 2006), engage in more racially insensitive behaviors (Apfelbaum et al., 2008; Holoien & Shelton, 2012; Norton et al., 2006), express higher levels of implicit prejudice (but not explicit prejudice) toward PoC than those who use a multicultural strategy (Correll et al., 2008), and are less likely to identify and report overt acts of racial discrimination (Apfelbaum et al., 2010). These findings show that a color-blind racial ideology is less effective in achieving racial justice than a multicultural or diversity approach.

The second dimension, power-evasion, encompasses the broader societal discourse which holds the assumption of equal opportunity (meritocracy) so that any failure to compete by racial minorities is construed as personal deficiency (Frankenberg, 1993; Neville et al., 2013). Three core strategies of power evasion in CBRI are the denial, minimization, and/or distortion of blatant forms of racism, institutional racism, and White privilege. Power-evasion tactics simply deny power relationships in society in favor of meritocratic independence, which necessarily includes denying racism. CBRI is reductionism, viewing PoC as isolated from the context of the racialized system in which they live, and assuming equal opportunity to access resources and opportunities. However, racism is rendered unrecognizable when separated from the context of systems and power structures.

Color-blindness masquerades as a benevolent and righteous ideology that purports that race does not and should not matter (Bonilla-Silva, 2006). Some psychologists are
not convinced that CBRI is unjust. Zuriff (2014) contended that even if unconscious racism does exist in the form of color-blindness, “such ignorance is not the equivalent of racism” and does not qualify someone as a racist (p. 310). However, Bonilla-Silva (2006) found that Whites who use color-blindness in communication often reveal intolerant underlying views of racial and ethnic minorities when questioned more directly about racial issues. Also, while Locascio (2014) contended that color-blind sentiments are good, Neville et al. (2013) argued that “racial color-blindness is unattainable, reinforces racial prejudices and/or inequality, [and] serves to justify and explain away racial inequalities in society” (p. 455).

CBRI has the outward appearance of benevolence. But when questioned, Whites often reveal implicit racial beliefs that are very different from explicit attitudes. Two examples highlight White’s contradiction between implicit beliefs and external behaviors. First, research has shown that pervasive microaggressions and other subtle types of racism experienced by minority youths negatively impact their mental health (Kessler et al., 1999; Szalacha et al., 2003; Williams et al., 2003). Implicit bias has negative effects, even when buried beneath benevolent conformity to social norms.

The second factor that contradicts Whites purported benevolent use of CBRI is illustrated through attitudes toward affirmative action. The majority of Whites report anger at affirmative action policies (Kuklinski et al., 1997) and oppose affirmative action policies that provide preferential treatment to PoC with the goal of improving their position (Pew Research Center, 2009) even after conceding that racism is still a problem (Bonilla-Silva, 2006). Bonilla Silva (2006) found that one objection to affirmative action is that it that it takes jobs away from Whites when it actually levels the playing field by
making discrimination in the hiring process illegal. “Supporters of affirmative action maintain that while a color-blind society may be desirable, acts of past discrimination and current institutional racism make it necessary to use race-conscious policies” (Awad et al., 2005, p. 1384). With the dominant discourse focusing on removing race from discourse, negative effects of racism will continue in perpetuity.

Whites pay a psychological price for the unawareness of current experiences of racism in two ways. First, color-blindness creates tension when the ideology competes with internal and external observations, which Todd and Abrams (2011) labeled White dialectics. Second, when Whites are unable to accurately perceive racism, they are unable to act to correct injustice. With the common contention that CBRI is a compassionate, progressive and fair-minded stance, one might contend that color-blindness is a worldview held by people who value social justice. But research reveals the opposite. Higher color-blind attitudes in college students significantly predicted lower social justice orientation and lower affirmative action beliefs (Awad et al., 2005; Lewis et al., 2012), more fear of racial minorities (Spanierman & Heppner, 2004), greater racial intolerance (Neville et al., 2000) and racially insensitive behavior (Apfelbaum et al., 2008; Holoien & Shelton, 2012; Norton et al., 2006). Greater fear of minorities is also related to lower racial awareness, cultural sensitivity, and understanding of White privilege (Spanierman et al., 2006; Spanierman et al., 2009).

CBRI is negatively related to social action since the lack of racial awareness and sensitivity inherent in color-blindness precludes people from recognizing White racism in the first place. For example, in a sample of 144 college student at a predominantly White university, students with higher levels of color-blindness endorsed higher levels of
support for social dominance of certain groups over others and also perceived the campus climate more positively than those with lower levels of color-blindness (Worthington et al., 2008). Also, cluster analysis of 230 White students’ responses to the Psychosocial Costs of Racism to Whites scale (PCRW; Spanierman & Heppner, 2004) led to identification of the “antiracist type”, which was characterized by informed empathy and guilt (high empathy and guilt and low fear of others Spanierman et al., 2006). After replicating the results of the original cluster analysis (Spanierman et al., 2009), Kordesh et al. (2013) conducted a follow-up qualitative analysis of ten White student participants in order to more fully understand the nuances of experiences. In the replicated study, five of the participants had endorsed responses consistent with the antiracist type and five had endorsed other patterns (i.e., unempathic and unaware, insensitive and afraid, fearful guilt and empathic but unaccountable). Qualitative exploration revealed that the antiracist type was aware of old-fashioned and modern racism (CBRI) and did not express either form of racism. Their awareness of racism was associated with frequent and active opposition to racism and intentional crossing of racial boundaries. Hence, low CBRI is predictive of the antiracist type and may be necessary to stimulate antiracist action. Further, Whites who endorse CBRI have actually been found to criticize antiracist action. Zou and Dickter (2013) sought to determine how racial minorities who challenge racist comments are perceived by Whites. When compared to White participants who endorsed low color-blindness, high color-blind Whites perceived PoC who confronted racist comments “more negatively and as responding less appropriately” (p. 92), especially if the racist comment was more ambiguous. Even children’s use of CBRI reduces awareness of racial injustice. In a sample of 60 elementary school students, Apfelbaum et al. (2010) found
that when students were primed with CBRI at school, they were less likely to recognize discrimination and therefore less likely to report racist infractions to teachers, thereby artificially depressing reports of racial injustice at school and allowing the continuation of explicit prejudice. Even White scholars in psychology are influenced by CBRI and find it difficult to recognize. A recent article by Neville et al. on CBRI (2013) sparked heated debate in the *American Psychologist*. Zuriff (2014), Locke (2014) and Locascio (2014), varied in their positions regarding color-blindness as a form of racism. The authors’ suggested that inhumanity towards others is not a race issue, but a sin issue (Locascio, 2014). Zuriff (2014) implied that the racists are the researchers who talk about race as important. If Whites are unable to recognize racism, and even criticize PoC who confront racism, they cannot act against (and may promote) racial injustice. This is the reason CBRI is inimical to the American ideal of equal opportunity.

The primary problem with CBRI is that it reduces awareness of racism by eliminating race in dominant discourse. Without awareness, Whites actually perpetuate the status quo rather than expressing benevolence. Lack of awareness is not passive; instead, it perpetuates injustice and Whites become complicit in institutional racism. Acknowledgement of current race issues and deeply entrenched negative views of racial minorities is the impetus that may allow some Whites to “break out” and become agents of racial justice.

**Psychosocial Costs of Racism to Whites**

Whites in the U.S. experience many benefits of living in a racist society. However, there are also costs associated with identification with hegemony and denial of racism. Psychosocial Costs of Racism to Whites (PCRW) is defined as “White
individuals’ experiences of the psychosocial costs of racism---the psychological and social ways that White individuals experience distress or loss as a result of being dominant group members in a racially oppressive society; that is, costs refer to the negative consequences experiences by Whites as a result of benefiting from White privilege” (Spanierman & Heppner, 2004, p. 252). Spanierman and Heppner (2004) developed the PCRW construct not to suggest that the costs of racism to Whites is remotely similar to the day-to-day violence PoC endure, but as an innovative way to facilitate the self-exploration of White individuals’ roles in perpetuating the system of oppression. The first PCRW is White empathic reactions (e.g., anger, sadness, frustration) in response to societal racism and White supremacy (Spanierman & Heppner, 2004; Kordesh et al., 2013; Poteat & Spanierman, 2008). Initial findings indicated that White empathy was positively associated with higher levels of racial awareness, attitudes toward racial diversity and ethnocultural empathy suggesting that increased empathic reactions may co-occur with increased awareness of the structural and ideological nature of racism, which are allusive of critical consciousness. The second PCRW is White guilt and shame regarding one’s own Whiteness and receipt of privilege (Spanierman & Heppner, 2004; Kordesh et al., 2013; Poteat & Spanierman, 2008). Whites who endorsed higher levels of guilt also endorsed pro-minority attitudes, moderate levels of understanding of institutional racism, and lack of commitment to racial attitudes, with no relationship to ethnocultural empathy. However research (Iyer, Leach, & Pedersen, 2004; Leach, Iyer, & Pederson, 2006) has indicated that inward focused emotions (e.g., guilt and shame) are least predictive of racial action because of their self- rather than other-focus. The third and final PCRW is fear of other races, which includes fear and
distrust of other races and feeling unsafe in their presence (Spanierman & Heppner, 2004; Kordesh et al., 2013; Poteat & Spanierman, 2008). Greater levels of White fear and distrust of PoC was related to lower levels of racial awareness and ethnocultural empathy, negative attitudes toward personal contact with other races, negative image of PoC, lack of commitment to racial attitudes and reliance on the opinions of others. These findings suggest lack of critical thinking in general and critical consciousness in particular, both of which are required precursors of anti-racist action. Because racial affect is likely an integral component of racial attitudes, these three factors are promising steps toward understanding White antiracists and allies (Kordesh et al., 2013).

PCRW has been the subject of a line of research related to anti-racism. Spanierman et al. (2006) cluster analyzed the responses of 230 White college students in order to understand the differences in reaction to racial issues among Whites based upon their level of endorsement of White empathy, guilt, and fear; color-blindness; and prejudicial attitudes toward PoC and women. Five groups emerged from the data. The five clusters were interpreted as follows. The first group, unempathic and unaware, experienced low empathy and guilt and moderate fear. The second group, which was also the largest group, was labeled empathic but unaccountable and reported experiencing high empathy and low guilt and fear. Coupled with their moderate racial awareness, Spanierman et al. suggested that this type may be aware but have no intention to act to relinquish the benefits they receive as a result of White hegemony. The third group, informed empathy and (accountable) guilt, experienced high empathy and low guilt and fear. This group of more than 90% females, had the highest racial awareness and cultural
sensitivity (highest endorsement of QDI) and reported high racial diversity in their friendships. This cluster was labeled by the authors as the Antiracist Type.

The fourth—and second largest—group, fearful guilt, experienced high guilt and fear and moderate empathy (Spanierman et al., 2006). Interestingly, this group is quite similar to the Antiracist Type, except that their guilt coexisted with low personal contact with other races, mostly White friends, high levels of fear and moderate empathy.

Empathy about racism is crucial to White antiracism (Goodman, 2001) and predicts of support for equal opportunity policies, whereas guilt does not (Iyer et al., 2003). The final group, insensitive and afraid, experienced the highest fear, low guilt and low empathy. This group was characterized by its fear and lack of awareness of and sensitivity to racial diversity, marking this group as having low critical consciousness (Spanierman et al., 2006). Spanierman et al. suggested that this group likely constructs a reality that denies the existence of racism. The second study validated these five clusters with an additional sample of 366 White college students (Spanierman, Neville, Liao, Hammer & Wang, 2008).

The third study again replicated the five-cluster results in a sample of 287 White freshman college students. Spanierman et al. (2009) found that appreciation and openness to cultural diversity and awareness of White privilege (CBRI) differentiated PCRW clusters in incoming college students. Surprisingly they found no significant differences between clusters for gender, racial diversity in home environments, or interracial friendships in high school. Students PCRW cluster type at entrance into college predicted level of participation in interracial friendships at year’s end where high empathy and low fear (with or without guilt) was most predictive of interracial
friendships. Finally, nearly half of all students changed PCRW clusters indicating that PCRW clusters are not fixed and that they change predictably. If movement occurred, students with the PCRW type of Insensitive and Afraid were most likely to move to a more desirable type of Empathic but Unaccountable; Empathic but Unaccountable and Fearful Guilt were also most likely to move to the more desirable subtype of Antiracist. However, students who were Antiracist at entrance and shifted in type were most likely to move to fearful guilt and those who were unempathic and unaware were most likely to become Insensitive and Afraid, both shifts in a less desirable direction which may be due to perceived threat and competition for resources.

The purpose of the fourth study was to support the findings of a unique Antiracist affect type. Kordesh et al. (2013) emailed students from a previous study (Spanierman et al., 2008), and asked them to participate in follow-up focus groups in order to elaborate upon their responses. Five antiracist and five non-antiracist participants completed the focus groups. Qualitative analysis revealed that, in comparison to non-antiracist participants, antiracist participants demonstrated a more complex understanding of White privilege and racism, actively opposed racism, challenged other Whites about racism, and reported experiencing emotional responses congruent with critical awareness of racism (i.e., frustration, anger, guilt, and helplessness). The authors concluded that PCRW, which measures racial affect, can be used to identify White racial allies on campus. Still, more work needs to be done to determine the extent to which these findings are replicated in a more diverse sample of Whites.
**PCRW and CBRI**

Color-blindness and costs of racism to Whites is often studied together with notable relationships between the two constructs and their subscales. Spanierman and Heppner’s (2004) initial construction and validation of the PCRW reported absolute correlations between the three CoBRAS subscales and total score and the three PCRW subscales that ranged from .11 to .43. Only the institutional discrimination subscale of CoBRAS and White empathy was found to be uncorrelated. Spanierman et al. (2009) found no correlation between the unawareness of privilege subscale of CoBRAS (the only subscale used) and White Fear although unawareness of privilege was related to empathy and guilt with correlations ranging between .26 and .40. In a longitudinal study of the trajectory of PCRW throughout college, Todd, Spanierman and Poteat (2011) found that PCRW over time was moderated by pre-college CoBRAS score. In students with higher awareness of racism at admission, guilt decreased, empathy increased, and fear remained about the same over time, whereas, in students with lower awareness of racism, guilt increased, empathy decreased, and fear decreased over time. Hence color-blindness and costs of racism are similar yet distinct constructs.

Like CBRI, all three facets of PCRW have also been linked to action and attitudes toward affirmative action policies. Swim and Miller (1999) argued that White guilt “results from recognition of privilege and discrimination and leads to support for affirmative action” (p. 512) which substantiated Steele’s (1990) contention that support for programs and policies aimed at restoring just treatment to Blacks may be precipitated by White guilt. However, Iyer et al. (2003) reported that while White guilt—a self-focused emotion—predicted some forms of affirmative action based programs, sympathy
(an other-focused emotion) was a more likely to predict general support for various affirmative action policies. Support for these types of policies is one form of action that Whites can take to reduce racial disparities. Finally, moderate guilt has been found to be related to anti-racist actions (Steward, Latu, Branscombe, & Denney, 2010). Thus there is precedent for using PCRW to delineate between types of Whites.

