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Overview

Most theoretical approaches to the study of intergroup relations view group dynamics as driven primarily by self-serving and self-protective motives. Individuals are assumed to pursue the interests of their own groups and exhibit hostile or prejudicial attitudes toward outgroup members. In particular, research on race relations has been examined under the assumption that advantaged racial majorities strive to protect and enhance their position while subjugating minority groups. Social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1980) postulates that ingroup bias reflects a need for positive collective-esteem which, in turn, enhances self-evaluations. The need for positive collective-esteem can be satisfied when the ingroup is seen as more positive than the outgroup, or when the outgroup is seen as more negative than the ingroup. A variety of studies have documented the manner in which individuals strive to cast a positive light on the ingroup, and how membership in a high-status group elicits a feeling akin to pride (Hinkle & Brown, 1990). Within the social identity framework, moreover, the motivation to maintain favorable intergroup comparisons is assumed to be stronger for highly identified group members.

In recent years, however, these conventionally accepted views on intergroup relations have been challenged. For instance, there is evidence suggesting that group membership in a high-status group (e.g., the White racial group) can serve as a source of negative affect and lead to ingroup derogation (e.g. Knowles & Peng, 2005; Branscombe, 1998; Swim & Miller, 1999), and Steele (1990) has argued that belonging to the White racial group elicits feelings of anxiety and guilt that arise from the perception of unfair
White advantage. Indeed, Knowles and Peng (2005) suggest that White identification may be defined as a power cognizant identity, marked by Whites’ awareness of their unearned privilege. In a society where meritocracy and colorblind ideals are normatively prescribed, the perception of unearned privilege poses a threat to the legitimacy of the status and accomplishments of the White racial group. Therefore, the acknowledgement of White privilege should be detrimental to the collective self-esteem of those who are highly identified with the White racial group. In contrast, social identity theory predicts that highly identified Whites should be more likely to deny, and thus not acknowledge, White privilege.

The present research aims to reconcile this discrepancy by proposing that individual variation in the motivation to express and endorse egalitarian values moderates the relationship between levels of White identification and perceptions of White privilege. A denial of the existence of White privilege is antithetical to an embracement of egalitarian values, and for this reason, individuals who are motivated to uphold such values may override the need to view the ingroup as superior by acknowledging the existence of White privilege. On the other hand, denying the existence of White privilege furthers the self-protective needs of individuals who do not embrace egalitarian values. In this thesis, two studies were conducted. In Study 1, Plant and Devine’s (1998) Motivation to Respond Without Prejudice Scale was employed in order to examine whether individual differences in the motivation to maintain egalitarian values would moderate the relationship between White identification and perceptions of White privilege. Study 2
then examined this relationship further by employing a compensatory measure of egalitarian motivation (Moskowitz, Gollwitzer, & Wasel’s, 1999).

White Identification as a Social Category

Research indicates that individuals are more likely to activate a specific social identity when the corresponding social category makes them a numerical minority. For example, racial minority children were found to be more likely to mention their race than were White children when describing themselves, and boys and girls were found to be more likely to mention their sex when describing themselves to the extent that there was a higher proportion of opposite-sex individuals in their household (McGuire & McGuire, 1988). The fact that activation of a specific social identity is facilitated by numerical minority status suggests that when individuals belong to a dominant group they are less likely to activate those aspects of their social identity that are based on membership in the dominant group. Thus, by virtue of their being numerically dominant in the racial makeup of the United States population, Whites are often assumed to have no meaningful racial identity.

Importantly, however, demographic changes to the U.S. population that are shrinking the relative proportion of Whites to non-Whites are enhancing the salience of “Whiteness” and thereby increasing the centrality and importance of White identity in everyday experience for White Americans (McDermott & Samson, 2005). Gallagher (1995), for instance, uncovered a high degree of racial awareness among White college students on a campus with a large Black population, and Perry (2001, 2002) reported that students in a multiracial high school who were confronted with their race on a daily basis
as a result of their exposure to non-Whites actively sought to understand the meaning of Whiteness. In addition, Knowles and Peng (2005) found that higher levels of White identification were positively associated with the relative proportion of non-Whites in the county where the majority of one’s childhood was spent. Taken together, these findings suggest that White identity is largely influenced by one’s experience with exposure to racial minorities. According to the model proposed by Knowles and Peng (2005), racial identification borne out of social exposure produces a range of cognitive and affective consequences (see Figure 1).
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*Figure 1.* A model of the formation and effects of White ingroup identification.
Interestingly, however, there is evidence suggesting that numerical minority status may not be a necessary precondition for the emergence of identification with a dominant social group. Specifically, Kanter (1977) observed in a field study that the presence of a token minority enhances dominants’ awareness of what they share in common. According to Kanter, the presence of a token minority is perceived as a threat to collectivity. Therefore, dominant group members try to strengthen their solidarity by exaggerating ingroup similarity. Laboratory evidence also supports the notion that threat is a significant predictor of higher levels of group identification (e.g. Rothgerber, 1997; Simon, Pantaleo, & Mummendey, 1995). Thus, White identification emerges not only as a result of local numerical minority status but also as a response to a perceived threat posed by racial minorities.

Intergroup Discrimination

Functionalist Views of Intergroup Discrimination

In a series of ethnographical studies, Summer (1906) observed that there is a universal tendency for people to differentiate themselves according to group membership. Distinguishing between ingroups and outgroups serves to preserve ingroup solidarity and counterattack hostile outsiders. In this way, intergroup differentiation serves as a tool for survival and a means to preserve peace within one’s ingroup. Summer also coined the term *ethnocentrism* to describe the fundamental inclination to express ingroup favoritism across cultures. This functionalist approach to intergroup discrimination suggests that intergroup differentiation maintains intergroup competition while facilitating ingroup favoritism and outgroup derogation.
A compelling demonstration of the ease with which intergroup discrimination can arise from group differentiation was provided by Sherif et al. (1954). In this study, two groups of eleven-year-old boys were separately brought to a summer camp without knowledge of the presence of the other. Eight days later, the two groups were brought into contact under circumstances that were designed to maximize group rivalries (e.g., a football competition, a treasure hunt, a tug of war, etc.). Intense intergroup hostility ensued, escalating into food fights, burning of group flags, ransacking of cabins, and other behaviors that signified intergroup antagonism. The campers also demonstrated consistent intergroup bias in trait ratings and performance evaluations on competitive tasks. It was not until the introduction of superordinate goals -mutual goals that require intergroup cooperation- that peace was restored between the two groups. Through this field experiment, Sherif and colleagues demonstrated that intergroup discrimination easily arises in the presence of competition.

Social Identity Theory

Although competition has been shown to enhance intergroup discrimination, it is hardly a necessary condition. Social identity theory was originally developed in an effort to account for the development of intergroup discrimination (Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel, Flament, Billing, Bund, 1971; Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Notably, Tajfel et al., (1971) demonstrated how assigning individuals into groups based on seemingly arbitrary and trivial criteria could induce considerable ingroup favoritism at the expense of the outgroup. In one study, participants were divided into two groups based on their preference for one of two abstract paintings. Following group categorization, participants
chose to allocate greater rewards to ingroup members than to outgroup members. Furthermore, there was a tendency for participants to pursue relative gain over absolute gain by maximizing the reward differential between ingroup and outgroup in favor of the ingroup rather than allocate objectively larger gains to ingroup members (Tajfel et al., 1971; Brewer & Silver, 1978). In all, Tajfel and colleagues (Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 1979) argued that category assignment in the “minimal group paradigm” was sufficient to establish social identity and thereby provide a basis for intergroup discrimination.