The research on CBRI and PCRW is of immense value in understanding and ending racism. Yet, further research is required to expand understanding of White antiracist behaviors. First, most of the research on the relationship of PCRW, CBRI, and anti-racism has relied on college student samples. Second, although researchers have found relationships between PCRW, CBRI, and the “Antiracist Type cluster”, antiracism requires behavioral correlates. An anti-racist behavioral inventory should be used to confirm their correlation with anti-racist attitudes. Third, the disparate findings about gender as a factor in PCRW type (Spanierman et al., 2009; Spanierman et al., 2006) and shifts from Antiracism in a less desirable direction (Spanierman et al., 2009) need clarification. The shift may be due to system justification and/or social dominance orientation which can increase with perceived threat. Therefore, to continue research on PCRW and CBRI, adding system justification variables and gathering data from a community sample will enhance further understanding of action taken to pursue racial justice.

**System Justification Theory**

System justification (SJ) is the “process by which existing social arrangements are legitimized, even at the expense of personal and group interest” (Jost & Banaji, 1994, p. 2). System justification theory (SJT) postulates that, to varying degrees, people are
motivated (often unconsciously) to defend and reinforce current economic, social, and political arrangements (Jost & van der Toorn, 2011). Initially borrowing and integrating Marxian social theory and experimental social psychology of Lewin, Allport, Tajfel, and others, SJT is used to explain stereotypes, prejudice, intergroup relations, ideologies and perceptions of the fairness and legitimacy of social arrangements. SJ helps to understand defense of the status quo vis a vis evidence of unfairness.

One strategy of SJ, stereotyping, explains the use of stereotypes in the following way. Stereotypes aimed at disenfranchised groups (e.g., poor, lazy, unambitious) are initially promulgated to explain existing societal structures by groups positioned to benefit from preservation of the status quo. Eventually these stereotypes are spread by the groups who are targets of these stereotypes as a way to explain and understand their own disenfranchised position as natural and just. Liviatan and Jost (2011) explain that the need to justify and maintain the status quo is motivated behavior to resist change, and system justifying attitudes result from cognitive dissonance which compels people to reduce uncertainty and threat by adjusting their attitude. But why justify the status quo? Why not change behavior? Resolution in the direction of the status quo meets basic human needs for safety, certainty, justice, fairness and predictability (Jost & Hunyady, 2005).

Stapel and Noordewier (2011) found that when participants perceived systemic injustice, they endorsed higher needs for structure and control of their social world. Participants satisfied their need for control and structure by stereotyping others—either positively (“poor but honest”) or negatively (“poor and lazy”)—as somehow deserving their privation. These stereotypes effectively assuage moral outrage by explaining the
inequalities. Confronting injustice and initiating change create unpredictability, uncertainty and the potential for disorder, which triggers higher need for certainty and predictability, which may explain why people choose to blame the victims rather than indict the system. It is often easier to rationalize racial disparities by labeling PoC as deficient in some way than it is to speak out against cultural ideologies that assume race is no longer a factor.

Another way that people defend the system is by adjusting their behavior to make the system appear legitimate. For example, Ledgerwood et al. (2011) found that participants who endorsed meritocratic ideology were much less critical of research that confirmed their stance than research that contradicted their belief that hard work leads to success. In fact, those participants who were told that success on a task was due to luck and not effort (threat to meritocratic beliefs) worked harder and longer because they were motivated to prove that success is related to effort (defending the system).

**Ideologies as System Justification**

In addition to stereotyping and behavioral adjustments, ideologies are also used to justify the system. Ideology is defined as “the way a system—a single individual or even a whole society—rationalizes itself. Ideologies may be idiosyncratic… impractical, or even delusional, but they still share the characteristics of coherence and temporal stability” (Knight, 2006, p. 619). Ideologies arise from the power groups of society before being adopted by the masses to become the status quo (Marx & Engels, 1846). These ideals are easily disseminated through elite-controlled media. In fact throughout history some have argued that the masses do not have the “political sophistication” to understand the very ideologies they espouse, an idea known as false consciousness
Marx writes of false consciousness as conscious choice that is not truly interrogated or understood. “Ideology is a process carried out by the so-called thinker with consciousness, but with a false consciousness. The real driving forces that move him remain unknown to him; otherwise it would not be an ideological process” (Marx as quoted in Jost & van der Toorn, 2012, p. 318). Whatever the level of understanding of ideology, SJT theorizes that people do not passively accept dominant ideology. Instead, defense of the status quo is motivated behavior with the goal of ensuring the perpetuation of existing social arrangements which provide the current socially constructed ideology and reality.

Color blindness is the current dominant racial ideology that legitimizes the disenfranchisement of and discrimination against PoC in the United States. Color-blind racial ideology advances the belief that race does not and should not matter (Bonilla-Silva, 2006), and it is often considered to be benevolent and righteous. But color-blindness is unattainable, it does not reduce racial prejudice, and it is used to justify racial inequalities in society (Neville et al., 2013). Use of CBRI permits Whites to maintain a compassionate and benevolent air (Bonilla-Silva, 2006), while receiving ideological legitimization of their hierarchy-enhancing goals. Whites recruit color-blindness for their benefit—to further solidify existing social hierarchies and to legitimize systems of inequality (Knowles et al., 2009; Neville et al, 2001), clearly revealing a system-justification motive. Far from being racially progressive and equitable, CBRI impedes progress toward equality and maintains the current social structure by justifying the status quo.
For members of groups who benefit from the status quo, justifying the system is consonant with ego and group justification motives, and research has found that higher SJ is directly correlated with self-esteem, ingroup favoritism and long term psychological well-being for advantaged group-members (Jost & Thompson, 2000). But for members of disadvantaged groups, system justification leads to conflicts between ego and group justification motives, so it has negative consequences on self-esteem, ingroup favoritism and long term psychological well-being (Jost & Thompson, 2000). For example, Eliezer et al. (2011) found that White women who believe that success results from hard work (i.e., meritocracy as justification) are more physically and psychologically vulnerable to discrimination due to conflicting motivations for personal justice and to justify the system. In fact, the women who endorsed high meritocratic beliefs had significantly higher resting blood pressure after a discriminatory event, which may be an indicator of increased emotional distress. In disadvantaged group-members, SJ can be deleterious to both physiological and psychological well-being.

However, for both advantaged and disadvantaged groups, system justification serves a temporal palliative function (Jost & Hunyady, 2002; Napier & Jost, 2008), meaning that at least in the short-term, higher endorsement of system justification is correlated with more positive affect and less negative affect (Napier & Jost, 2008), higher motivation and better performance under stress (Tomaka & Blascovich, 1994), less vulnerability to negative events (Lambert et al., 1999), and reduced feelings of uncertainty, helplessness, cognitive dissonance, moral outrage and other negative psychological experiences (Kay et al., 2008; Wakslak et al., 2007). But this short-term psychological gain has ancillary negative consequences to the advantaged of subduing
the motivation to act against injustice and strengthening resistance to social change (Jost & van der Toorn, 2011; Wakslak et al., 2007). The system justification motivation is so robust that people have been found to rationalize the status quo by adjusting their preferences to fit with the anticipated outcome (i.e., people switch preference for political candidates based upon anticipated outcome; Jost et al., 2004). So how can people overcome the motivation to defend the system and take a stand so that social change can occur?

One way to overcome resistance to change and uncertainty (system justification motive) is to increase the need for personal justice (ego justification motive) and/or group justice (group justification motive; Jost et al., 2004). Since CBRI assumes that one’s racial group identification is unimportant, rejecting CBRI and adopting higher White racial identification (not to be confused with White racial pride) may be one way to allow moral outrage to do its work of transforming Whites into antiracism change agents. O’Brien and Major’s study also found a stronger positive relationship between system justification and self-esteem in Whites (high status racial group) who not only strongly identified with their racial group but also indicated that their race is important to their identity. White racial identity (consciousness of race as important) excludes the possibility that race is not important (CBRI) and this is just one possibility. Rejecting CBRI would reduce SJ and increase antiracist action.

Another way to overcome resistance to change is by raising one’s consciousness of inequality. Zimmerman and Reyna (2013) explored whether people perceived the gap between a system’s ideal goals (equal opportunity for all) and its achievement of these goals. Analyses revealed that people typically perceived at least some measureable gap
between the ideal and reality; however, the larger the perceived discrepancy, the more dissatisfaction with the system, and the more likely to advocate for inequality-attenuating policies (i.e., affirmative action). While high status groups were less likely to recognize discrepancies between the goals and outcomes of a system ideology, the relationship still persists. Whites may be capable of overcoming their complacency and complicity—resulting from their system justifying actions—by overcoming their ignorance of the experiences of racial “others” through racial consciousness.

System justification provides the means to maintain the status quo because it explains away racism and its effects. Systemic ideologies that perpetuate racism (e.g., CBRI) are often left unchallenged. While this benefits Whites, PoC are negatively impacted by SJ beliefs. SJ reduces antiracist action since is reduces moral outrage against racism. While CBRI and SJ are not typically found together in research studies, the literature indicates that CBRI is an ideology used to maintain the status quo. This study will bring these constructs together to elucidate the relationship between SJ and CBRI and their effects on antiracist action.

**Social Dominance Orientation**

Social Dominance Orientation (SDO)—part of SJT—is the general tendency to prefer hierarchical, non-egalitarian relationships between groups (Pratto et al., 1994). Specific types of oppression (i.e., racism, sexism, heterosexism) are special cases of the more general and universal orientation toward dominance and oppression (Sidanius et al., 2004). Rather than focusing on why people are prejudiced and discriminatory (i.e., SJT), SDO focuses on why societies tend to be hierarchical. SDO is a measure of individual variation, but it is not a personality variable. Pratto et al. (1994) refer to it as a way of
thinking about “group-based human social life…in which different kinds of people (e.g., with high or low SDO) play different roles (e.g., enhance or attenuate inequality) and have different effects on each other (e.g., in how much they discriminate in the allocation of resources)” (p. 755).

SDO is directly related to endorsement of hierarchy-enhancing ideologies (e.g., Just World Beliefs) and self-selection into social roles that value power structures (Pratto et al., 1994). Preference for a career on the police squad would likely be coupled with high SDO. Pratto et al., (1994) found that SDO was also indirectly related to concern for others, communality, tolerance, altruism, equal opportunity, and directly related to beliefs in sexism, patriotism, cultural elitism, conservatism, opposition to social programs, racial policies, and women's rights, support for military programs, opposition to gay and lesbian rights, environmental programs, miscegeny, support for U.S. chauvinism, law-and-order policies, and Republican party identification. Thus there is support for the contention that SDO predicts support for hierarchy-enhancing policies and programs.

Pratto et al. (1994) seminal work discusses the role of ideologies in SDO, postulating that “societies minimize group conflict by creating consensus on ideologies that promote the superiority of one group over others” (p. 741) and re-labels ideologies that stabilize a system of oppression as hierarchy-enhancing legitimizing myths. CBRI is a racial ideology that is discussed in the SDO literature. In a sample of 144 college students at a predominantly White university, students with higher levels of color-blindness endorsed higher levels of support for social dominance of certain groups over others (SDO) and also perceived the campus climate more positively than those with lower levels of color-blindness.
While both SDO and SJT are constructs that explain perpetuation of the status quo and preservation of inequality, they differ in their objects of justification. First, while system justification theory emphasizes the tendency of dominant group members to justify the system, SDO focuses on the tendency to rationalize group dominance. Second, system justification theory has a stronger focus on justification processes of members of low-status groups, while research on SDO tends to focus on the maintenance of group dominance by dominant-group members. Finally, SJT posits that the system justification motive is more pronounced under circumstances that threaten the status quo (Jost et al., 2003), whereas SDO is an individual level variable that consistently predicts support for group based dominance.

Overbeck et al. (2004) conducted two studies to test the theoretical assumption of system justification theory (out-group favoritism in disadvantaged group members and in-group favoritism in advantaged group members) and social identity theory (general in-group favoritism) in relation to levels of endorsement of SDO and system justification beliefs. One sample was comprised of 156 undergraduate students in the U.S. and the other included 88 undergraduate students in Italy. Members of low-status groups who were low in SDO actively challenged the legitimacy of status differences; whereas, members of low-status groups who were high in SDO actively defended the status quo when the legitimacy and stability of the system was perceived to be threatened. These findings suggest that SDO offers an added component to understanding the complex beliefs and motivations that lead to active resistance or acquiescence to the status quo. Finally, while SDO and SJ are often found to be significantly correlated, correlations are low, suggesting they are different constructs. Correlations typically range from .07 to .14.
System justification and social dominance orientation perpetuate the status quo, preventing both large and small scale social action by assuaging the perception of unfairness necessary to compel action. System justification is complex in that it has both negative and positive effects that vary depending on the group to which one belongs. Regardless of the effects, SJ reduces the need to act to better the system. While SDO is part of SJT, it offers a nuanced look at beliefs about hierarchy and power rather than motivation to maintain the status quo. Thus both constructs will be useful in understanding CBRI and antiracist behaviors in this investigation.

**Antiracist Action**

There are some key terms that are important to this discussion. Social action is a process of discovering injustice, reflecting on possibilities, and implementing behavior with the intent of changing the system. Working toward social justice humanizes all people, oppressed and oppressor alike (Freire, 1970). While activism is often thought to be political in nature, researchers look more broadly at ways the people plan action to change societal structures. Social justice is conceptualized as “justice toward the goal of full and equal participation for all groups, where resources are equitably distributed and everyone is physically and psychologically safe” (Reason & Davis, 2005, p, 3). Racial justice is a specific form of social justice where the goal is full and equal participation of all races in societal questions, decisions and occupations and equitable access to resources. Within the community of activists for racial justice, all races can work toward racial justice, including Whites. Racial allies are Whites who work for racial justice in
order to dismantle the system of oppression that upholds the privilege and power they receive due to their dominant group membership (Broido, 2000; Reason & Davis, 2005). Racial allies are also termed antiracists, which O’Brien (2001) defined as “persons who have committed themselves, in thought, action, and practice, to dismantling racism . . . .” Rather than trying to minimize the significance of racism in the United States, for themselves and others, antiracists make it a point to notice and address racism” (p. 4). Therefore, a person is not antiracist unless he or she takes measurable action against racism. For the purposes of this paper antiracists and racial allies will be used interchangeably as much of the literature overlaps and enriches the other.

Racial allies have three primary roles as explicated by Roades and Mio (2000): (1) recognition of the oppression of People of Color PoC; (2) recognition of White privilege; and, (3) standing up for others in a way that challenges the status quo. Therefore, antiracist action is any intentional behavior with the goal of upsetting the status quo and shifting dominant discourse toward the goal of racial justice. Alimo (2012) conducted a qualitative study of White antiracists in order to get a richer and deeper understanding of how they make sense of their role and struggles. Antiracists personally define antiracism as the awareness and understanding of the structural nature of inequality and work intended to eradicate racism. Antiracist activists in Alimo’s (2012) study reported that it is not enough to intellectualize and reflect. An essential ingredient of antiracism is “taking responsibility for acting on the awareness that they had gained” (p. 544). Antiracist participants typically reported that their action involved leadership roles in antiracist initiatives, ongoing active engagement and membership with antiracist organizations, and “conscious, purposeful communication about racism in daily
life” (p. 544). This included challenging other Whites on the topic of privilege, exposing their own alliance with PoC, confronting White racism when it happens, and standing alongside PoC when they experience oppression. Other less typical actions included attendance at marches and demonstrations, incorporation of antiracist policies and perspectives into the workplace, and development and creation of special projects in support of antiracism. The variety of antiracist actions recounted by these activists was notable.

D’Andrea and Daniels (1999) elucidated five dispositional attitudes of Whites that help to understand antiracist development among Whites. The Affective-Impulsive disposition was marked by “simple, hostile, and illogical ways of thinking about individuals from different racial groups” (D’Andrea & Daniels, 1999, p. 95) which manifested in old-fashioned racist behaviors (i.e., physical violence, openly hostile and demeaning remarks). The Rational Disposition displayed cognitive rigidity in dualistic thinking about right and wrong with general knowledge about the history of racism. However, they continued to use their rationality to justify separatist beliefs (e.g., not buying a home in an integrated neighborhood) and demonstrated a “superficial affective niceness when it came to discussing issues related to racism” (p. 96). This “niceness” became anger and hostility at the suggestion that a local initiative to integrate the neighborhood may result in job losses for Whites. Their behavior included color-blind speech and a lack of awareness of the differential effects of racism on Whites and PoC. The Liberal Disposition was marked by a more complex understanding of individual, institutional, and cultural forms of racism, recognition of basic human rights, and awareness of and respect for diverse racial-cultural values, behaviors, attitudes and
worldviews. Although this disposition demonstrated increased perspective taking, participants continued to hold ethnocentric beliefs (e.g., bilingual programs are not good), marked apathy, and limited empathy about the problem of racism. These attitudes and affect were manifest in inaction motivated by their desire to avoid negative reactions from peers for being strong antiracist advocates and their discomfort with acknowledging White privilege and personal racism. The fourth disposition—Principled—demonstrated knowledge about the sociopolitical history of White racism, understanding unconscious forms of racism informed by socialization into White superiority, and relativistic thinking that recognized “the legitimacy and value of diverse perspectives and behaviors that emerge from diverse human contexts (p. 98). Whites of the Principled Disposition were able to criticize their professions as embodying aspects of racial hegemony, and did so with passion, excitement, optimism, hopefulness, idealism, and emerging cynicism of societal structures. Antiracist behaviors began to emerge in this disposition, with participants beginning to express concern and initiate discussions about racism as social pathology. Although they were aware and becoming active, the Principled Whites tended to be inconsistent at intentionally and reflectively addressing racism and were hesitant to take action against unintentional and covert forms of racism that are most evident at the institutional level. The authors suggested that this may be due to their lack of support from others and suspicion by others when confronting racism. The final disposition—Principled Activistic—was found in less than 1% of respondents. Along with the ability to think relativistically, this type was more abstract and comprehensive with systemic level thinking about the embeddedness of racism in culture (e.g., art, religion, media) with greater understanding and articulation of what needed to be done to ameliorate
racism. They were neither overwhelmed nor cynical; instead, they demonstrated hopeful optimism in dealing with racism, faith in humanity, and spiritual connectedness with others. Pieterse et al. (in review) suggested that these dispositions can be conceptualized as a developmental process of burgeoning antiracism.

Complementing the perspective of D’Andrea and Daniels (1999) above, Derman-Sparks and Phillips (1997) outlined four phases of antiracism. The authors defined phase one as the phase where exploration of racism begins, including defining constructs and receiving information. Phase two included exposure to contradictions between the American ideal and the reality of racism. Phase three was marked by examination of personal complicity in structural racism as reflected in socialized assumptions, beliefs, and behaviors. Finally, phase four included strategies for anti-racism activism at the individual and institutional level. Consistent with D’Andrea and Daniels, Derman-Sparks and Phillips argue that knowledge and awareness are essential components in the development of behaviors and strategies consistent with antiracism. Both perspectives above emphasize how activism differs at various developmental levels, but that differing types and styles of antiracist behaviors have legitimacy in the process of the developing antiracist. Pieterse et al. (2015) used these dispositions and phases—with their cognitive, affective and behavioral components—to inform their construction of a scale to measure antiracist action with a focus on knowledge and awareness as prerequisites to consistent antiracist action.

Now moving from antiracist roles and disposition, the research also speaks to actions taken by antiracists. The large range of antiracist action has been categorized into types and levels to facilitate understanding. Nagda et al. (2003, 2004) categorized social
action into three types. First, action that is self-directed comes from the aspiration of rectifying social inequality and includes educating oneself and self-reflection. Action can also be other-directed, meaning that it is responsive to witnessing social injustice such as confronting peers when telling a racist joke or reinforcing behaviors that support social justice. Finally, intergroup collaborative actions encompass actions that challenge societal structures, such as joining an advocacy group. In a study of college student activists, Reason et al. (2005) found that action can be taken at any level: intrapersonal, interpersonal, social, political or global and can take many forms, from silence to active visible protest. Behaviors can include intentional reflection on personal racism, or learning about experiences of oppression (Asta & Vacha-Haase, 2013). Recruiting other Whites into action is also critical (Broido & Reason, 2005). Research has indicated that many White allies translated their awareness, knowledge and skills about racism into action only when recruited by White peers (Alimo, 2012). This finding suggests the importance of seemingly minor actions to raise critical consciousness. In fact, these low risk activities can build confidence for higher risk ally behaviors (Alimo, 2012) including intergroup collaborative actions (Edwards, 2006). Other actions include subtle or direct challenges to racist statements, interrupting racist jokes or racist treatment (Kivel, 2002; Mallinckrodt et al., 2014), forming ties with the community, displaying symbols of support (Worthington et al., 2005), becoming a racial ally (Ayvazian, 2004) attending demonstrations, writing letters to Congressional Representatives or newspapers (O’Brien, 2001), boycotts (Corning & Myers, 2002), and whistleblowing. Action can even be indirect (Mead, 1934), meaning that a behavior may appear to be meaningless and impotent, but it shifts the discourse. For instance, a racial ally who chooses to not attend a
racially themed party to symbolize disagreement with the objectification of PoC is engaging in social action.

One of the limitations of the literature on antiracism and ally work is that there has been no instrument that has proven to be both reliable and valid to measure antiracist behaviors. Several instruments have been developed to assess knowledge, beliefs, attitudes, and feelings related to racial awareness. These include the Quick Discrimination Index (QDI; Ponterrotto et al., 2002), Psychosocial Costs of Racism to Whites (PCRW; Spanierman & Heppner, 2004), White Privilege Attitudes Scale (Pinteritis, Poteat, & Spanierman, 2009), and Color-Blind Racial Attitudes Scale (CoBRAS; Neville et al., 2000). However, the endorsement of antiracist attitudes may not consistently extend to antiracist behaviors. To fill this gap, Pieterse et al. (2015) developed the Antiracist Behavior Inventory (ARBI) to measure the full range of action taken by antiracists at any point in development levels. The ARBI is the first measure of its kind and shows promise for use in measuring antiracist action. It encompasses the developmental conceptualization of antiracist behavior within different levels of action.

Antiracist action can be thought of broadly as any behavior intended to upset the racial status quo. The development of antiracist activists is captured by the ARBI. Because the measure was recently, very little research has been done using this measure. The ARBI will help to understand the behavioral correlates of racial attitudes (CCI, CBRI, PCRW and SJB) rather than taking a leap of faith that attitudes produce behavior. CCI, CBRI, PCRW, and SJB will likely contribute to understanding different types and levels of action taken for racial justice.
Antiracist behavior has many varieties. It can look different depending on the stage of development for the anti-racist ally. Research has been limited due to lack of survey instruments that inquire of anti-racist behaviors. Anti-racist attitudes are often considered proxies for behavior. However, social science research indicates that attitudes are not a good predictor of behavior. Thus, research on anti-racist behavior must ask about behaviors to reach a better understanding of anti-racism. The ARBI is a promising new inventory, but it needs to be validated. This study will provide validity data for the measure while filling the gap in research.

**Purpose of the Study**

This study will examine within group differences of White participants in their CC, CBRI, CBRI, SDO, SJ, and PCRW and determine in what ways these ideologies, thoughts, feelings, and motivations translate into antiracist action. While continuing to study attributes of racial allies in isolation is of merit, patterns of White characteristics may better capture the nuances of antiracist behavior.

Thus, the primary purpose of this investigation is to use cluster analysis to explore characteristics of Whites who have broken through their socialization into CBRI and SJB and now act in pursuit of racial justice. Cluster analysis is an effective analytic technique to help researchers examine multiple constructs of interest while identifying groups of similar individuals (Borgen & Barnett, 1987). Therefore, in this study different clusters of White individuals will be formed based upon their patterns of scores on critical consciousness (CC), distressing feelings related to Whiteness (PCRW), belief in the system as fair and just (SJ) and dominance as natural (SDO), and their own consciousness of White privilege, institutional discrimination, and racial issues.
(CoBRAS). Once these differences are determined, the nuances of profiles will be described in terms of their levels of endorsement of antiracist action (ARBI).

Based upon previously discussed research, the following research questions are proposed for this study:

1. What are the psychometric properties of the ARBI in this sample?
   
   Hypothesis 1: The 3-factor structure of the ARBI will be replicated.
   
   Hypothesis 2: Acceptable reliability ($\alpha > .70$; Gliem & Gliem, 2003) will be obtained on full-scale and subscale level scores.

2. What clusters of Whites will emerge in this sample, specifically related to critical consciousness (CC), how they perceive the system (SJT), their awareness of racial discrimination (CoBRAS), their level of entitlement related to their social location (SDO), and the affective costs of being part of a racialized society (PCRW)?
   
   Given the exploratory nature of this research question, no hypotheses are presented.

3. Are there significant differences in ARBI subscales between cluster groups?
   
   Hypothesis 3: MANOVA will reveal significant between cluster differences such that clusters higher in CBRI, SJ, and SDO and lower on CC and PCRW will be lower on ARBI.

4. Are there significant differences between clusters on demographic variables?
   
   Hypothesis 4: The literature suggests that females, younger cohorts, and people with more education are more aware of racism and value diversity. Further because members of the LGBT community experience oppression and generally have higher awareness of discrimination. Therefore it is
hypothesized that MANOVA will reveal significant between cluster
differences such that clusters lower in CBRI, SJ, SDO and higher in CC,
PCRW, and ARBI will be younger, more educated, and contain significantly
more females than clusters high on CBRI, SJ, SDO and low on CC, PCRW,
and ARBI.

Increasing antiracist action is of critical importance to counseling psychologists
whose core professional values are diversity and social justice. Talking about inclusion
and equity is of merit; yet, as with color-blindness, people abide by social proscriptions
against outward expressions of racism, while maintaining deeply entrenched implicit
biases. In other words, people may simultaneously speak of racism with disgust (i.e., an
overt hate crime) and have racist beliefs (i.e., believing Black people are naturally less
intelligent than Whites). When individuals and communities move from talking to doing,
this is an obvious indicator of deeply held values regarding diversity. While attitudes do
not predict behaviors, behaviors do predict attitudes.

The answers to the research questions posed in this proposed dissertation will
benefit the field of counseling psychology in several ways. First, the data will likely
provide additional evidence about the negative consequences of CBRI as the dominant
racial ideology. Second, because antiracist behaviors are so varied, a peak into the
underlying beliefs and emotions that occur with specific types of behaviors will also
provide insight into the process of the developing antiracist for additional inquiry.
Finally, studying these clusters in a community sample will provide additional validity
data to the antiracist type outside of the college environment.
CHAPTER III

METHODS

The first section of this chapter will describe this quantitative research study. The design is correlational to test the primary research question about the characteristics of White allies who engage in racial action. The second section will describe the population, how participants were recruited, number of participants required, procedures for their participation and the criteria for inclusion in this study. In the next section, each construct and its measurement instrument will be reviewed. The final portion of this chapter will give an account of the statistical analyses used to test the research hypotheses.

Research Questions

1. What are the psychometric properties of the ARBI in this sample?

   Hypothesis 1: The 3-factor structure of the ARBI will be replicated.
   Hypothesis 2: Acceptable reliability ($\alpha > .70$; Gliem & Gliem, 2003) will be obtained on full-scale and subscale level scores.

2. What clusters of Whites will emerge in this sample, specifically related to how they perceive the system (SJT), their awareness of racial discrimination (CoBRAS), their level of entitlement related to their social location (SDO), the
affective costs of being part of a racialized society (PCRW)? Given the exploratory nature of this research question, no hypotheses are presented.

3. Are there significant differences in ARBI subscales between cluster groups?

   Hypothesis 3: MANOVA will reveal significant between cluster differences such that clusters higher in CBRI, PCRW, SJ, and SDO will be lower on ARBI. Clusters lower on CC will endorse lower antiracist behaviors.

4. Are there significant differences between clusters on demographic variables?

   Hypothesis 4: The literature suggests that females, younger cohorts, and people with more education are more aware of racism and value diversity. Further because members of the LGBT community experience oppression and generally have higher awareness of discrimination. Finally, White people with high incomes often live in racially segregated White communities. Therefore it is hypothesized that MANOVA and Chi Square analyses will reveal significant between cluster differences such that clusters lower in CBRI, PCRW, SJ, SDO and higher in CC and ARBI will be younger, more educated, contain significantly more females, students, members of the LGBT community, and significantly less high income Whites than clusters high on CC, CBRI, PCRW, SJ, SDO and low on ARBI.

**Participants**

The sample consisted of 339 White students (173; 51%) and community members (166; 49%), with 117 males (34.5%) and 222 females (65.5%). Ages ranged from 18 to 79 with the average age of 30.82 (SD = 13.13). Three hundred participants self-identifies
as heterosexual (88%), 21 as bisexual (6.1%), 5 as lesbian (1.7%), and 6 as gay (2.2%).

All demographic data were self-reported.