Social identity theory posits that people have a need to achieve and maintain positive social identities. Social identity, as defined by Tajfel (1981) is, "…that aspect of the individuals' self-concept which derives from their knowledge of their membership in a social group (or groups) together with the value and emotional significance attached to that membership” (p. 255). Although research on self and identity traditionally focuses on personal, individualized identity, some theorists also propose that individuals acquire identity and self-worth through group membership (e.g., Baumeister, 1991). Consistent with this view, social identity theory postulates a fundamental need for positive social identity that in turn creates the desire to establish ingroup superiority and positive ingroup distinctiveness through favorable intergroup comparisons. Individuals derive positive self-evaluations from positive ingroup distinctiveness which, in turn, provides a basis for collective self-esteem (Crocker & Luhtanen, 1990). According to Tajfel (1978), a series of causal paths link social categorization to the formation of social identity and the need for favorable intergroup comparison.
Abundant empirical evidence supports the notion that individuals are motivated to maintain a positive social identity. Individuals demonstrate ingroup favoritism in the absence of competition or self-interest, inferred similarity between the self and ingroup members, or knowledge of or familiarity with ingroup others (see Brewer, 1979, for a review). In turn, those who are given the opportunity to discriminate in favor of their ingroup report higher self-esteem than do those who are not provided with such an opportunity (Oakes & Turner, 1980; Lemyre & Smith, 1985). Moreover, not only do individuals evaluate ingroup members more favorably, but they are also more likely to highlight group membership when positive features of the group are salient. For example, Simon, Pantaleo, and Mummendey (1995) demonstrated that participants who were asked to list positive rather than negative attributes of ingroup members provided higher similarity ratings for the self and for ingroup members. In addition, Cialdini et al. (1976) reported a higher frequency of college students wearing school sweatshirts following Saturdays when their school football team won, presumably because they were attempting to strengthen their identification with a successful ingroup. Within the framework of social identity theory, intergroup bias effects are explained by the need to create and maintain a positive social identity.

Given its emphasis on positive social identity in accounting for intergroup bias, social identity theory strongly implies that an increase in the level of group identification should enhance intergroup discrimination. Because individuals who are highly identified with a group should be particularly motivated to establish favorable intergroup comparisons in order to derive positive identity from those aspects of group membership
that are important to the self-concept, they should also display greater tendencies to engage in intergroup discrimination. Consistent with this view, Sidanius, Pratto, and Mitchell (2001) found that individuals with stronger group identification rated their ingroup as relatively more competent than the outgroup and expressed a greater desire to maintain social distance between the ingroup and outgroup. Similarly, Branscombe and Wann (1994) found that stronger group identification was associated with greater outgroup derogation in the face of threats to collective self-esteem.

**Social Dominance Theory**

In the social identity tradition, intergroup bias is generally considered to be a function of favoritism toward the ingroup rather than derogation of the outgroup (Brewer, 1979). In contrast, however, Sidanius and Pratto (1999) argued that some forms of intergroup discrimination, such as interethnic violence, ethnic cleansing, police beatings, lynchings, slavery, and colonialism cannot be explained solely by ingroup favoritism. To account for group oppression and subjugation, social dominance theory was developed as an extension of social identity theory, postulating that people have a desire to actively oppress and dominate outgroups (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999).

Social dominance theory maintains that all societies have a fundamental tendency to form group-based hierarchies, and social inequality among groups is justified through legitimizing myths - ideologies that define values, beliefs, attributions, and social practices in ways that legitimate existing hierarchical relationships. Although blatant forms of outgroup oppression may be rare in democratic societies, inequality may nonetheless be maintained through the meritocracy principle, inheritance law,
institutional racism and discrimination (e.g. Pratto, Sidanius, & Stallworth, 1993). Once legitimizing myths are internalized by both high and low status groups, inequality becomes acceptable and group conflict is minimized. Moreover, high-status groups are posited to endorse hierarchy-enhancing legitimizing myths to a greater extent than are low-status groups because such myths better serve the interests of high-status groups. Accordingly, the theory predicts wider acceptance of such myths among Whites than among Blacks, among middle-class individuals than among working class individuals, and among heterosexual individuals than among gay, lesbian, and bisexual individuals (Sidanius, Levin, & Pratto, 1996).

Conceptually similar to the propositions of social dominance theory, system justification theory posits that people are motivated to defend and justify existing social systems (Jost & Banaji, 1994). In particular, high-status groups with greater access to economic, political, and social power are thought to have stronger desires to believe in the legitimacy and justifiability of existing social arrangements because they serve to protect their self-interests (Jost & Banaji, 1994). Jost and his colleagues argue that believing in the legitimacy of existing social systems allows high-status group members to feel good about themselves (Jost, Burgess, & Mosso, 2001; Jost & Hunyady, 2002). Therefore, enhanced system justification tendencies are associated with higher self-esteem among high-status group members (Jost & Hunyady, 2002; Jost & Thompson, 2000; Quinn & Crocker, 1999). Moreover, the association between endorsement of system-justifying beliefs and psychological well-being among high-status group members is particularly strong among those who are strongly identified with the group (O’Brien &
Major, 2005). This is consistent with the social identity theory prediction that individuals
with stronger group identification are more motivated to maintain the relative superiority
of their ingroup over the outgroup.

White Privilege

The history of racial relations in the United States is replete with examples of
legitimizing myth and system justifying practices that have helped to preserve White
privilege and racial disparity. For instance, Whites’ claim of superiority over non-Whites
was used to justify colonization and enslavement (Fredrickson, 1981). Moreover, the
Naturalization Act of 1790 allowed only “free White persons” to apply for American
citizenship while explicitly excluding non-Whites from such opportunities, underscoring
the notion that Whiteness meant freedom in the labor force status (Roediger, 1991;
Haney-Lopez, 1996). Over time, Irish, Italians, Poles, and Jews who were initially
classified as “non-Whites” managed to differentiate themselves from other types of non-
White immigrants, thereby enabling them to advance their status in political and
economic arenas (Takaki, 1993; Roediger, 1991). Existing social structures maintained
boundaries between Whites and non-Whites by granting Whites basic civil rights,
property ownership, access to education, and better employment opportunities while
depriving non-Whites of the same rights (Harris, 1993). This allowed even the poorest
Whites to enjoy advantages over non-Whites (DuBois, 1956).