**Procedure**

A sample of 526 self-identified White participants (289 community and 237 from the University of Akron) was recruited from the University of Akron, and social networking sites, forums, and listservs pertaining to general interests, antiracism, advocacy, and racial ally interests. Students at the University of Akron were recruited from upper level psychology courses and from HPR during the 2015 spring and summer semesters. Recruitment and survey procedures were as follows:

**Upper level psychology courses.** The primary researcher emailed instructors of upper level psychology courses during the Spring semester of 2015 and opened the study for general participation via HPR until data requirements were met. The email solicitation requested that the instructor forward an email to the class requesting student participation for extra credit in the course. The email introduced the topic of the study and the survey procedures, and students were offered the opportunity to complete the study as a way of gaining extra credit points in that psychology course. If interested, students were directed to click on a link to the HPR / Qualtrics site, which sent them to the informed consent page. Informed consent provided the study rationale, length of time to complete, IRB approval number, the voluntary aspect of survey completion, and points of contact for the study. Participants were required to indicate their consent by clicking on a link at the bottom of the page that directed them to the survey items. The 103-item survey plus demographic information required about 45 minutes to complete. Participants were not required to complete all items to receive the extra credit and could
exit the survey at any time without reprisal. At the end of the survey students were provided an educational debriefing on racial justice and contact information for the both the primary researcher and the dissertation committee chair. All participant data have been kept separate from response data to ensure confidentiality.

**Community members via social networking websites.** Community members on various social networking websites were recruited by a post from the researcher that described the study, provided the Qualtrics survey link for more information, and offered the opportunity to participate in this study as a way of gaining entry into a drawing for one of six $50 gift cards. Once the Qualtrics survey link was clicked, the Qualtrics website presented the informed consent page, which provided the study rationale, length of time to complete the study, IRB approval number, the voluntary aspect of survey completion, and points of contact for the study. Participants were required to indicate their consent by clicking on a link at the bottom of the page that directed them to the survey items. The 103-item survey plus demographic information required about 45 minutes to complete. Participants were not required to complete all items to receive entry into the drawing but they were required to continue to the end of the survey in order to submit their email address. At the end of the survey, participants were provided an education debriefing on racial justice, they were thanked for their time, and were provided contact information for the primary researcher and the dissertation committee chair. In order to enter their email address into a drawing, participants were directed to click another link that took them out of the item response area. Email addresses were entered into a different survey. All participant data has been kept separate from response data to ensure confidentiality.
Instruments

**Demographic Questionnaire.** The demographic questionnaire collected the following information: age, gender, race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, educational information, occupational information, annual income, and political affiliation. The information regarding age and race were used to remove individuals who do not meet the study’s inclusion criteria (i.e., self-identification as White or under 18). A copy of this measure can be found in Appendix A.

**Critical Consciousness Inventory (CCI; Thomas et al, 2014).** The CCI is a 9-item self-report measure of individual levels of critical consciousness. The CCI uses Guttman model scaling where participants select between one of four statements that most accurately captures their understanding of oppression as it relates to sociopolitical development and social perspective-taking. In order to capture stages of critical consciousness, the four statements were written to reflect Watts et al.’s (1999) model of sociopolitical development. The first stage, precritical, reflects lack of awareness of issues of oppression. The beginning critical stage captures a time when individuals are beginning to recognize problems related to inequity and oppression. The critical stage is indicative of an individual with a good understanding of critical consciousness, while the postcritical stage includes personal action when witnessing oppression. Sample items include:

1a I believe that the world is basically fair.

1b I believe that the world is basically fair but others believe that it is unfair.

1c I believe that the world is unfair for some people.

1d I believe that the world is unfair, and I make sure to treat others fairly.
6a I don’t notice when people make prejudiced comments.

6b I notice when people make prejudiced comments and it hurts me.

6c It hurts me when people make prejudiced comments but I am able to move on.

6d When someone makes a prejudiced comment, I tell them that what they said is hurtful.

Initial development and validation revealed that among a diverse sample of college freshmen, the ordinal level data progressed as would be expected based upon Guttman scaling, but that two levels of critical consciousness (instead of four) were evident for this sample: low and high. Findings revealed racial differences in levels of critical consciousness where Black students endorsed significantly higher levels of critical consciousness than White students. Predictive validity indicators include significant variance in social dominance orientation (SDO) accounted for by CCI scores where higher levels of SDO predicted lower levels of CCI, and significant variance in stigma consciousness accounted for by CCI where higher levels of stigma consciousness were predictive of higher levels of CCI. Cronbach’s alpha for this sample was 0.61 for individuals and 0.87 for items. For the current sample, the Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient was .79. A copy of this measure can be found in Appendix C.

Color-Blind Racial Attitudes Scale (CoBRAS; Neville et al., 2000). The CoBRAS measures the extent to which people deny the existence of racism and negate interracial experiences. The CoBRAS is 20-item self-report measure of color-blind racial ideology. Participants are asked to rate the extent that they agree with each statement on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (not at all appropriate or clear) to 5 (very appropriate or clear). Initially, 26 items were developed based upon the working definitions of color-
blind racial attitudes by Schofield (1986) and Frankenberg (1993), a review of the literature on color-blindness, discussions with racially diverse students and community members, and consultation with experts on racial identity. Half of the items are worded negatively to help reduce response bias and the reading level was tested and found to be just above a sixth grade level. Initial development and validation—a five-part study with more than 1100 participants—revealed that among a sample of college students and community members a three-factor, 20-item structure accounted for 45% of the total variance of the 26-item pool. The first factor assesses awareness of Racial Privilege and includes 7 statements reflecting denial of White privilege (e.g., “White people in the U.S. have certain advantages because of the color of their skin”). The second factor measures awareness of Institutional Discrimination and includes 7 statements that reflect unawareness of institutional discrimination (e.g., “Social policies, such as affirmative action, discriminate unfairly against white people”). The third factor measures awareness of Blatant Racial Issues and includes 6 items that measure the level of denial of the pervasiveness of discrimination (e.g., “Racial problems in the U.S. are rare, isolated situations”). Scores are determined by reverse coding relevant items and then summing item responses. Total scores range from 20 to 100 with higher scores reflecting higher color-blindness. Subscale scores can also be calculated with higher scores reflecting higher endorsement of awareness of racial privilege (subscale score ranges from 7 to 35), institutional discrimination (subscale score ranges from 7 to 35), and blatant racial issues (subscale scores range from 6 to 30). The authors obtained Cronbach alpha reliability coefficients from .86-.91 in the sample of over 1100 college students and community members. In a sample of 165 White counseling and counseling psychology trainees,
Cronbach alpha reliabilities were .82 for Awareness of Privilege, .78 for Institutional Discrimination, and .73 for Blatant Racism. For the current sample, Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficients was .93. The CoBRAS demonstrated convergent validity through moderate to strong relationship with two discrimination scales—the Quick Discrimination Index (QDI; Ponterotto et al., 1995) and the Symbolic Racism Scale (SRS; Henry & Sears, 2002). The CoBRAS has also demonstrated construct validity through inverse relationship with the White Privilege Attitudes Scale (WPAS; Pinteritis, Poteat, & Spanierman, 2009). A copy of this measure can be found in Appendix D.

**Psychosocial Costs of Racism to Whites (PCRW; Spanierman & Heppner, 2004).** The PCRW inventory measures the extent to which Whites experience distress as a result of being part of the dominant group in a racially oppressive society. The PCRW is a 16-item self-report measure of affective costs of racism to Whites. Participants are asked to rate the extent that they agree with each statement on a 6-point scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 6 (*strongly agree*). Initially, 36 items (and one validity item) were developed that reflected affective, cognitive, and behavioral dimensions of costs. To ensure each item’s content, clarity, and parsimony, doctoral and undergraduate students completed the instrument; and, faculty experts in race, multiculturalism, and scale development were consulted. A 6-point scale was chosen to avoid over-endorsement of neutrality. Initial development and validation revealed that among a sample of college students a three-factor, 16-item structure accounted for 49% of the total variance of the 36-item pool. The first factor included 6 items that assessed White Empathic Reactions toward Racism (e.g., “I feel helpless about not being able to eliminate racism” and “It disturbs me when people express racist views”). The second
factor included 5 items that measured White Guilt (e.g., “Sometimes I feel guilty about being White” and “I am afraid that I abuse my power and privilege as a White person”). The third factor included 5 items that measure White Fear of Others (e.g., “I have very few friends of other races” and “I feel safe in most neighborhoods, regardless of the racial composition”). Scores are determined by reverse coding relevant items and then summing item responses. Total scores range from 16 to 96 with higher scores reflect higher costs. Subscale scores can also be calculated with higher scores reflecting higher endorsement of White Empathic Reactions Toward Racism (subscale score ranges from 6 to 36), White Guilt (subscale score ranges from 5 to 30), and White Fear of Others (subscale scores range from 5 to 30). The PCRW was constructed using White college students (Spanierman & Heppner, 2004), and it has continued to been used primarily with college samples, with internal consistency reliability estimates ranging from .70 to .85 for White Empathy, from .73 to .81 for White Guilt, and .63 to .78 for White Fear (Spanierman et al., 2006; Spanierman & Heppner, 2004; Spanierman et al., 2009). The factor structure of the PCRW was replicated with a community sample of 284 White participants yielding the same factor structure with similar reliability estimates (White Empathy $\alpha = .75$; White Guilt $\alpha = .59$; and, White Fear $\alpha = .65$; Poteat & Spanierman, 2008). Test-retest reliability of responses from 35 college students over a 2-week period was .84, .95 and .69 for Factors 1, 2, and 3, respectively (Spanierman & Heppner, 2004). For the current sample, Cronbach’s alpha reliability was .68. Convergent validity was supported by significant relationships of PCRW subscales with various measures, as follows (Spanierman & Heppner, 2004): Factor 1, White Empathic Reactions Toward Racism, was negatively related to CoBRAS (Neville et al., 2000; $r = -.30, p < .01$); positively related to the
Empathic Feeling and Expression ($r = .67, p < .01$), Acceptance of Cultural Differences ($r = .39, p < .01$), and Empathic Awareness ($r = .54, p < .01$) subscales of the Scale of Ethnocultural Empathy (SEE; Wang et al., 2003); positively related to the Quick Discrimination Index (QDI; Ponterotto et al., 1995) Subscale 1, General Cognitive Attitudes Toward Racial Diversity / Multiculturalism ($r = .48, p < .01$), and negatively related to the Oklahoma Racial Attitudes Scale (ORAS; LaFleur et al., 2002) Conflictive subscale ($r = -.31, p < .05$; Spanierman & Heppner, 2004). Factor 2, White Guilt, was negatively related to CoBRAS (Neville et al., 2000; $r = -.38, p < .01$), positively correlated with the QDI (Ponterotto et al., 1995) Subscale 1, General Cognitive Attitudes Toward Racial Diversity / Multiculturalism ($r = .46, p < .01$); positively related to the ORAS (LaFleur et al., 2002) Reactive ($r = .42, p < .01$) and Dissonant ($r = .29, p < .05$) subscales, but negatively related to the Dominant subscale ($r = -.39, p < .01$; Spanierman & Heppner, 2004). Factor 3, White Fear of Others, was positively related to CoBRAS (Neville et al., 2000; $r = .11, p < .05$), and negatively related to the QDI (Ponterotto et al., 1995) Subscale 2, Affective Attitudes Toward More Personal Contact (Closeness) With Racial Diversity ($r = -.70, p < .01$; Spanierman & Heppner, 2004). A copy of this measure can be found in Appendix E.

**Social Dominance Orientation Scale (SDOS; Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994).** The SDOS measures the extent to which people prefer hierarchical versus egalitarian intergroup dynamics. The SDOS is a 14-item self-report measure of attitudes toward social group inequality. Participants are asked to rate the extent that they endorse certain beliefs on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (*extremely negative*) to 7 (*extremely positive*) and include items such as “Some groups of people are simply inferior to others”
and “It would be good if groups could be equal.” Scores are determined by summing responses after reverse coding specific items. Total scores range from 14 to 98 with higher scores reflecting higher endorsement of inherent inequality of some groups over others. While Pratto et al. (1994) found a one-factor solution for the SDOS, a 4-part study by Jost and Thompson (2000) with a total sample of 1675 psychology students (1297 European Americans and 378 African Americans) found a two-factor solution to be a better fit. The first factor—Group Based Dominance (GBD)—included 8 items such as “Inferior groups should stay in their place.” The second factor—Opposition to Equality (OEQ)—included 8 items that assessed endorsement of opposition to equality (e.g., “We should do what we can to equalize conditions for different groups”). Subscale scores can also be calculated with higher scores reflecting higher endorsement of Group Based Dominance (subscale score ranges from 8 to 56) and Opposition to Inequality (subscale score ranges from 7 to 56).

Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, and Malle (1994) developed the SDOS by testing more than 70 items from the National Election Study and the S6 Conservatism scale (Sidanius, 1976) that were considered to be proxies for SDO. Fourteen items were then selected that concerned belief in inherent superiority and inferiority of groups and approval of greater social distance between groups. Half of the items were worded to indicate approval of equality with the other seven items indicating approval of inequality. Pratto et al. validated the SDOS by aggregating 13 samples (1,952 total participants) of primarily college students who had taken the 14-item SDOS along with other measures of personality, attitudes, and experiences. Some samples had also completed ideological or policy attitude items. Principal components analysis of the 14-item SDO measure
yielded a unidimensional scale with good internal consistency (α = .83) and test-retest reliability (3 months apart; \( r = .81, p < .0; \) “some months later”; \( r = .84, p < .001 \)). Hypothesized gender differences emerged with men espousing higher SDO than women. Construct validity was supported for SDO: Average correlations indicated that SDO was significantly positively correlated with measures of political-economic conservatism in 7 of 8 samples \( (r = .38) \), cultural elitism \( (r = .40) \), anti-Black attitudes \( (r = .30) \) and racism \( (r = .55) \), anti-Arab racism \( (r = .22) \), Modern Racism \( (r = .53) \), sexism \( (r = .47) \), and support of Wars of Dominance \( (r = .31) \). SDO was negatively correlated with support of Wars for Humanitarian Reasons \( (r = -.41) \). SDO also predicted differences in self-selection into hierarchy-attenuating and hierarchy-enhancing careers after graduation. Discriminant validity was supported by insignificant correlations with Authoritarianism \( (r = .18, ns) \) and Right Wing Authoritarianism \( (r = .14, ns) \), personality variables such as Dominance, \( (r = .03, -.006, ns) \), and Big Five Extraversion, Neuroticism, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness (absolute values of \( r \) between .02 and .19) indicating that SDO is not a personality variable. Convergent validity was demonstrated by significant negative correlations with Empathy \( (r = -.31) \), altruism \( (r = -.32 \) and -.24), Communality \( (r = -.42, -.24) \), the Humanitarianism and Egalitarianism \( (r = -.34) \), and Tolerance \( (r = -.27, -.36 \) and -.27). For the current sample, Cronbach’s alpha reliability was .89. A copy of this measure can be found in Appendix F.

**System Justification Scale (SJS; Kay & Jost, 2003).** The SJS measures the extent to which people believe that the sociopolitical system in the U.S. is just. The SJS is an 8-item, unidimensional, self-report measure that examines perceptions of the fairness of the prevailing social system. Participants are asked to rate the extent that they
agree with each statement on a 9-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 9 (strongly agree). The SJS was constructed for the study to measure how situations effect system justification. Example items include “In general, the American political system operates as it should” and “Most policies serve the greater good”). Scores are determined by reverse coding relevant items and then summing item responses. Total scores range from 8 to 72 with higher scores reflect higher system justification beliefs. Alpha coefficients with student samples range from .75 to .88 (Kay & Jost, 2003; Kay, Jost & Young, 2005; Phelan & Rudman, 2011; Wakslak, Jost, & Bauer, 2011; Zimmerman & Reyna, 2013) and with international populations in Canada and New Zealand are .80 and .69 respectively (Laurin, Kay, & Shepherd, 2011; Osborne & Sibley, 2013). Carter, Ferguson and Hassin (2011) reported alpha reliability of .83 in a sample of 229 community members. Kay and Jost (2003) reported Cronbach’s alpha reliabilities for the four studies that indicate acceptable to good scale reliability of the scale ($\alpha = .87$ Study 1, $\alpha = .75$ Study 2, $\alpha = .86$ Study 3, $\alpha = .75$ Study 4). For the current sample, the Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient was .73. The scale was independently validated using an additional sample of 117 participants and demonstrated good convergent validity (without redundancy) through strong positive correlations with along with the Global BJW scale ($\alpha = .88$, $r = .62$; Lipkus, 1991) and a scale constructed to measure the need for balance and complementarity in the social world ($\alpha = .56$, $r = .34$; Kay & Jost, 2003). A copy of this measure can be found in Appendix G.

Anti-Racist Behavior Inventory (ARBI; Pieterse & Utsey, in press). The Anti-Racist Behavior Inventory (ARBI) measures not only political activism for racial justice, but also beliefs and feelings that reflect critical consciousness of the system of racial
oppression and behaviors intended to interfere with the system. The ARBI is a 21-item self-report measure of anti-racist action. Participants are asked to rate the extent that they “agree with the following statements” on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Initial development and validation revealed that among White counselor trainees a three-factor structure accounted for 47% of the total variance of the item pool. The first factor assesses Awareness of Racism and includes 9 statements reflecting knowledge, opinions, and emotions related to Whites’ awareness of racism (e.g., “The police unfairly target Black men and Latinos” and “I feel guilty and ashamed when I think of the history of racism and slavery in the U.S.”). The second factor measures Individual Advocacy and includes 7 items denoting intra and interpersonal action for racial justice (e.g., “I actively seek to educate myself about the experience of racism” and “I have challenged acts of racism that I have witnessed in my workplace or [community]”). The third factor measures Institutional Advocacy and includes 5 items signifying social and institutional action for racial justice (e.g., “I volunteer with anti-racist or racial justice organizations” and “When I read articles in newspapers or magazines that perpetuate racist ideas, I generally write a letter to the editor”). Scores are determined by reverse coding relevant items and then summing item responses. Total scores range from 21 to 105 with higher scores reflect higher engagement in antiracist behaviors. Subscale scores can also be calculated with higher scores reflecting higher endorsement of Awareness of Racism (subscale score ranges from 9 to 45), Individual Advocacy (subscale score ranges from 7 to 35), and Institutional Advocacy (subscale scores range from 5 to 25). The scale was developed by constructing sixty-eight items based upon descriptions of antiracism education, training, and advocacy
(Derman-Sparks & Phillips, 1997; Kivel, 2002; Ring, 2000; Smith & Reddington, 2010; Tatum, 1992) and advice of experts. The items were reviewed by antiracist scholars and activists who provided feedback on content and clarity and took part in focus groups. After deleting and adding items based upon the feedback received, 55 items were administered to a sample of 346 White and REM graduate students in counseling and counseling psychology programs. Exploratory factor analysis led to a 3-factor solution of 21 items accounting for 47% of the total variance. The first factor, Individual Activism, included 9 items that measure “advocacy-related behaviors that could be undertaken by an individual without the assistance or support of other individuals” (p. 15). Factor 2, Awareness of Racism, included 7 items that measure awareness of and feelings associated with racism. The third factor, Institutional Activism, included 5 items that measure organizational and institutional antiracism behaviors. Internal consistencies of each factor were .80, .88, and .79, respectively. Confirmatory factor analysis of responses of 165 White counseling and counseling psychology students confirmed the factor structure and also provided evidence of convergent validity with the CoBRAS (Neville et al., 2000) with correlations between -.26 to -.66, the QDI (Ponterotto et al., 1995) with correlations between .29 to .79, and the Symbolic Racism Scale (SRS; Henry & Sears, 2002) with correlations between -.21 to -.67. Subscale reliability estimates were .78, .86, and .76, respectively with total scale reliability of .83. Finally, test-retest reliability was established by administering the ARBI on two separate occasions three weeks apart to 36 White counseling psychology graduate students. For the current sample, factor structure was confirmed and Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficients were as follows: individual
advocacy = .84; awareness of racism = .90; institutional advocacy = .84; and, total ARBI = .92. A copy of this measure can be found in Appendix H.

**Data Analysis Plan**

Before analyses were conducted, data were cleaned (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001) leaving 358 participants’ data available for analysis. Descriptive statistics and correlations were then obtained. In order to answer research question 1, data were analyzed through confirmatory factor analysis. Research question 2 was explored through cluster analysis. Research questions 3 and 4 were answered by using MANOVA and Chi Square analyses. SPSS Version 23 was used for all analyses.

First the data were cleaned and missing data accounted for. Although best practices recommended by Schlomer, Bauman, and Card (2010) include a complex step-by-step process for handling missing data, Parent (2013) found that when compared to AIA, advanced methods did not produce significant or meaningful differences in means, standard deviations, variations, correlation matrices, or alphas when analyzing scale- or subscale-level data (as opposed to item-level analyses). This study meets this requirement. Parent also found that mean substitution inflated correlations only when missingness is high and there are few items, weakly related items, or low sample size, none of which will likely be present in this study. Therefore, the recommended best practices of Parent were followed in this dissertation research: Available item analysis (AIA), which neither imputes nor deletes, will be used to handle low-level (< 10%) item-level missing data, and multiple imputation for all other situations.

The assumption of normality was tested via examination of the Shapiro-Wilk (SW) test of normality and observation of the resulting Q-Q Plot in SPSS. Review of the
SW test for normality indicated that normality was a reasonable assumption for SJT ($SW = .99, df = 357, p = .20$), ARBI ($SW = .99, df = 357, p = .12$), and PCRW ($SW > .99, df = 357, p = .60$). The Q-Q plot and histogram also suggested that normality was reasonable. However, review of the SW test for normality suggested that normality was not a reasonable assumption for CoBRAS ($SW = .98, df = 357, p < .01$) where both charts revealed a departure from normality the “2” range and between “5” and “6,” where there were slight increases in the frequency of endorsement of these levels of colorblindness. Review of the SW test for normality suggested that normality was also not a reasonable assumption for CCI ($SW = .99, df = 357, p < .01$) where both charts revealed a departure from normality at the low and high ends as well as positive kurtosis. Finally, review of the SW test for normality suggested that normality was not a reasonable assumption for SDOS ($SW = .91, df = 357, p < .001$) where both plots revealed positive skewness.

Using the outlier labeling rule with the updated recommendation of a $g = 2.2$ (as opposed to 1.5; Hoaglin & Iglewicz, 1987) revealed no statistically significant outliers on either the lower or upper ends of ARBI, PCRW, CoBRAS, CCI, and SDOS. Outliers were noted for SJT where the upper (2.01) and lower bounds (8.12) were exceeded resulting in deletion of 19 lines of participant data.

After data cleaning, data were examined for normality and level of missingness on each scale. After data cleaning, analyses revealed less than 10% missingness of scale-level data. Thus AIA was used. AIA uses available scale-level participant data to produce a participant scale mean score. The missing data point is simply not calculated for the participant scale mean. No scales reported more than 10% missingness, so multiple imputation was not used. Next, compared means for all constructs between
student and community samples to determine whether significant differences existed between groups.

**Research Question #1**

What are the psychometric properties of the ARBI in this sample?

- **Hypothesis 1**: The 3-factor structure of the ARBI will be replicated.

- **Hypothesis 2**: Acceptable reliability ($\alpha > .70$; Gliem & Gliem, 2003) will be obtained on full-scale and subscale level scores.

In order to answer this research question, a confirmatory factor analysis was run using SPSS with a predefined number of factors. Compared competing models in order to determine best fit.

**Research Question #2**

In order to answer the research question, *What are the differences between clusters of Whites that emerge in this sample, specifically related to how they perceive the system (SJT), their awareness of racial discrimination (CoBRAS), their level of entitlement related to their social location (SDO), and the affective costs of being part of a racialized society (PCRW)?* Cluster analysis—an exploratory classification procedure—was used to form homogenous groups within the dataset (Borgen & Barnett, 1987). Prior to standardization of the data, cluster analysis was used to explore and describe different patterns of responses by Whites on the following variables: CoBRAS, PCRW, SDO, CC, and SJT (see Figure 1). This analysis was selected to enable to identification the characteristic patterns associated with varying levels and types of antiracist action. Analyses were conducted in the same fashion as Spanierman et al. (2006) cluster analysis. A two-step procedure, as outlined by Gordon (1999), was used to
identify cluster groups. Specific interpretative criteria was used to understand the clusters.

Step 1 included a hierarchical cluster analysis using Ward’s (1963) clustering method. Ward’s method is a “procedure for forming hierarchical groups of mutually exclusive subsets, each of which has members that are maximally similar with respect to specified characteristics” (p. 236) while yielding optimal effect sizes. This means that Ward’s method will suggest a range of clustering solutions that minimize within-group variability while maximizing between-group variability. The least squared Euclidian distance between pairs of samples is obtained through repeated calculations of distance to produce the lowest possible dissimilarity within nodes (working clusters). Once nodes have been formed, Ward’s linkage method—an agglomerative algorithm found in SPSS—continues (but does not complete) the process of grouping. Ward’s linkage method does not use the Euclidian distance measure noted above to increase dissimilarity; instead, Ward’s linkage method differentiates clusters in successive steps with the goal of minimizing the error sum of squares of the cluster—an analysis of variance approach—thereby reducing dissimilarity within clusters while maximizing dissimilarity between clusters.

Step 2, a non-hierarchical k-means cluster analysis, was used to confirm the first step and find the best participant groupings for the clusters. In k-means clustering, the set of objects is predefined by the number of clusters (centroids) found in step 1. By re-running the analysis with the selected number of clusters, every case with sufficient response rates is allocated to a particular cluster. A dendogram figure was produced and interpreted.
Once clusters were formed using the two-step method outlined by Gordon (1999), scores were standardized using Z-scores to make interpretation possible. Clusters were interpreted based upon their distance from the sample standardized mean using the following interpretive criteria used by Weathersby, Speight, Whittaker, Witherspoon, and Thomas (under review). Cluster mean z-scores that fell ½ of a standard deviation from the sample mean were interpreted as “slightly” below or above the mean, one standard deviation from the sample mean were interpreted as “significantly” below or above the mean, 1.5 standard deviations from the sample mean were interpreted as “well” below or above the mean, and 2 or more standard deviations from the sample mean were interpreted as “substantially” below or above the mean.

**Research Question #3**

In order to answer the research question, *Are there significant differences between clusters on demographic variables?* MANOVA and Chi Square Analyses were conducted to test for differences between cluster groups on age and gender. While there have been mixed findings on gender as a predictor of diversity orientation and anti-racism, the literature evidences a cohort effect (younger people are more diversity aware), gender effect (overrepresentation of females), and an effect of higher education (higher value of diversity) on awareness of racism. Therefore, it was hypothesized that clusters with high anti-racist behaviors would be younger and more educated with significantly more females and students than clusters low on antiracist behaviors.

**Research Question #4**

In order to answer the research question, *Are there significant differences in ARBI subscales between cluster groups?* A MANOVA was conducted on ARBI subscales
(awareness of racism, individual advocacy, and institutional advocacy) between cluster groups.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Descriptive Analyses

Data was collected from 526 participants. Participant data was deleted if the rows contained too many blank cells (deleted 114 rows), participants did not self-identify as White (deleted 53 rows), participants were under 18 years of age (deleted 1 row), or if noted as an outlier (deleted 19 rows). Data cleaning resulted in 339 available lines of data. The sample consisted of 339 White students (173; 51%) and community members (166; 49%), with 117 males (34.5%) and 222 females (65.5%). Ages ranged from 18 to 79 with the average age of 30.82 (SD = 13.13). Three hundred participants self-identifies as heterosexual (88%), 21 as bisexual (6.1%), 5 as lesbian (1.7%), and 6 as gay (2.2%). All demographic data were self-reported. The means, standard deviations, ranges, and reliability estimates for all measures are presented in Table 1. A correlation matrix is presented in Table 2. Overall, the sample endorses some system justification beliefs and hold beliefs that groups are inherently unequal. Generally speaking this sample of Whites has similar colorblind racial ideology (M = 3.78, SD = 1.00), psychosocial costs of racism (M = 3.70, SD = 0.58), and anti-racist behaviors (M = 3.23, SD = 0.76), to the scale averages (M = 3.5, 3.5, and 3.0 respectively). In general this group of respondents endorses higher than average critical consciousness beliefs (M = 2.92, SD = 0.54, scale average = 2.5), system justification beliefs (M = 5.43, SD = 1.33, scale average = 5.00),
and social dominance orientation (M = 5.84, SD = .97, scale average = 4.00). Overall this is a sample with some conflicting beliefs and a general sense that while minority groups experience inequality, that may be appropriate given “inherent” racial differences.

Initially data were analyzed to determine whether the sample group (community versus student samples) means were significantly different for each construct of interest. One-way between subjects Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) tests were conducted to compare the effect of sample type on SJT, PCRW, COBRAS, CCI, and SDOS. For the group comparison, the ANOVA result indicated significant differences for PCRW [F (1, 338) = 8.44, p < .01] and COBRAS [F (1, 337) = 5.67, p = .02]. However, upon viewing, while means were statistically significantly different for PCRW and COBRAS, the means were not practically significant. For example, the difference between PCRW means for community (M = 3.80, SD = .58) and student (M = 3.62, SD = .56) are, in essence, the same response on the Likert scale. Therefore, the sample types were combined into one overall sample. Table 3 displays the means, standard deviations, and p-values for all scales by sample group.

The correlation matrix provides information regarding the relationships between variables. All variables were significantly correlated at the p < .001 level (2-tailed). Interestingly, higher endorsement of color-blindness and higher endorsement of system justifying beliefs were related to of lower costs of racism to Whites in this sample. As expected, agreeing with the status quo of the system and being less aware of racial issues is related to less fear, guilt, and empathy. A surprising finding is the direction of correlations of CC with SJ, ARB, color-blindness and SDO. Higher levels of critical consciousness were related to higher system justification beliefs, higher color-blindness,
higher beliefs that groups are inherently unequal, and lower anti-racist behaviors. This is opposite of what the literature would predict for the critical consciousness construct.