In contemporary society, system-legitimizing ideologies that are used to maintain
White privilege and justify racial disparity include Belief in a Just World (Lerner &
Miller, 1978), the Protestant Work Ethic (Katz & Hass, 1988), the Belief in Individual
Mobility (Major, Gramzow, McCoy, Levin, Schmader, & Sidanius, 2002), and general beliefs in meritocracy (McNamee & Miller, 2004). The Just World Hypothesis posits that people have a need to believe that they live in a just and orderly world where people get what they deserve (Lerner & Miller, 1978), and the Protestant Work Ethic and Belief in Individual Mobility maintain that anyone who works hard will be rewarded accordingly (Katz & Hass, 1988; Major et al., 2002). Meritocracy beliefs prescribe that individuals should not be credited with or held accountable for something that is a consequence of birth rather than choice. Indeed, many Whites believe that the United States is a fair and egalitarian society that embodies such an ideal (McNamee & Miller, 2004; Gallagher, 1996). By viewing individuals as capable of “pulling themselves up by their bootstraps,” those who are badly off may be held responsible for their predicament. As a result, socioeconomic disparity and disproportionately higher rates of poverty among racial minorities are seen as functions of individual endeavor rather than systemically granted privileges (or the lack thereof).

Given the enhanced desire for high-status groups to endorse system-justifying ideologies, it is reasonable to predict that Whites would be motivated to deny the existence of White privilege. Consistent with this assumption, it has been shown that many Whites perceive that non-Whites have opportunities for success that are equal to or better than those of Whites (Gallagher, 1996) and thus do not believe that certain privileges are associated with the virtue of simply being White. In turn, such individuals also do not believe that past and present discrimination against non-Whites has benefited Whites (Feagin & O’Brien, 2003). This so-called “leveled playing field” argument arises
from a worldview that disaffirms White privilege and considers affirmative action policies to be a form of reverse discrimination (Gallagher, 1996). In this way, Whites are seen as victims of affirmative action and false accusations of racism, held accountable unjustly for their ancestors’ moral transgressions (Doane, 1997).

The denial of White privilege serves not only to maintain existing systems that preserve the interests of the White racial group but to also cast a positive light upon its members. Denying the existence of White privilege inevitably forces individuals to explain racial disparities in terms of differences in effort, talent, and merit, rather than differential privilege between races. By rejecting the notion of White privilege, non-Whites are held accountable for their predicament and socioeconomic disparities between races are perceived as a reflection of Whites’ superior attributes. In turn, this attribution contributes to favorable intergroup comparisons for Whites and increases the perceived desirability of the White racial group. From a social identity theory perspective, the enhancement of White’s positive social identification further enhances their self-esteem.

If it is indeed the case that highly identified Whites are more motivated to establish favorable intergroup comparisons, it may also be that such individuals are more apt to engage in intergroup discrimination. In support, Sidanius, Laar, Levin and Sinclair (2004) demonstrated that Whites with a higher level of racial identity expressed an increased sense of White racial victimization and stronger racism and were also more likely to oppose campus diversity, affirmative action, and miscegenation. Similarly, Lowery, Unzueta, Goff, and Knowles (2006) found that higher levels of White racial identification were associated with less support for affirmative action policies.
White Guilt

Based upon the research reviewed up to this point, it would seem that Whites who strongly identify themselves as “White” should be more likely to deny the existence of White privilege and should demonstrate a greater tendency to attribute racial disparity to internal factors than to external factors. However, additional research suggests that the relationship between social identity and intergroup bias may not be so straightforward. Notably, Knowles and Peng (2005) found that highly identified Whites were more likely than those less identified to feel collective guilt for Whites’ historical transgressions against Blacks. In their studies, White participants were asked to provide emotion ratings after reading historical accounts of Black lynchings, false imprisonment, and mutilation. Interestingly, high levels of White identification were found to be positively associated with higher levels of shame, embarrassment, and general feelings of guilt about social inequalities between Whites and Blacks. Furthermore, highly identified Whites believed that ingroup transgressions directed against outgroup members reflected negatively on themselves and their self-appraisals. In kind, Lickel, Schmader, Curtis, Scarnier, and Ames (2005) found that when in-group identification was strong, individuals experienced vicarious shame and guilt when ingroup members committed transgressions, and additional evidence has indicated that vicarious shame and guilt are experienced to a greater extent in collectivistic than in individualistic cultures (Stipek, 1998).

Steele (1990) argued that White guilt stems from an awareness of unearned White privilege and racism, as well as, “...the inevitable gratitude one feels for being White rather than Black in America” (p. 499). Consistent with this view, Iyer, Leach, and
Crosby (2003) found that beliefs in the existence of White privilege elicited feelings of guilt that, in turn, were associated with support for measures of restitution and racial compensation. Similarly, Swim and Miller (1999) found that beliefs in the existence of White privilege was associated with greater guilt, stronger support for affirmative action policies, and more negative evaluations of Whites. Branscombe (1998) argued that enhancing awareness of ingroup privilege is distressing for high-status group members because such thoughts include the implication that their advantages come at the expense of less advantaged groups. From this perspective, then, social identity may actually serve as a source of negative affect and lead to ingroup derogation.

Knowles and Peng (2005) suggested that White identity can be defined as a power-cognizant identity, marked by Whites’ awareness of their unearned privilege. This view is also consistent with ethnographical data collected by Perry (2001, 2002) indicating that White privilege is a core issue that resonates in comments expressed by those who are particularly conscious of their race. Critically, this perspective on White identity directly contradicts traditional theories of intergroup relations that draw upon social identity theory. According to the social identity framework, group members seek positive distinctiveness via favorable intergroup comparisons that heighten differences between ingroups and outgroups. Thus, social identity theory would predict that individuals who are highly identified with the White racial group should be motivated to deny, and not acknowledge, White privilege because the existence of White privilege threatens to minimize White accomplishments. Systems justification theory also makes the same predictions with regard to White privilege: High-status groups should be more
inclined to endorse the legitimacy of existing social systems that favor them. Therefore, Whites should be more motivated to deny the existence of White privilege because it threatens the legitimacy of their status. Overall, then, social identity theory and systems justification theory contrast starkly with Knowles and Peng’s (2005) notion that White identity is a power-cognizant identity that operates against the principles of self-protection and self-interest. In the present proposal, it is argued that these two conflicting ideas can be reconciled by considering individual variation in the motivation to express and endorse egalitarian values.

*Motivation to Control Prejudiced Responding*

Denying the existence of White privilege and drawing internal attributions for the existence of racial disparities poses a quandary for those who embrace racial egalitarianism. Likewise, supporting the maintenance of existing social systems that preserve the high status of Whites directly conflicts with egalitarian values (e.g., Allport, 1954; Dovidio & Gaertner, 2004). Empirical evidence suggests that individuals who have adopted egalitarian standards experience compunction when they become aware that their behavior is in conflict with their standards (Devine, Monteith, Zuwerink, Eliot, 1991), and an increased awareness of discrepancies between one’s non-prejudiced standards and prejudiced responses appears to activate self-regulatory processes aimed at reducing prejudiced responses (Monteith, 1993). Furthermore, stimuli that have induced guilt in relation to prejudicial responses in the past may later come to be perceived as cues for behavioral control that serve to activate prejudice-related behavioral inhibition (Monteith, Ashburn-Nardo, Voils, & Czopp, 2002). In kind, Moskowitz and colleagues (Moskowitz,
Gollwitzer, & Wasel, 1999; Moskowitz, Salomon, & Taylor, 2000) have argued that chronic egalitarian goals preconsciously inhibit the activation of stereotypes that are typically assumed to be uncontrollable.

In the present proposal, it is argued that individuals who embrace egalitarian standards may be particularly likely to acknowledge the existence of White privilege because it allows them to ascribe racial disparity to the failure of social systems. Indeed, acknowledgement of White privilege may be part of a self-regulatory mechanism (Monteith, 1993) that works to reduce prejudiced responses by overriding the need to view the ingroup as superior. By this logic, then, individuals who embrace egalitarian standards may be particularly apt to form a power-cognizant White identity (Knowles & Peng, 2005).

Measuring White Identification

White identification measurement instruments employed by sociologists and social psychologists typically ask individuals to indicate the personal importance of their racial identification or their feelings of closeness toward other members of their racial group (e.g. Sidanius et al., 2004; McDermott & Samson, 2005). Such instruments tend to be reactive, however, because social norms prescribe that individuals should ignore racial differences and embrace a color-blind ideology (Blauner, 1992). For this reason, White Americans often feel compelled to downplay their racial awareness (Alderfer, 1994; Frankenberg, 1993). This leaves open the possibility that explicit measures of White identification used in the past studies might have assessed levels of explicit racism.
In order to minimize the demand characteristics associated with explicit measures of White identification, Knowles and Peng (2005) developed an implicit measure of White identification - the White Identity Centrality Implicit Association Test (WICIAT) that is a modified version of the Implicit Association Test (Greenwald, McGhee, & Schwartz, 1998). Knowles and Peng conceptualize White identity as an association between the self and the White ingroup, and the WICIAT uses response latency measurement in order to assess the strength of this association. According to their findings, individuals identified by the WICIAT as having stronger White racial identification took longer to judge the self-descriptiveness of self-ingroup inconsistent traits than self-ingroup consistent traits, presumably because the merged representations of the self and their White ingroup interfered with judgments that separated the self from their ingroup (Smith & Henry, 1996). In addition, highly identified Whites took longer to categorize racially ambiguous targets than did those with lower racial identity (categorization latency effect), and were more likely to categorize racially ambiguous targets as outgroup members (ingroup overexclusion effect). According to Knowles and Peng, these effects occur because highly identified members of a group are motivated to be accurate in drawing ingroup-outgroup distinctions, and they seek to avoid false inclusions to protect ingroup-outgroup boundaries (Castano, Yzerbyt, Bourguignon, & Seron, 2002; Blascovich, Wyer, Swart, & Kibler, 1997). In so doing, the WICIAT appears to be tapping the degree of overlap between the self and group representations in a fairly non-reactive manner. Moreover, the fact that scores on the WICIAT correlate weakly with more explicit measures of White identification indicates that the WICIAT
accounts for unique variance above and beyond what is captured by more explicit measures.

There is disagreement in the literature regarding the proper definition and conceptualization of social identity (see Deaux, 1996, for a review). On the one hand, Turner et al. (1987) emphasized self-categorization processes in defining social identity and ascribed little importance to the cognitive contents, meanings, or beliefs associated with the category. On the other hand, Tajfel (1981) conceptualized social identity as one’s knowledge of group membership, including its cognitive contents, value, and the emotional significance of being associated with the group. The proposed research will not focus on the cognitive contents or affective aspects of White identification when assessing levels of racial identification because such aspects are expected to vary systematically with the extent to which one has adopted egalitarian values. Cognitive or affective aspects of White identification that are unique to those who have or have not adopted egalitarian values are perhaps more closely associated with the motivation to deny or acknowledge White privilege than they are to the strength of one’s association with White group membership. For example, although one may be tempted to measure White pride as a proxy for White identification among nonegalitarian individuals, pride may actually be a direct consequence of the denial of White privilege. If so, then the observation of a relationship between White pride and perceptions of White privilege would be uninformative with regard to the relationship between White identification and perceptions of White privilege. Similarly, employing levels of White guilt as a proxy for strength of White identification among egalitarian individuals may be uninformative if
White guilt is a direct consequence of acknowledging White privilege. Moreover, explicit assessment of personal importance and significance of being White may tap on racism rather than the strength of group identification. Past work providing support for positive association between White identification and perceptions of White privilege primarily relied on explicit measures of White identification (e.g. Sidanius et al., 2004; Lowery et al., 2006), whereas Knowles and Peng’s studies suggesting negative association between White identification and perceptions of White privilege employed an implicit measure of White identification. Thus, it needs to be examined whether the positive association between White identification and perceptions of White privilege can be observed when an implicit measure of identification is employed. Because the WICIAT is simply a measure of the strength of association between self and White group membership, it offers the clearest method for examining the pure relationship between strength of White identification and perceptions of White privilege.

**Goal of the Present Research**

The majority of work examining social identity suggests that stronger group identification is associated with greater intergroup discrimination (e.g., Jost & Banaji, 1994; Sidanius et al., 2004; Tajfel, 1981). From this perspective, levels of White identification should be negatively associated with beliefs in the existence of White privilege. Therefore, it is assumed that people who are highly White-identified should be more motivated to deny the existence of White privilege in order to ensure favorable intergroup comparisons and support existing social systems that favor ingroup members. In contrast, Knowles and Peng (2005) argue that Whiteness is a power-cognizant identity
marked by Whites’ awareness of their unearned privilege. From this perspective, White identification is assumed to be positively associated with beliefs in the existence of White privilege and, thus, highly identified Whites should be more likely to acknowledge the existence of White privilege. How can these two opposing views be reconciled? It is proposed that individual differences in the motivation to maintain egalitarian standards should moderate the relationship between strength of White identification and perceptions of White privilege. More specifically, it is hypothesized that a positive association between White identification level and perceptions of White privilege will be found among individuals who are motivated to maintain egalitarian standards, whereas a negative association between levels of White identification and perceptions of White privilege will be found among individuals who are less motivated to maintain egalitarian standards.

Study 1

To examine whether motivation to maintain egalitarian standards moderates the relationship between strength of White identification and perceptions of White privilege, participants were assessed for their levels of White identification, motivation to maintain egalitarian standards as captured by the Motivation to Respond Without Prejudice Scale (Plant & Devine, 1998), and belief in the existence of White privilege. Participants were also asked to indicate the extent to which internal and external factors account for the disparities that exist between Whites and non-Whites. In addition, White guilt was measured in order to examine whether it was associated with perceptions of White privilege.
Hypothesis 1

Highly identified Whites who have low egalitarian standards should be less likely to believe in the existence of White privilege than should those with lower levels of White identification, whereas highly identified Whites who have high egalitarian standards should be more likely to believe in the existence of White privilege than should those with lower levels of White identification.

Plant and Devine (1998) argued that individuals who are motivated to respond without prejudice because of their internalization of egalitarian standards experience more guilt than should those who are motivated to respond without prejudice for social desirability reasons when behaviors fail to meet such standards. For this reason, it is proposed that individual differences in internal motivation to respond without prejudice (IMS) may be a stronger moderator of the hypothesized White identification level-perceptions of White privilege relationship than are individual differences in external motivation to respond without prejudice (EMS).