**Research Question #1**

What are the psychometric properties of the ARBI in this sample? Is the structure of the ARBI confirmed in this sample of Whites? Hypothesis 1: The 3-factor structure of the ARBI will be replicated. Hypothesis 2: Acceptable reliability ($\alpha > .70$; Gliem & Gliem, 2003) will be obtained on full-scale and subscale level scores.

The first hypothesis was answered by conducting a confirmatory factor analysis and the second hypothesis was answered by running Crohnbach’s alpha reliability estimates on the full scale and the three subscales. To validate the structure of the ARBI for this sample, a Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) using SPSS Analysis of Moments Structure (AMOS) version 23. To assess model fit, three models were tested for fit. The first model (Figure 1) is a three-factor solution where all items load on their hypothesized factor and the factors have been allowed to covary. Chi-Square statistic and goodness-of-fit indices were reviewed, including Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI), the Comparative Fit Index (CFI), and the Root-Mean-Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA). General guidelines used to determine acceptable fit were as follows: RMSEA < .06 (Hu & Bentler, 1999), TLI and CFI > .95 (Kline, 2011) and adequate structure guidelines used were RMSEA < .08 and TLI/CFI > .90. Additionally, because a significant Chi-Square can be an artifact of large sample size, Kline recommends using the ratio of Chi-Square to degrees of freedom as a more sensitive indicator of model fit with a ratio equal to or less than 2.0 indicating good model fit. The results of the CFA indicated acceptable fit for the three factor model $\chi^2 (173, N = 337) = 367.7, p < .001, \chi^2/\text{df} = 2.13, \text{TLI} = .94,$
CFI = .94, and RMSEA = .057 (CI .05 - .07, p = .06]. These results generally indicate that the three-factor structure of the ARBI is an acceptable to good fit for this sample. All hypothesized paths were significant.

The second model (Figure 2) is a hierarchical model where all items load on each of their hypothesized factors, which, in turn, load onto an overall ARBI factor. Chi-Square statistic and goodness-of-fit indices were reviewed, including Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI), the Comparative Fit Index (CFI), and the Root-Mean-Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA). The results of the CFA indicated acceptable fit for the three factor model \[\chi^2 (186, N =337) = 774.52, p < .001, \chi^2/df = 4.16, TLI = .83, CFI = .85, \text{ and RMSEA} = .097 (CI .09 - .10, p < .001]. These results generally indicate that the three-factor, hierarchical structure of the ARBI is poor fit for this sample. All hypothesized paths were significant.

The third model (Figure 3) is a single-factor model where all items load on one factor. Chi-Square statistic and goodness-of-fit indices were reviewed, including Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI), the Comparative Fit Index (CFI), and the Root-Mean-Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA). The results of the CFA indicated poor fit for the one factor model \[\chi^2 (189, N =337) = 1503.09, p < .001, \chi^2/df = 7.95, TLI = .62, CFI = .66, \text{ and RMSEA} = .14 (CI .14 - .15, p < .001]. These results generally indicate that the one-factor structure of the ARBI is a poor fit for this sample. All hypothesized paths were significant.

Cronbach’s alphas for Factor 1, Individual Activism, was .84; for Factor 2, Racism Awareness, was .89; for Factor 3, Institutional Activism, was .83; and for full scale was .92. Overall, full scale and subscale reliabilities are good and mostly consistent
with alphas obtained in scale construction. In the initial study, internal consistencies for each factor were .80, .88, and .79 respectively, and .83 for ARBI full scale.

**Research Question #2**

What are the differences between clusters of Whites that emerge in this sample, specifically related to how they perceive the system (SJT), their awareness of discrimination (CCI) and discriminatory White ideology (CoBRAS), their level of entitlement related to their social location (SDO), and the affective costs of being part of a racialized society (PCRW)?

The second research question was answered by first creating clusters of Whites based upon their perceptions of the system, awareness of discrimination and discriminatory ideology, sense that group inequality is endemic to groups, and perceived costs of living with inequality between racial groups. Cluster analysis is an exploratory classification procedure that forms homogenous groups that are maximally different the other(s). Because many of the scales used different ranges of possible answers, and because cluster analysis works best if scores are represented on the same metric system (Cheung & Chang, 2005), all scores for critical consciousness, system justification beliefs, social dominance orientation, and color-blindness were converted to Z-scores. Ward’s clustering procedure was initially used to determine the best range of possible solutions for clusters that would yield optimal effect sizes. Ward’s clustering method hypothesized that the best cluster solution would range between two and four clusters.

The second step in the clustering procedure was to run a K-means analysis for a known number of homogenous groups. K-means statistical manipulation maximizes between cluster differences while minimizing within cluster differences (Cheung &
Chang, 2005). While a two cluster solution was found to be the most parsimonious solution, yielding the most homogeneous groups, a three-cluster solution was chosen as it was more descriptive and reflective of the literature and the constructs. The K-means method was used to find the best groupings for participants in three clusters. There were no participants excluded from the clustering process. It was noted during analyses that the Critical Consciousness construct was not performing as expected from the literature. Specifically, the cluster of participants with high colorblindness also reflected high critical consciousness, whereas the cluster of participants low in colorblindness reflected low critical consciousness scores. Items were reviewed to ensure proper survey procedures and proper coding of results (i.e., no reverse scoring). It is unclear why this occurred so critical consciousness was ultimately excluded from cluster analyses and follow-up analyses. Potential reasons for this finding are discussed in the discussion section.

Cluster profiles were interpreted based upon the distance from the standardized mean of the sample (M = 0, SD = 0.5). Z-scores approximately one-half standard deviation from the mean were interpreted as “slightly” above or below the mean, z-scores approximately one standard deviation from the mean were interpreted as “significantly” above or below the mean, z-scores approximately one and one-half standard deviations from the mean were interpreted as “well” above or below the mean, and z-scores two or more standard deviations from the mean were interpreted as “substantially” above or below the mean. Table 4 shows z-scores for each of the three clusters and Table 5 summarizes demographic information and scale scores across the cluster groups. Table 6 displays the mean differences in z-scores between clusters.
Cluster #1 was labeled *High Ideologies Perpetuating Injustice / Low Perceived Affective Costs of Injustice*.

Group Profile 1 (n=65; 19% of the sample). Compared to the total sample, these participants had significantly above average system justifying beliefs, color-blindness, and social dominance orientation, with low perceived costs of living in an unjust society. Figure 4 depicts Cluster #1.

Cluster #2 was labeled *Average Ideologies Perpetuating Injustice / Average Perceived Affective Costs of Injustice*.

Group Profile 2 (n=104; 31% of the sample). Compared to the total sample, these participants had average system justifying beliefs, color-blindness, and social dominance orientation, with average perceived costs of living in an unjust society. Figure 5 depicts Cluster #2.

Cluster #3 was labeled *Low Ideologies Perpetuating Injustice / High Perceived Affective Costs of Injustice*.

Group Profile 3 (n=168; 50% of the sample). Compared to the total sample, these participants had significantly below average system justifying beliefs, color-blindness, and social dominance orientation, with high perceived costs of living in an unjust society. Figure 6 depicts Cluster #3.

**Research Question #3**

Are there significant differences between clusters on demographic variables?

An analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to determine if there were significant differences between clusters on age. The omnibus test revealed no significant difference between groups on age [F (2, 332) = .46, p = .63]. A chi-square analysis was
conducted to determine if there were significant differences between clusters on gender. (Although education was hypothesized to predict cluster differences, data collection methods did not allow for equal comparison between groups as the demographic instruments contained different levels of responses.) Results showed significant differences between clusters on gender \( \chi^2 (2, N=339) = 26.64, p > .001 \). Further analysis revealed that Cluster #1 had the smallest percentage of females (25.2% of cluster). Cluster #2 (35.1% of cluster) and Cluster #3 (39.6% of cluster) did not differ on gender.

**Research Question #4**

Are there significant differences in ARBI subscales between cluster groups?

A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used to compare the three clusters on anti-racist behaviors using the three ARBI subscales: Individual Advocacy, Racism Awareness, and Institutional Advocacy. The multivariate test was significant (Wilk’s Lambda = 0.45, \( F = 53.49, df = 664, p < .001 \)) indicating that there are significant differences between groups on ARBI subscales. The univariate \( F \) tests revealed significant differences between clusters for ARBI Individual Advocacy \( F (2, 334) = 46.81, p < .001 \), ARBI Racism Awareness \( F (2, 334) = 98.02, p < .001 \), and for ARBI Institutional Advocacy \( F (2, 334) = 16.48, p < .001 \). Tukey’s post-hoc analysis revealed the following: Cluster #3 endorsed the highest level of Individual Advocacy \( M = 3.13 \), and its mean was significantly greater than Cluster #1 \( M = 2.14, p < .001 \), which endorsed the lowest level of Individual Advocacy, and Cluster #2 \( M = 2.71, p < .001 \). Cluster #3 endorsed the highest level of Racism Awareness \( M = 3.91 \), and its mean was significantly greater than Cluster #1 \( M = 1.90, p < .001 \), which endorsed the lowest
level of Racism Awareness, and Cluster #2 (M = 3.01, p < .001). Finally, Cluster #3 endorsed the highest level of Institutional Advocacy (M = 4.16), and its mean was significantly greater than Cluster #1 (M = 3.52, p < .001), which endorsed the lowest level of Institutional Advocacy, but was not significantly different from Cluster #2 (M = 4.05, p = .54).

Overall, ARBI means are theoretically consistent with the differences observed between clusters. As expected, individuals who endorse the highest levels of color-blindness, system justification beliefs, and social dominance orientation also endorse the lowest levels of racism awareness and advocacy on an individual and institutional level, while individuals who endorse the lowest levels of color-blindness, system justification beliefs, and social dominance orientation also endorse the highest levels of racism awareness and advocacy on an individual and institutional level.
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to (1) validate the use of the ARBI with this sample, (2) to statistically form groups of Whites who differ in their understanding and experiences related to race and racism and their ideological sense of the justness of current sociocultural and sociopolitical arrangements, and (3) to understand how these groups’ beliefs and ideologies are related to social justice actions for racial and ethnic minorities.

The sample consisted of 339 White students and community members, ages 18 to 79 (mean age was 31), with approximately twice as many females as males. Generally speaking this sample of Whites has similar colorblind racial ideology, psychosocial costs of racism, and anti-racist behaviors to the scale averages, with higher than average critical consciousness, system justification beliefs, and social dominance orientation. Overall this is a sample with some conflicting beliefs and a general sense that while minority groups experience inequality, that may be appropriate given “inherent” racial differences.

As expected, all variables were significantly correlated. Interestingly, higher endorsement of color-blindness and higher endorsement of system justifying beliefs were related to of lower costs of racism to Whites in this sample meaning that agreeing with the status quo of the system and being less aware of racial issues predicts less fear of,
guilt about, and empathy for racial issues. Greater awareness of racial issues is psychologically uncomfortable and cognitively complex, which may be why the tendency of Whites (and increasingly also minorities) is toward CBRI.

A surprising result was the direction of correlations of CC with SJ, ARB, color-blindness and SDO. In this sample higher levels of critical consciousness were related to higher system justification beliefs, higher color-blindness, higher beliefs that groups are inherently unequal, and lower anti-racist behaviors. One reason this scale did not perform as expected may be that the scoring is overly simplistic for such a complex construct. Critical consciousness is a developmental process. If several areas of critical consciousness lag, while others are beginning to develop, the overall scale score could still be elevated. This process may take years, and arguably a lifetime. A more accurate way of describing CC based upon this scale may be a profile, where participants are described based upon item content. For example, participants on average may believe that “people get what they deserve” but “feel angry that some people are treated badly because of oppression.” Here the average demonstrates both precritical and postcritical development that washes out any meaningful results when using Guttman scoring, but is critical to understanding where a population may be lagging in awareness. This could provide more specific interventions to assist in critical consciousness development.

One reason for this result may be that Whites have been socialized to answer racial questions in a socially prescribed way. Whites often genuinely believe they are racially conscious and progressive and appear so until questioned more deeply about their beliefs. Research by Bonilla-Silva and Forman (2000) sought to understand “why Whites seem more tolerant in survey research than they do in interviews,” using a sample of
college students who “should exhibit less racist views than other segments of the population” (p. 54). Findings confirmed that Whites hold conflicting racial views that are evidenced when collecting both survey and interview data. The student participants overwhelmingly favored interracial contact while interviews evidenced the opposite—most Whites became incoherent, expressed serious reservations about, or simply avoided answering questions about interracial dating and marriage altogether. It could be that Whites learn how to answer questions about race, but when asked to explain their attitudes, the lack of reflective thinking renders them unable to uphold their White storyline.

Confirmatory factor analysis, using three competing models, was used to determine if the hypothesized structure of the ARBI was the best fit for use with this sample, including full scale and subscale scores. The first model was a three-factor solution where all items load on their hypothesized factor and the factors were allowed to covary. The second model was a hierarchical model where all items load on each of their hypothesized factors, which, in turn, load onto an overall ARBI factor. The third model was a single-factor model where all items load on one factor. These results generally indicated that the three-factor structure of the ARBI and the hierarchical model were an acceptable to good fit for this sample while the single-factor, full-scale solution was a poor fit for this sample. Overall, full scale and subscale reliabilities are good. Only subscale level data were used in determining differences between groups on anti-racist behaviors.

Cluster analysis was used to form maximally homogenous groups of Whites while also maximizing between-group differences in order to understand how groups of Whites
differ in their understanding of race and racism and their ideological sense of the justness of current sociocultural and sociopolitical arrangements using five variables: CCI, COBRAS, PCRW, SJT, and SDO. Three clusters emerged from the data, as follows:

Cluster #1 \( (n = 67) \) was labeled *The Status Quo*. Approximately one-third of participants fell into this cluster. Cluster #1 consisted of 16\% males and 84\% females. When looking at level of engagement in anti-racist behaviors, this group of Whites endorsed the lowest level of Individual Advocacy, Racism Awareness, and Individual Advocacy of all groups. Tettegah (2016) discusses “the good, the bad, and the ugly of empathy” (p. 182). The good are those with high empathic responsiveness to all people. The bad are those with no empathic responses toward anyone. The ugly are those with preferential empathy for Whites so that a police shooting of an innocent White person engenders rage, while a police shooting of an innocent Black person engenders “silent stoning,” where the White person does not want to see color and therefore blames the victim. This “racial empathy gap” is part of the reason that White police officers and vigilantes mistakenly shoot innocent Blacks and why the White public is able to stay disconnected from unjust police and vigilante shootings (Silverstein, 2013). These authors suggest that an increase in racial empathy would correspond with a decrease in colorblindness, and allow empathic rage to promote mass White action.

Cluster #2 \( (n = 104) \) was labeled *The Moderate* as it cumulatively endorsed Average Ideologies Perpetuating Injustice and Average Perceived Affective Costs of Injustice. Almost one-half of participants in the sample were grouped in this cluster. Cluster #2 consisted of 25\% males and 75\% females. When looking at level of engagement in anti-racist behaviors, this group of Whites endorsed moderate in its level
of engagement in Individual Advocacy, Racism Awareness, and Institutional Advocacy. Levels of anti-racist behaviors in this group were significantly lower than Cluster #3 and significantly higher than Cluster #2. This cluster is interesting because of its very flat and dispassionate presentation. It appears that this cluster of Whites holds no strong opinions or convictions when it comes to racism. One possibility is that this cluster prefers to remain moderate and are careful to remain detached from racial issues. This may be the most difficult cluster to intervene with given their reluctance to commit to and endorse any particular racial ideology. More likely, however, this may simply be evidence of unintentional ignorance, which is the product of a system that supports the racial status quo. White supremacy is systemic. It is evident in the racial makeup of our nation’s political structure (i.e., House and Senate), heads of the U.S. financial system (i.e., CEOs of banks and Fortune 500 companies), educational apportionment, and residential segregation. Because of a system that upholds White supremacy—making it appear normative instead of oppressive—Whites legitimately often do not know the experiences of oppression within communities of color. Neither do they know how their privilege is a cost to other groups. This largest group of Whites seems to reflect the product of systemic racism, which is ignorance.

Cluster #3 \((n = 168)\) was labeled *Beginning Anti-Racist Type*. This cluster was comprised of the largest portion of the sample, nearly 50\% of the sample, and contained the highest proportion of males (48\%), which was 68.4\% of the males in the sample. When looking at level of engagement in anti-racist behaviors, this group of Whites endorsed the highest level of Individual Advocacy, Racism Awareness, and Institutional Advocacy. This cluster displays attitudes and actions most consistent with counseling
psychology values. As such it would be ideal to find ways to move counseling psychology trainees and the public into this cluster. However, it is important to note that all constructs were less than one standard deviation from the average of this sample, meaning that these individuals continue to have room to grow in their understanding of racism, development of cultural empathy, and system justifying tendencies. Further, while this group was the highest on antiracist behaviors, on issues of individual advocacy the sample on average was “neutral” but “agreed” with statements indicating awareness of racism and institutional advocacy, suggesting that there is still more to learn for these individuals. See counseling psychology implications to training below, because this type of pattern is likely the typical counseling psychology student in need of mentoring and encouragement to continue growth.

The above cluster findings are consistent with the literature. Spanierman et al. (2006) performed a cluster analysis of PCRW and then determined differences between clusters on racial attitudes and cultural sensitivity. Although this study used subscale level data in the analyses, the three clusters that significantly differed from the rest (Clusters C, D, and E) evidenced subscales of PCRW being indirectly related to CoBRAS. Specifically Cluster C (Informed Empathy and Guilt) and Cluster D (Fearful Guilt) subscales of PCRW were generally highest (except White Fear) while they endorsed the greatest understanding of Racial Privilege (lowest scores on unawareness of Racial Privilege) and Cluster C also endorsed the lowest levels of unawareness of Institutional Discrimination, meaning that Whites who were lowest on colorblindness generally experienced greater White Empathy and White Guilt than other clusters. Further, Cluster E (Insensitive and Afraid), which was generally lower on PCRW
subscales (except White Fear), was the highest on two of the three subscales of CoBRAS, Institutional Discrimination and Blatant Racial Issues, meaning that Whites who experienced lower White Empathy and White Guilt often have higher awareness of racial issues and institutional discrimination. Spanierman et al. stated that these results are most favorable, where awareness of racial privilege and injustice informs White Empathy and White Guilt. Further, Petierse et al. (2016) relationships between CoBRAS and anti-racist behaviors were also replicated in this study, where scores for ARBI subscales were significantly inversely related to scores on the CoBRAS. Petierse et al. stated that "the finding suggests that participants who endorsed anti-racism behaviors and awareness of racism were less likely to endorse attitudes associated with White privilege or other aspects of racism" (p. 16). Because of this, interventions aimed at increasing awareness of racism will likely translate into more antiracist behaviors. This is supported by the literature. For example, Bronder (2016) used an experimental design to compare the effects of video interventions on colorblindness. Findings indicated that the experimental group, which watched a brief video on racial discrimination and White privilege, showed significantly greater change in colorblind racial attitudes than the control condition, which watched a brief video on notetaking skills. The current study shows that these reductions in colorblindness would likely increase White individuals’ commitment to and execution of behaviors that challenge racism.

**Implications**

Ideological constructs such as CBRI, SDO, and SJT, and constructs with racial themes (i.e., CC and PCRW) are so complex that it can be difficult to understand how they work in studies. Integrated into ideological constructs are social desirability,
storylines, common discourses, racial socialization, defense mechanisms, societal structures, questions of legality, questions of morality, social cognition, and cognitive and affective components. Recent integration of the literature on CBRI with the literatures on system justification and law highlights the expansiveness of this theory. More work needs to be done to integrate other disciplines (i.e., ethnography, sociology, neuroscience) in order to increase understanding of the underlying barriers involved in becoming and maintaining racial awareness (i.e., motivation, neuroscience, and cognitive energy).

In this study males were overrepresented in the beginning antiracist cluster relative to other clusters. Because most studies have been focused on college students, it may be that findings of these studies do not apply to community samples. This is an interesting finding because one of the explanations of women having a more multicultural understanding is that women have historically experienced oppression. If White men (arguably the most privileged group) in the community have overcome the blindness of privilege and become aware of injustice, it is important to understand how. These would likely be effective interventions to exploit.

While much work has been done to identify interventions to decrease CBRI, a critical step to prevention and remediation of racism has been missed. For some Whites, racial colorblindness is appealing for benevolent reasons. They have good intentions when endorsing racial color-blindness (Knowles, et al., 2009) and believe that CBRI is “a way to prevent the kind of blatant discrimination that accompanied Jim Crow segregation—separate water fountains, separate schools, abusive governance, and vastly unequal job opportunities” (Babbitt, Toosi, & Sommers, 2016, p. 55), a way to protect
minorities from harm, or simply a default approach of “inherited silence” (p. 61). We need to help this subset of the White population resolve the question implicit in social debate: Is CBRI or multiculturalism the racially progressive stance? In order to do this, counseling psychologists must begin to open up discourse within the White community via mainstream media such as Ted talks, podcasts, newspaper editorials, news and talk-show appearances, and media statements about our research that are understandable to the communities we serve. But not all Whites are open to having discussions about racism awareness. Babbitt et al. suggest that this is due to investment in the status quo and a way to protect their privilege. However, it is important to note that this is likely unconscious and unmotivated. Instead the tendency to justify the status quo may be reflective of a system that keeps Whites blind to experiences of other groups. In these situations it may be beneficial to begin with helping Whites to see specific consequences of racism and how these are problematic for Whites as well (Hitchcock, 2002). For example, segregated communities and being disconnected from Blacks leave Whites afraid of traveling through Black communities and attending Black cultural events. Instilling the idea of integration and learning from one another could begin the process of healing racial wounds. In the mainstream media much of our research goes unnoticed because we have not translated it into concise and usable soundbites. This leaves our research to be misinterpreted and taken out of context by media outlets who are often untrained in reading scholarly work. As counseling psychologist who ascribe to social justice we have an obligation to get our research out. Over time, faced with overwhelming evidence spun in a positive fashion (i.e., “Spend time with a cultural partner!” versus “Stop excluding other races from your social circle.”), the racial climate
can shift toward inclusion and equity. By making our research inspiring and applicable to clients, students, public school teachers, and the mainstream media, divisive racial ideologies can be minimized.

The implications of this research to the field of counseling psychology are within its foundational philosophy of multiculturalism. First, developing multicultural awareness and competence is a large focus of counseling psychology. But there is also an emphasis on social justice advocacy—one dimension of the “skill” element of multicultural competence—that has been more difficult to instill in counseling psychologists. These findings suggest that training and scholarly work in multiculturalism and diversity should continue to focus on increasing awareness of privilege, oppression, ideologies, and other systemic forces that ensure continuation of racism. However, an added piece is educating counseling psychologists about what anti-racist action entails. Petierse, Utsey, and Miller’s (2015) scale has allowed us to refocus on antiracism as a developmental process. Many counseling psychologists are unsure about how to live out their anti-racist views. Petierse’s work is foundational in that it presents clear ways to do anti-racism which are based upon theory. Letting psychologists know that action begins with challenging one’s own views, extends to personal relationships, and then to systemic structures (including financial and program support) can provide a starting point for anti-racist action. Less provocative anti-racist action can increase confidence in antiracists so that they can begin to express their beliefs in their own social contexts, and then step into antiracist action that is disruptive on a larger scale. These small-scale, developmental actions can easily be incorporated into a busy schedule. There has to be a starting point. For example, antiracists can journal about one
situation per week where racism was a factor. By elaborating on how the event was racism and where one might intervene, they challenge their own thoughts and responses. This also prepares antiracists for the next time they come into contact with that form of racism and increases their chances of acting in accordance with their convictions.

Further, the theory indicates that seeking support from other antiracist activists is one way to bolster one’s own commitment to anti-racist action. For example, intervening when someone uses a racial slur can be a difficult experience. By having others who value anti-racism, the antiracist can seek support and affirmation from other Whites. By educating counseling psychologists about this and other resiliency factors, they can find ways to increase their ability to do antiracist action.

**Strengths and Limitations of Current Research**

One strength of this study is its contribution to understanding what constitutes antiracism. Those participants who endorsed antiracist behaviors endorsed all three levels. Antiracism is not a black-and-white construct. Whites must go through a developmental process in becoming antiracists where behaviors begin with challenging their own thoughts about race, move to challenging others about their racial attitudes, and then finally challenging the structures that uphold racism. Secondly, a high percentage of the sample that is derived from community members as opposed to student convenience samples. Conclusions drawn from student samples likely do not generalize to community members who do not move predominately in liberal academic environments. Also, instead of inferring an antiracist type from antiracist attitudes, this study used a measure of antiracist behaviors. This literature has shown that attitudes and behaviors can be very different. By having participants report their behaviors, there is no need to infer.
As with all studies, this study has several limitations. First, the items of the measures in this study have high face validity. Research has shown that oftentimes discussion of politically charged topics can polarize thinking within that context. Some defensiveness was noted in participants who emailed the primary researcher stating that they understood the nature of the study and that the study was antiquated and overly liberal. A second limitation may be the selection of participants. The students in this sample likely have a heightened understanding of and sympathy for racial struggles due to the liberal context of the university. Similarly, because community members were mostly drawn from Facebook, these individuals who self-selected to take part in the study may have represented a specific sub-cultural or group within society. One final limitation is the external validity of the study. Research has proven that people’s endorsed attitudes often differs significantly from their behaviors. While this study sought to understand behaviors related to attitudes about race, these behaviors were not observed. Instead they were self-reported and thus susceptible to this bias of endorsing how one wants to behave (consistent with self) and how one does behave (which may be inconsistent with how one views oneself). Finally, scoring the CCI was problematic in this study. Findings were inconsistent with the literature. This may indicate that the scale should be translated into an attitude profile instead of being a measure of developmental stage of critical consciousness. More work needs to be done to determine why the scale was not validated with this sample, and if it can be consistently validated in other studies.

**Future research**

It is important to increasingly partner with other disciplines in research. Counseling psychology and psychology in general seem to be behind in the sciences’
understanding that integration and collaboration can give greater understanding. This is especially the case with race constructs, which span the individual, interpersonal, group, societal, and systemic domains. Further, adopting a social psychology research design where participants are observed responding to racist situations, would provide data to confirm (or not) survey data, allowing for a richer understanding of processes involved in answering survey items and in thinking about racial attitudes. Another area that should be researched is the effect of smaller developmental antiracist action on the long-term antiracist actions of counseling psychology trainees. This could significantly add to counseling psychology literature on multicultural competence and training. Finally, a research design with randomized sample into control and experimental groups should be used to test interventions that increase or decrease participants’ desire to engage in antiracist behaviors. This could also include an opportunity to respond to an experimental situation after the intervention.

**Conclusions**

The aim of this study was to learn more about what characterizes the antiracist type. The antiracist type are those White individuals to practice antiracist behaviors. This study described groups of Whites based upon their levels of endorsement of colorblindness, system justification tendencies, endorsement of social dominance, and psychosocial costs of being White. Cluster analysis revealed that those Whites who engaged in antiracist behaviors most frequently also tended to endorse lower colorblindness, system justifying beliefs, and social dominance, but experiences greater affective costs related to their awareness of racism. Further, this study sought to determine differences in age and gender between groups. While age was not a factor,
gender was a significant predictor of cluster assignment where the antiracist cluster contained significantly more males than the other two clusters. The final aim of this study was to validate the Anti Racist Behavioral Inventory. In this sample of Whites the structure of the ARBI was replicated. Overall findings were consistent with the literature. The cluster groups supported the significance of colorblindness in emerging antiracist behaviors. Research on interventions aimed at increasing awareness of race-related issues (thereby reducing colorblindness, system justification, and beliefs in social dominance) should continue. These interventions have been shown to decrease colorblindness which in this study is also related to more frequent antiracist behaviors in students and community members. Strengths and limitations of the study were addressed and recommendations were provided based upon the study findings. This study highlights the significance of a developmental approach to antiracist behaviors and emphasizes the need to legitimize antiracism at varying levels—the personal, social, and institutional. Continued work to understand antiracist behaviors increases the likelihood of Whites working to support People of Color in dismantling structural racism.
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### TABLES