Hypothesis 2

Highly identified Whites who have low egalitarian standards should demonstrate a greater tendency to attribute racial disparity to internal factors than to external factors compared to those with lower levels of White identification. Drawing internal causal attributions for racial disparities highlights Whites’ superior attributes and thus provides an occasion for favorable intergroup comparisons. This should be particularly self-serving for those who are highly identified. In contrast, highly identified Whites who
have high egalitarian standards should demonstrate a greater tendency to attribute racial
disparity to external factors than to internal factors compared to those with lower levels
of White identification. External attributions of racial disparity may allow those highly
identified to express egalitarian values while minimizing prejudiced responses.
Consistent with Hypothesis 1, it is also expected that IMS will be a stronger moderator of
the hypothesized White identification level-causal attribution relationship than will EMS.

Method

Participants
135 White introductory psychology students from Ohio University were recruited
to satisfy a course requirement. Two participants were dropped because of a computer
malfunction and a failure to follow instructions.

Materials

White identification. Levels of White identification were measured by the
computer-based White Identity Centrality Implicit Associations Test (WICIAT –
Knowles & Peng, 2005), designed to assess the extent to which White identity is
incorporated into the self-concept. The test consists of 5 blocks of judgment trials that
require participants to categorize stimuli as quickly and as accurately as possible. In the
first block of trials, participants are presented with photos of White or non-White faces
and told to press a key to indicate whether the face belonged to a White or non-White
individual. In the second block, participants are presented with self-related words (i.e., I,
me, mine) or other-related words (i.e., they, them, their) and told to categorize them as
“self” or “other” by pressing the same pair of keys used in the first block. The third block combines the White/non-White and self-other judgments that were presented in the previous two blocks, such that one key represents White or self and the other key represents non-White or other. The fourth block reverses the key assignments for the race-related category distinction, and the fifth block combines self-other judgments with the reversed White/non-White judgments used in the previous block such that one key represents White or other and the other key represents non-White or self.

**Motivation to maintain egalitarian standards.** The motivation to maintain egalitarian standards was assessed by the IMS/EMS scales (Plant & Devine, 1998 – see Appendix A).

**White guilt.** The White Guilt scale (Swim & Miller, 1999) was administered to assess Whites’ feelings of collective guilt toward racial minority (see Appendix B).

**Perceptions of White privilege.** Perceptions of White privilege were assessed by Swim and Miller’s (1999) 5-item White Privilege Scale (see Appendix C).

**Causal attributions for racial disparity.** Perceptions of causes of racial disparity were assessed by a 28-item scale adopted and modified from studies conducted by Zucker and Weiner (1993). Half of the items focus on reasons for why non-Whites fall behind Whites in terms of socioeconomic status (SES), whereas the other half focus on reasons for why Whites stay ahead of non-Whites with regard to SES. In each portion, 6 items focus on internal causal attributions, and 8 items focus on external causal attributions (see Appendix D).
Procedure

Because of concerns that completion of the IMS/EMS measures and White Guilt measure might serve to remind or sensitize participants to existing normative standards regarding the expression of egalitarian attitudes, participants completed the study measures in one of two different orders. Specifically, half of the participants were randomly assigned to order 1: WICIAT, White Guilt scale, IMS/EMS, perceptions of White privilege scale, and causal attribution scale, whereas the other half were assigned to order 2: WICIAT, perceptions of White privilege scale, causal attribution scale, White Guilt scale, and IMS/EMS. Following completion of these measures, participants were debriefed and thanked for their participation.

Results and Discussion

WICIAT

The compatible and incompatible combination response latencies in blocks three and five were used to compute WICIAT scores. Following Knowles and Peng (2005), latencies under 300 ms and over 3,000 ms were considered outliers and were replaced with values of 300 ms and 3,000 ms, respectively. A reciprocal transformation was then conducted by dividing each recorded response latency by 1,000 so that higher values represented faster responses, whereas lower values represented slower responses. For each participant, the difference between the mean response latencies in the compatible and incompatible combination blocks was divided by the pooled standard deviation of the two blocks so as to compute the effect size (i.e. Cohen’s $d$) representing the relative ease
of drawing an association between White and self, as well as between non-White and others. Participants’ mean automatic association effect as measured by Cohen’s $d$ was 0.85 (SD = 0.79), ranging from a low mean of -1.92 to a high mean of +3.43.

Scores on the WICIAT were not found to correlate significantly with perceptions of White privilege ($r = .08, p = .34$), or internal ($r = .06, p = .48$) or external ($r = -.05, p = .55$) causal attributions of racial disparity. Intercorrelations between the study variables are presented in Table 1.

Table 1.
*Correlations among White Identity, Perceptions of White Privilege, Internal and External Causal Attributions of Racial Disparity, IMS, EMS, and Guilt.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</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>1. White Identity</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. White Privilege</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Internal Attributions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. External Attributions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. IMS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. EMS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Guilt</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05.  **p < 0.1.

*White Privilege*

A hierarchical linear regression analysis was conducted for White privilege employing scores on the WICIAT, IMS/EMS, measure order, and all combinations of two-way and three-way interaction terms as predictors.

When IMS and EMS were entered into the same block, the analysis revealed that IMS and EMS were positively associated with stronger beliefs in the existence of White...
privilege, $F(2, 125) = 4.91, p < .05$. However, the effect was driven by EMS, $\beta = .21$, $p < .05$, rather than by IMS, $\beta = .15$, $p > .05$. No other effects were significant.

Conceivably, external motivation may sometimes elicit stronger efforts to engage in behavioral inhibition than does internal motivation. It is also possible that the IMS might have failed to sufficiently capture participants’ level of motivation to maintain egalitarian standards.

In extending the original analysis of IMS and EMS, Devine et al. (2002) argued that those who score high in IMS and low in EMS are more motivated to respond without prejudice than are those who score high in both IMS and EMS. This prediction hinges on the assumption that there are conceptual parallels between the sources of motivation to maintain egalitarian standards and Ryan and Connell’s (1989) model of perceived locus of causality. Ryan and Connell postulated that behavior motivation can be placed along a continuum of autonomy, with external reasons on one end, and internal reasons on the other. According to the model, autonomous individuals who regulate their behavior solely for internal reasons are more effective in pursuing goal-relevant behavior than are those motivated for both internal and external reasons who, in turn, are more effective than those who are solely motivated for external reasons. Mapping the IMS and EMS onto Ryan and Connell’s model, Devine et al. (2002) demonstrated that individuals high in IMS and low in EMS are less likely to show racial bias than are those who exhibit any other combination of IMS and EMS.

In light of this work, a correlation between levels of White identification and perceptions of White privilege was separately computed for those high in IMS and low in
EMS and for the aggregate of all other combinations. Whereas there was a statistically significant positive correlation between White identification and perceptions of White privilege among the internally motivated (i.e., high IMS, low EMS), $r = +.45, p < .05$, the correlation for the aggregate of the others was not significant, $r = .02, p > .05$. Moreover, based on Fisher’s $z$ transformation, the difference between the magnitude of these two correlations was statistically significant, $z = 2.04, p < .05$. The results of this analysis are supportive of Knowles and Peng’s (2005) notion of power-cognizant White identity, which predicts a positive correlation between White identification and perceptions of White privilege.