#### Table 1

**Scale Summaries**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Potential Range</th>
<th>Observed Range</th>
<th>Reliability Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCI</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>1.00-4.00</td>
<td>1.22-4.00</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COBRAS</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00-6.00</td>
<td>1.50-6.00</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCRW</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>1.00-6.00</td>
<td>1.94-5.31</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJT</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.00-9.00</td>
<td>2.13-8.00</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDOS</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>1.00-7.00</td>
<td>2.63-7.00</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARBI</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>1.00-5.00</td>
<td>1.00-5.00</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* CCI = Critical Consciousness Inventory; COBRAS = Colorblind Racial Attitudes Scale; PCRW = Psychosocial Costs of Racism to Whites total; SJT = System Justification Theory total; SDOS = Social Dominance Orientation Scale; ARBI = Anti-Racism Behavioral Inventory.
Table 2
*Pearson’s Product Moment Correlations for Scales*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CCI</th>
<th>COBRAS</th>
<th>PCRW</th>
<th>SJT</th>
<th>SDOS</th>
<th>ARBI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCI</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COBRAS</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCRW</td>
<td>-.34**</td>
<td>-.50**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJT</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDOS</td>
<td>-.52**</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARBI</td>
<td>-.62*</td>
<td>-.72**</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>-.43**</td>
<td>-.45**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. * = \( p \leq .05 \), ** = \( p \leq .01 \). N = 339 for all analyses except for ARBI (N = 338).*
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Between Groups</th>
<th>Within Groups</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCI</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>97.13</td>
<td>97.13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>.930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COBRAS</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>334.95</td>
<td>340.58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCRW</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>110.83</td>
<td>113.61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>8.44</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJT</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>597.08</td>
<td>597.18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>.809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDOS</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>317.83</td>
<td>318.16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>.554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARBI</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>192.24</td>
<td>192.47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>.527</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. CCI = Critical Consciousness Inventory; COBRAS = Colorblind Racial Attitudes Scale; PCRW = Psychosocial Costs of Racism to Whites total; SJT = System Justification Theory total; SDOS = Social Dominance Orientation Scale; ARBI = Anti-Racism Behavioral Inventory.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Cluster Group 1 (n=67)</th>
<th>Cluster Group 2 (n=104)</th>
<th>Cluster Group 3 (n=168)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COBRAS</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>-0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCRW</td>
<td>-1.02</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJT</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>-0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDOS</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>-0.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* CCI = Critical Consciousness Inventory; COBRAS = Colorblind Racial Attitudes Scale; PCRW = Psychosocial Costs of Racism to Whites total; SJT = System Justification Theory total; SDOS = Social Dominance Orientation Scale.
Table 5

*Mean Summary Table of Cluster Groups*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Cluster #1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Cluster #2</th>
<th></th>
<th>Cluster #3</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>$M$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>30.76</td>
<td>13.89</td>
<td>29.87</td>
<td>13.58</td>
<td>31.45</td>
<td>12.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COBRAS</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCRW</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJT</td>
<td>6.74</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDOS</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARBI</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARBI IND</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARBI RAC</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARBI INS</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* CCI = Critical Consciousness Inventory; COBRAS = Colorblind Racial Attitudes Scale; PCRW = Psychosocial Costs of Racism to Whites total; SJT = System Justification Theory total; SDOS = Social Dominance Orientation Scale; ARBI = Anti-Racism Behavioral Inventory; ARBI IND = Anti-Racism Behavioral Inventory Individual Advocacy; ARBI RAC = Anti-Racism Behavioral Inventory Racism Awareness; ARBI INS = Anti-Racism Behavioral Inventory Institutional Advocacy.
Table 6  
*Mean Differences for Cluster Profiles on ARBI Subscales*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster Group</th>
<th>#1</th>
<th>#2</th>
<th>#3</th>
<th>#1</th>
<th>#2</th>
<th>#3</th>
<th>#1</th>
<th>#2</th>
<th>#3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>.69**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1.19**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>1.06**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2.05**</td>
<td>.86**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td>.02*</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* * = *p* ≤ .05, ** = *p* ≤ .001. ARBI = Anti-Racism Behavioral Inventory; ARBI IND = Anti-Racism Behavioral Inventory Individual Advocacy; ARBI RAC = Anti-Racism Behavioral Inventory Racism Awareness; ARBI INS = Anti-Racism Behavioral Inventory Institutional Advocacy.
FIGURES

Figure 1. Three-factor solution where all items load on their hypothesized factor and the factors have been allowed to covary.

Note. ARBI = Anti-Racism Behavioral Inventory. All paths are significant.
Figure 2. A hierarchical model where all items load on each of their hypothesized factors, which, in turn, load onto an overall ARBI factor.

Note. ARBI = Anti-Racism Behavioral Inventory. All paths are significant.
Figure 3. Single-factor model where all ARBI items load onto one factor.

Note. ARBI = Anti-Racism Behavioral Inventory. All paths are significant.
Figure 4. Cluster #1.

Note. COBRAS = Colorblind Racial Attitudes Scale; PCRW = Psychosocial Costs of Racism to Whites total; SJT = System Justification Theory total; SDOS = Social Dominance Orientation Scale.
Figure 5. Cluster #2.

Note. COBRAS = Colorblind Racial Attitudes Scale; PCRW = Psychosocial Costs of Racism to Whites total; SJT = System Justification Theory total; SDOS = Social Dominance Orientation Scale.
Figure 6. Cluster #3.

**Note.** COBRAS = Colorblind Racial Attitudes Scale; PCRW = Psychosocial Costs of Racism to Whites total; SJT = System Justification Theory total; SDOS = Social Dominance Orientation Scale.
APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

Demographic Form

Please answer what best describes you:

1. What is your age: ___

2. What is your gender:
   ____ Male
   ____ Female

3. What is your sexual orientation?
   ____ Lesbian
   ____ Gay
   ____ Bisexual
   ____ Transsexual
   ____ Heterosexual
   ____ Other, please specify: _______________________

4. What is your race/ethnicity:
   ____ Caucasian/European-American
   ____ Black/African-American
   ____ Hispanic
   ____ Asian American/ Pacific Islander
   ____ Native American
   ____ Biracial
   ____ Other, please specify: _______________________

5. What is your highest level of education?
   ____ middle school
   ____ high school
   ____ associate degree
6. If you are currently a student, what is your current year in school:
   ___ High school
   ___ College Freshman
   ___ College Sophomore
   ___ College Junior
   ___ College Senior
   ___ Graduate student
   ___ Not applicable

7. What is your family’s household income:
   ___ less than $10,000
   ___ $10,000 to $20,000
   ___ $20,000 to $30,000
   ___ $30,000 to $40,000
   ___ $40,000 to $50,000
   ___ $50,000 to $60,000
   ___ $60,000 to $70,000
   ___ $70,000 to $80,000
   ___ $80,000 to $90,000
   ___ $90,000 to $100,000
   ___ over $100,000
APPENDIX B

CRITICAL CONSCIOUSNESS INVENTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Precritical</th>
<th>Beginning Critical</th>
<th>Critical</th>
<th>Postcritical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1a I believe that the world is basically fair.
1b I believe that the world is basically fair but others believe that it is unfair.
1c I believe that the world is unfair for some people.
1d I believe that the world is unfair, and I make sure to treat others fairly.

2a I believe that all people are treated equally.
2b I believe that some people don’t take advantage of opportunities given to them and blame others instead.
2c I believe that some groups are discriminated against.
2d I work to make sure that people are treated equally and are given equal chances.

3a I think that education gives everyone an equal chance to do well.
3b I think that education gives everyone who works hard an equal chance.
3c I think that the educational system is unequal.
3d I think that the educational system needs to be changed in order for everyone to have an equal chance.

4a I believe people get what they deserve.
4b I believe that some people are treated badly but there are ways that they can work to be treated fairly.
4c I believe that some people are treated badly because of oppression.
4d I feel angry that some people are treated badly because of oppression and I often do something to change it.

5a I think all social groups are respected.
5b I think the social groups that are not respected have done things that lead people to think badly of them.
5c I think people do not respect members of some social groups based on stereotypes.
5d I am respectful of people in all social groups, and I speak up when others are not.

6a I don’t notice when people make prejudiced comments.
6b I notice when people make prejudiced comments and it hurts me.
6c It hurts me when people make prejudiced comments but I am able to move on.
6d When someone makes a prejudiced comment, I tell them that what they said is hurtful.

7a When people tell a joke that makes fun of a social group, I laugh and don’t really think about it.
7b When people tell a joke that makes fun of a social group, I laugh but also feel uncomfortable.
7c When people tell a joke that makes fun of a social group, I realize that the joke is based on a stereotype.
7d I tell people when I feel that their joke was offensive.

8a I don’t see much oppression in this country.
8b I feel hopeless and overwhelmed when I think about oppression in this country.
8c I feel like oppression in this country is less than in the past and will continue to change.
8d I actively work to support organizations which help people who are oppressed.

9a I don’t feel bad when people say they have been oppressed.
9b I feel sad or angry when experiencing or seeing oppression.
9c I often become sad or angry when experiencing or seeing oppression, but I find ways to cope with my feelings.
9d I work to protect myself from negative feelings when acts of oppression happen.
APPENDIX C

COLOR-BLIND RACIAL ATTITUDES SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(16.) White people in the U.S. have certain advantages because of the color of their skin.
(10.) Race is very important in determining who is successful and who is not.
(26.) Race plays an important role in who gets sent to prison.
(04.) Race plays a major role in the type of social services (such as type of health care or day care) that people receive in the U.S.
(12.) Racial and ethnic minorities do not have the same opportunities as white people in the U.S.
01. Everyone who works hard, no matter what race they are, has an equal chance to become rich.
(19.) White people are more to blame for racial discrimination than racial and ethnic minorities.
20. Social policies, such as affirmative action, discriminate unfairly against white people.
13. White people in the U.S. are discriminated against because of the color of their skin.
18. English should be the only official language in the U.S.
(07.) Due to racial discrimination, programs such as affirmative action are necessary to help create equality.
22. Racial and ethnic minorities in the U.S. have certain advantages because of the color of their skin.
06. It is important that people begin to think of themselves as American and not African American, Mexican American or Italian American.
17. Immigrants should try to fit into the culture and values of the U.S.
23. Racial problems in the U.S. are rare, isolated situations.
14. Talking about racial issues causes unnecessary tension.
(09.) Racism is a major problem in the U.S.
21. It is important for public schools to teach about the history and contributions of racial and ethnic minorities.
(15.) It is important for political leaders to talk about racism to help work through or solve society's problems.
11. Racism may have been a problem in the past, it is not an important problem today.
Note. Item numbers in parentheses have been reverse scored.
APPENDIX D

PSYCHOSOCIAL COSTS OF RACISM TO WHITES SCALE (PCRW)
PLEASE RESPOND TO THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS BY INSERTING ONLY ONE NUMBER NEXT TO THE ITEM FROM THE CHART BELOW. YOUR POSSIBLE CHOICES RANGE FROM 1-6. PLEASE ANSWER HONESTLY, AS THERE ARE NO RIGHT OR WRONG ANSWERS. AVOID ANSWERING AS YOU THINK YOU “SHOULD” FEEL OR AS HOW YOU WOULD EXPECT OTHERS TO ANSWER. ALL RESPONSES ARE COMPLETELY ANONYMOUS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Moderately Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Moderately Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. When I hear about acts of racial violence, I become angry or depressed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I feel safe in most neighborhoods, regardless of the racial composition.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I feel helpless about not being able to eliminate racism.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sometimes I feel guilty about being White.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I have very few friends of other races.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I become sad when I think about racial injustice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Being White makes me feel personally responsible for racism.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I never feel ashamed about being White.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I am fearful that racial minority populations are rapidly increasing in the U.S., and my group will no longer be the numerical majority.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I am angry that racism exists.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I am distrustful of people of other races.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I feel good about being White.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I often find myself fearful of people of other races.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Racism is dehumanizing to people of all races, including Whites.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I am afraid that I abuse my power and privilege as a White person.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. It disturbs me when people express racist views.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

SOCIAL DOMINANCE ORIENTATION SCALE

Which of the following objects or statements do you have a positive or negative feeling towards? Beside each object or statement, place a number from "1" to "7" which represents the degree of your positive or negative feeling.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extremely Positive</td>
<td>Somewhat Positive</td>
<td>Slightly Positive</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Slightly Negative</td>
<td>Somewhat Negative</td>
<td>Extremely Negative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. We should strive to make incomes as equal as possible.

2. Group equality should be our ideal.
3. It's OK if some groups have more of a chance in life than others.
4. To get ahead in life, it is sometimes necessary to step on other groups.
5. We should do what we can to equalize conditions for different groups.
6. It's probably a good thing that certain groups are at the top and others are at the bottom.
7. Inferior groups should stay in their place.
8. We would have fewer problems if groups were treated more equally.
9. It would be good if groups could be equal.
10. In getting what you want, it is sometimes necessary to use force against other groups.
11. All groups should be given an equal chance in life.
12. If certain groups stayed in their place, we would have fewer problems.
13. We should strive for increased social equality.
14. Sometimes other groups must be kept in their place.
15. Some groups of people are simply inferior to other groups.
16. No one group should dominate in society.
APPENDIX F

SYSTEM JUSTIFICATION SCALE

1                2                3                4                5                6                7                8                9
Strongly Disagree                Neutral                Strongly Agree

____ In general, you find society to be fair.
____ In general, the American political system operates as it should.
____ American society needs to be radically restructured. (reverse-scored)
____ The United States is the best country in the world to live in.
____ Most policies serve the greater good.
____ Everyone has a fair shot at wealth and happiness.
____ Our society is getting worse every year. (reverse-scored)
____ Society is set up so that people usually get what they deserve.
APPENDIX G

Anti Racism Behavioral Inventory ©

Please indicate how much you agree with the following statements by using the response format below. There are no right or wrong answers. Just respond as honestly as you can.

Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree
1 2 3 4 5

1. When I hear people telling racist jokes and using negative racial stereotypes, I usually confront them
   1 2 3 4 5
2. I give money to organizations working against racism and discrimination
   1 2 3 4 5
3. I actively seek to understand how I participate in both intentional and unintentional racism
   1 2 3 4 5
4. I feel guilty and ashamed when I think of the history of racism and slavery in the US
   1 2 3 4 5
5. I actively seek to educate myself about the experience of racism
   1 2 3 4 5
6. When I read in articles in newspapers or magazines that are perpetuating racist ideas and I generally write a letter to the editor
   1 2 3 4 5
7. I interrupt racist conversations and jokes when I hear my friends talking that way
   1 2 3 4 5
8. I am actively involved in exposing companies that uphold exclusionary and racist practices
   1 2 3 4 5
9. It bothers me that my country has yet to acknowledge the impact of slavery
   1 2 3 4 5
10. I have challenged acts of racism that I have witnessed in my workplace or at school
    1 2 3 4 5
11. The US should offer some type of payment to the descendants of slaves
    1 2 3 4 5
12. I make it a point to educate myself about the experience of historically oppressed groups in the US (e.g. slavery, internment of Japanese, American Indians and the trail of tears etc.)
    1 2 3 4 5
13. The US has not acknowledged the impact of slavery.
    1 2 3 4 5
14. Because of racism in the US Blacks do not have the same educational opportunities as compared to Whites.
    1 2 3 4 5
15. I often speak to my friends about the problem of racism in the US and what we can do about it.
    1 2 3 4 5
16. Within the US racism, is largely perpetuated by the White racial majority
    1 2 3 4 5
17. I write letters to local & state politicians to voice my concerns about racism
    1 2 3 4 5
18. I do not like to talk about racism in public
    1 2 3 4 5
19. I volunteer with anti-racist or racial justice organizations
    1 2 3 4 5
20. I interrupt racist conversations and jokes when I hear them in my family
    1 2 3 4 5
21. The police unfairly target Black men and Latino’s.
    1 2 3 4 5