**Internal Attributions for Racial Disparity**

A separate hierarchical regression analysis was conducted for internal attributions for racial disparity. The significant main effect of IMS/EMS block was obtained, $F(2, 125) = 4.84, p < .01$. IMS was negatively correlated with a tendency to draw internal attributions, $\beta = -.22, p < .05$, whereas EMS was positively correlated with a tendency to draw internal attributions, $\beta = .17, p < .05$. No other effects were significant.

**External Attributions for Racial Disparity**

A hierarchical regression analysis was repeated for external attributions for racial disparity. A significant main effect of IMS/EMS block was obtained, $F(2, 125) = 3.34, p = .05$. The effect was driven by IMS, such that IMS was positively associated with stronger external attributions for racial disparity, $\beta = .23, p < .05$. The hypothesized
WICIAT X IMS/EMS interactions were not obtained for either internal or external attributions for racial disparity, and no other effects were significant.

**Study 2**

Earlier in the proposal it was argued that perceptions of racial disparities could elicit differential patterns of causal attributions in line with the distinctive needs of individuals who are and are not motivated to maintain egalitarian standards. Among those not so motivated, perceived racial disparity is an occasion for favorable intergroup comparisons. By drawing internal causal attributions for disparities and denying White privilege, the perceived desirability of the White ingroup can be enhanced. Conversely, among those who are motivated to inhibit prejudiced responses, recognizing racial disparities is an occasion for maintaining egalitarianism through external causal attributions for poverty and acknowledgement of White privilege.

Study 1 failed to find the predicted interactive effects of White identification strength and IMS on perceptions of White privilege. However, there was a statistically significant positive correlation between White identification and perceptions of White privilege among individuals high in IMS and low in EMS. Because internalized egalitarian standards are hypothesized to be a critical moderator of the relationship between levels of White identification and attributions for racial disparity, an alternative method for assessing egalitarian motivation was employed in Study 2. Moskowitz et al. (1999) argued that self-report measures of prejudice and egalitarianism may assess beliefs but still fail to capture motivation because one can endorse beliefs on a scale without being committed to them. Thus, it is possible that the motivation to respond
without prejudice scale used in Study 1 failed to differentiate between those who believe in egalitarianism but are more versus less committed to the behavioral maintenance and pursuit of egalitarian goals. Therefore, it is important to differentiate between those who are and are not committed to pursuing egalitarian goals.

To assess chronic egalitarian goal orientations instead of egalitarian beliefs, Moskowitz et al. (1999) examined compensatory behaviors following the failure to attain a desired goal state. In one study, Moskowitz et al. (1999) induced feelings of “incompleteness” by manipulating participants into making stereotypical judgments about women through the use of multiple-choice options that presented highly stereotypical answer options. Compensatory behavior was then measured by computing difference scores for semantic differential scales that were administered both before and after the incompleteness induction that included stereotype-relevant items about women. In Study 2, these items were modified so as to assess egalitarian standards regarding race rather than gender.

To assess levels of commitment to racial egalitarian goals, participants in Study 2 were forced to make stereotypic judgments about a racial minority. After reading brief descriptions of a stereotype-relevant situation (e.g., “Jason, a 19 year-old African-American college student, had a 2.0 grade point average after his first semester in school”), participants were presented with three stereotypical sentences to choose from. For the example provided above, the following options were included:

a.) African-Americans are more likely to succeed in sports rather than in academics.

b.) Most African-Americans aren’t as qualified or prepared for college as their White classmates.
c.) Most American universities have lower academic standards for African-Americans than for Whites.

For those who are strongly committed to pursuing egalitarian goals, the failure to express egalitarian values should be particularly likely to elicit feelings of incompleteness. Given that such individuals strive for self-completion through compensatory behaviors, they were therefore expected to increase their efforts to be egalitarian after failing to achieve egalitarian goals. For those who were less strongly committed to pursuing egalitarian goals, on the other hand, stereotypic judgments should be less apt to elicit feelings of incompleteness. Therefore, such individuals were expected to be less likely to exhibit compensatory behaviors.

Because the motivation to maintain racial egalitarianism is an individual differences variable, individuals who are high and low on this dimension may systematically differ from one another on other relevant constructs. For example, racially egalitarian individuals may have more liberal attitudes toward a variety of social issues that may translate into external attributions for socioeconomic disparity. To examine this potential alternative explanation, the race of the target of socioeconomic disparity was manipulated. If the motivation to maintain racial egalitarianism does indeed moderate the relationship between levels of White identification and patterns of causal attributions for racial disparities, then such differential patterns should only be expected when individuals are asked to consider individual members of racial groups that are perceived to be victims of socioeconomic disparity.
Hypothesis 1

Highly White-identified participants who are low on motivation to maintain egalitarian standards will make internal attributions for racial disparities and deny the existence of White privilege to a greater extent when a woman in poverty is described as African-American than will those who are low in White identification and low on egalitarian motivation. In contrast, highly White-identified participants who are high on motivation to maintain egalitarian standards will make external attributions and acknowledge the existence of White privilege to a greater extent than will those who are low in White identification and high on egalitarian motivation. Finally, it is predicted that levels of White identification and egalitarian motivation will not exert differential effects when a woman in poverty is described as a White American.

Method

Participants and Design

140 White introductory psychology students from Ohio University were recruited in order to satisfy a course requirement. Three of the participants were excluded from analyses because of more than 40% error rates on the WICIAT, suggesting that their responses were random. Of the remaining 137 participants, 114 were assigned to the African-American target condition, and 23 were assigned to the White target condition.
Procedure

Disparity Manipulation. After completing the WICIAT, participants in the African American target condition read the following paragraph:

Anita is a 52 year old Black woman who works as a janitor. She makes $5.50 an hour with no health insurance or pension. Pregnant at 17 and forced to drop out of high school, she went on welfare and later had 4 more children. She now lives in a subsidized housing complex with a leaky roof and broken windows. She periodically suffers from asthma attacks that seem to be caused by the mold growing under the carpet, yet she has no money to see a doctor or replace the floor.

Census data indicate that there are millions of people like Anita who are struggling in poverty while millions of others prosper. What do you think are the obstacles that prevent the poor from achieving economic success?

Participants in the White target condition read the identical paragraph, with the exception that Anita was described as White. All participants then completed the causal attribution scale and White privilege scale employed in Study 1.

Incompleteness induction. Participants then responded to semantic differential scales that allowed them to indicate their beliefs about Blacks along 9-point (1 = “does not describe at all,” 9 = “describes extremely well”) adjective rating scales (see Appendix E). They were then asked to complete multiple-choice questions designed to induce feelings of incompleteness. Each question consisted of a stereotype-related situation (e.g., Jason, a 19 year-old African-American college student, had a 2.0 grade point average after his first semester in school), and three (forced-choice) stereotypical explanations to choose from (e.g. African-Americans are more likely to succeed in sports rather than in academics; most African-Americans aren’t as qualified or prepared for college as their White classmates; most American universities have lower academic standards for
African-Americans than for Whites – see Appendix F). Following the incompleteness induction, participants once again completed the adjective ratings. In addition, in order to assess participants’ emotional experience as a result of the incompleteness induction, they were asked to complete the affect measure that included a guilt item (see Appendix G). Finally, participants were debriefed and thanked for their participation.

Results and Discussion

Semantic Differential

To assess levels of commitment to racial egalitarian goals through compensatory behavior, semantic differential scores were computed by subtracting the mean of the first adjective ratings from the mean of the second adjective ratings. Participants’ mean semantic differential score across conditions was 0.12 ($SD = 0.40$), ranging from a low mean of -0.69 to a high mean of 0.94. Intercorrelations between study variables for the two conditions are presented in Table 2 and 3.

Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. White Identity</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. White Privilege</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td></td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Internal Attributions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.32**</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. External Attributions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Semantic Differential</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Guilt</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.75**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Shame</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Embarrassment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05.  **p < 0.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. White Identity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. White Privilege</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Internal Attributions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. External Attributions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Semantic Differential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Guilt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Shame</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Embarrassment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05. **p < 0.1.

White Privilege, and Internal and External Attributions for Racial Disparity

Separate hierarchical linear regression analyses were conducted for the African-American and White target conditions. White privilege and internal and external causal attribution dimensions of racial disparity were regressed on scores on the WICIAT, egalitarian motivation measure, and the interaction between the WICIAT and the egalitarian motivation measure. In the African American target condition, the hypothesized interaction between strength of White identification and motivation to maintain and pursue egalitarian goals was not significant for any of the dependent variables. A significant main effect of egalitarian motivation was obtained for White privilege, $F(2, 111) = 3.93, p = .05$. Individuals who were committed to pursuing egalitarian goals were more likely than those who were not to report stronger beliefs in the existence of White privilege, $\beta = .19, p = .05$. No other effects were significant in either the African-American or White target condition. In addition, to examine the effects of the manipulation, the African-American and White target conditions were compared.
along each of the dependent variables. Participants in the African American target condition were significantly more likely than those in the White target condition to believe in the existence of White privilege, $t(135) = 2.03, p < .05$. No significant effects were obtained for internal and external causal attributions for racial disparities. Further, guilt, shame, and embarrassment were not significantly correlated with the semantic differential scores.

The results of Study 2 failed to support the hypothesis that highly White-identified individuals who are low on egalitarian motivation would make internal attributions for racial disparities and deny the existence of White privilege to a greater extent than would those who are low in White identification and low on egalitarian motivation.

General Discussion

Previous research on intergroup relations provides conflicting evidence regarding the effects of White identification. Within traditional theories of intergroup relations that draw upon the social identity framework, highly identified group members are assumed to be more likely to engage in intergroup discrimination. Thus, highly identified Whites are expected to deny the existence of White privilege and make internal attributions for racial disparities so as to establish favorable intergroup comparisons for the White racial group. In contrast, Knowles and Peng (2005) proposed that White identity is a power-cognizant identity, marked by Whites’ awareness of their unearned privilege. From this perspective, White identification is assumed to be associated with the acknowledgement of White privilege and external attributions for racial disparities. The goal of the present
research was to reconcile this discrepancy by proposing that individual variation in the motivation to endorse egalitarian values moderates the relationship between levels of White identification and perceptions of White privilege. It was predicted that highly identified Whites who have low egalitarian standards would be less likely to believe in the existence of White privilege and make internal causal attributions for racial disparities than would those with lower levels of White identification. In contrast, it was expected that highly identified Whites who have high egalitarian standards would be more likely to believe in the existence of White privilege and make external causal attributions for racial disparities than would those with lower levels of White identification. Study 1 failed to obtain the expected interaction. However, there was a significant positive correlation between White identification level and perceptions of White privilege among high IMS/low EMS participants, and this correlation was significantly more positive than that of participants who exhibited any other combinations of IMS and EMS. This analysis supports Knowles and Peng’s (2005) conceptualization of White identity as a power-cognizant identity in that highly identified egalitarian Whites were more likely to believe in the existence of White privilege than were low identifiers. There was no significant interaction for attributions for racial disparity, and correlations between White identification and causal attributions for racial disparities were not significant for either high IMS/low EMS participants or any other combination of IMS and EMS. Although correlations between White privilege and internal/external attributions for racial disparity were both statistically significant, the analysis performed on attributions for racial disparity did not mirror the results obtained for White privilege. The results of Study 2
indicated a positive association between egalitarian motivation and perceptions of White privilege when a woman was described as African American, but failed to show an interaction with levels of White identification.

The failure to find the hypothesized interaction may reflect a variation in the influence of White identification. The notion of a power-cognizant identity assumes that highly identified Whites are more likely to be aware of White privilege than are those with lower identification. Although Knowles and Peng (2005) do not explicitly discuss how White identification borne out of social exposure to non-Whites translates into the awareness of White privilege, it would seem that the non-White population to which White individuals are exposed would need to be perceived as suffering from some form of relative deprivation in order for the non-White exposure to become associated with White privilege through identification processes. The sample employed in Knowles and Peng’s (2005) study which demonstrated a positive correlation between White identification and White guilt was derived from a prestigious private university (Stanford). Though speculative, many of those students might have perceived relative socioeconomic and educational advantages over non-Whites in their exposure to a greater extent than the sample employed in the present research (Ohio University). If this is indeed the case, then White identification for the relatively non-advantaged participants in the present sample might be less likely to shape into a power-cognizant identity and thus, be of less importance in determining perceptions of White privilege. Similarly, for those with low egalitarian standards, lack of relative advantage may also be equally less
likely to lead to perceptions of White privilege regardless of levels of White identification.

In a series of studies on social identification in women, Skevington and Baker (1989) showed that there are different types of gender identities with a variety of characteristics and processes associated with them. By the same token, White identification for the relatively non-advantaged might entail meanings and consequences that are different from those of more advantaged Whites. It may be worthwhile to note that participants in the African-American target condition in Study 2 of the present research were significantly more likely than those in the White target condition to believe in the existence of White privilege. This suggests that exposure to non-Whites who are and are not relatively disadvantaged may differentially influence perceptions of White privilege. Therefore, future work that examines the relationship between White identification and perceptions of White privilege may benefit from taking into account the personal advantages that a given sample of White individuals perceive to have over non-Whites in their social exposure. In addition, it may be useful to investigate whether the perceived magnitude of racial disparity in society at large (i.e., that is beyond their immediate environment) is different between advantaged and non-advantaged Whites as well as between high and low identifiers.

Though not focused on egalitarianism as an independent predictor of perceptions of White privilege, Study 2 demonstrated that participants with stronger egalitarian motivation were more likely to believe in the existence of White privilege than did those with less motivation. These results are consistent with Swim and Miller’s (1999) studies
suggesting an association between beliefs in the existence of White privilege and prejudice toward Blacks. Thus, it appears that Moskowitz et al.’s (1999) compensatory measure can be applied to predict racial egalitarian motivation. In addition to its utility in assessing egalitarian goals rather than egalitarian beliefs, the compensatory measure may be useful when more explicit measures of egalitarianism enhance demand characteristics.

In the present research, White identification was operationally defined as the association between self and the White racial group. Capturing this dimension of White identification by the relatively non-reactive WICIAT has advantages over more explicit measures of identification because Whites are often reluctant to acknowledge their racial awareness for fear of being labeled as racist (Alderfer, 1994; Frankenberg, 1993). The WICIAT enables the assessment of White identification level for those who do not openly embrace their White identity and, perhaps, for those who are not even aware of having the identity. Although such an implicit association between self and the White ingroup has been shown to produce cognitive and affective consequences (Knowles & Peng, 2005), it is an overstatement to conclude that this dimension alone predicts all identification-related phenomena. Indeed, many investigators emphasize the importance of the multidimensionality of identity, with each dimension uniquely contributing to cognitive, affective and motivational elements of White identity (e.g. Jackson & Smith, 1999; Sellers, Rowley, Chavous, Sheotan, & Smith, 1997). Whereas much work on identity to date has primarily focused on minority identity, research on dominant identity -White identity in particular- has been rather sparse. Given the potential impact White
identification has on intergroup attitudes and behaviors, the antecedents and consequences of White identity deserve further study.
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Appendix A: Internal and External Motivation to Respond Without Prejudice Scale

The following questions concern reasons people might have for trying to respond in non-prejudiced ways toward racial minorities. We want to be clear that we are not evaluating you or your individual responses. All your responses will be completely confidential. If we are to learn anything useful, it is important that you respond to each of the questions openly and honestly. Please give your response according to the scale below.

1. I attempt to act in non-prejudiced ways toward racial minorities because it is personally important to me.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9
   Strongly disagree
   Strongly agree

2. According to my personal values, using stereotypes about racial minorities is OK.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9
   Strongly disagree
   Strongly agree

3. I am personally motivated by my beliefs to be non-prejudiced toward racial minorities.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9
   Strongly disagree
   Strongly agree

4. Because of my personal values, I believe that using stereotypes about racial minorities is wrong.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9
   Strongly disagree
   Strongly agree

5. Being non-prejudiced toward racial minorities is important to my self-concept.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9
   Strongly disagree
   Strongly agree

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9
   Strongly disagree
   Strongly agree

7. I try to hide any negative thoughts about Racial minorities in order to avoid negative reactions from others.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9
   Strongly disagree
   Strongly agree
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>I attempted prejudiced toward Racial minorities, I would be concerned that others would be angry with me.</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>I attempt to appear non-prejudiced toward Racial minorities in order to avoid disapproval from others.</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>I try to act non-prejudiced toward Racial minorities because of pressure from others.</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Appendix B: White Guilt Scale**

1. Although I feel my behavior is typically nondiscriminatory toward racial minorities, I still feel guilt due to my association with the White race.  
   - Strongly disagree  
   - Strongly agree

2. I feel guilt about the past and present social inequality of minority Americans (i.e., slavery, poverty).  
   - Strongly disagree  
   - Strongly agree

3. I do not feel guilty about social inequality between White and minority Americans.  
   - Strongly disagree  
   - Strongly agree

4. When I learn about racism, I feel guilt due to my association with the White race.  
   - Strongly disagree  
   - Strongly agree

5. I feel guilt about the benefits and privileges that I receive as a White Americans.  
   - Strongly disagree  
   - Strongly agree
Appendix C: White Privilege Scale

1. White people have certain advantages that minorities do not have in this society.

<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>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. My status as a White person grants me unearned privileges in today’s society.

<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>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. I feel that White skin in the United States opens many doors for Whites during their everyday lives.

<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>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. I do not feel that White people have any benefits or privileges due to their race.

(R)

<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>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. My skin color is an asset to me in my everyday life.

<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>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D: Causal Attribution of Racial Disparity

Racial disparity has been a thorny issue in the US. Although legal discrimination has disappeared, and socioeconomic status of racial minorities has vastly improved in recent years, stubborn gaps still persist between Whites and racial minorities. What do you think are contributing to the socioeconomic disparity between Whites and racial minorities? First, please indicate your opinion about why many minorities fall behind Whites.

1. Lack of effort and laziness by the poor
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   Strongly disagree
   Strongly agree

2. No attempts at self-improvement among the poor
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   Strongly disagree
   Strongly agree

3. Lack of thrift and proper money management by the poor
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   Strongly disagree
   Strongly agree

4. Failure to take advantage of educational and training opportunities on the part of the poor
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   Strongly disagree
   Strongly agree

5. Lack of ability and talent among the poor
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   Strongly disagree
   Strongly agree

6. Lack of character and will power among the poor
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   Strongly disagree
   Strongly agree

Failure of society to provide good schools for many Americans
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   Strongly disagree
   Strongly agree

7. Failure of industry to provide enough job
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
8. Prejudice and discrimination  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Being taken advantage by the rich  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Low wages in some businesses and industries  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Limited opportunities given by society  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Not having the right “contacts”  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Not inheriting money from relatives  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next, please indicate your opinion about why Whites are ahead of minorities in terms of socioeconomic status.

1. Ample effort and hard work by the financially successful  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Extensive attempts at self-improvement among the financially successful  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Thrift and proper money management by the financially successful  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Taking advantage of educational and training opportunities on the part of the financially successful
1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9
Strongly disagree
Strongly agree

5. Ample ability and talent by the financially successful
1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9
Strongly disagree
Strongly agree

6. Strong character and will power by the financially successful
1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9
Strongly disagree
Strongly agree

7. Good schools available to the financially successful
1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9
Strongly disagree
Strongly agree

8. Good jobs provided by industry
1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9
Strongly disagree
Strongly agree

9. Preferential treatment
1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9
Strongly disagree
Strongly agree

10. Taking advantage of the poor
1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9
Strongly disagree
Strongly agree

11. High wages in some businesses and industries
1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9
Strongly disagree
Strongly agree

12. Plenty of opportunities given by society
1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9
Strongly disagree
Strongly agree

13. Having the right “contacts”
1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. Inheriting money from relatives</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix E: Semantic Differential Scale

Please indicate how each adjective below will describe a typical African American.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjective</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all typical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Extremely typical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tough</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Extremely typical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Extremely typical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low intelligence</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Extremely typical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uneducated</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Extremely typical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lazy</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Extremely typical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexually perverse</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Extremely typical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Extremely typical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhythmic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all typical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely typical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostentatious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all typical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely typical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inferior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all typical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely typical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different food preferences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all typical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely typical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different family characteristic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all typical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely typical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dirty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all typical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely typical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smelly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all typical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely typical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F: Incompleteness Induction

For each situation below, please indicate description/explanation that you think is most reasonable.

1) Jason, a 19 year-old African-American college student, had a 2.0 grade point average after his first semester in school.
   d.) African-Americans are more likely to succeed in sports rather than in academics.
   e.) Most African-Americans aren’t as qualified or prepared for college as their white classmates.
   f.) Most American universities have lower academic standards for African-Americans than for whites.

2) Amanda, an African-American mother of two, depends on welfare to help support her family.
   a.) African-Americans are more likely to be raised by a single mother than by both parents
   b.) African-Americans are more likely to grow up in poverty than whites.
   c.) African-Americans are lazy.

3) Scott, a 24 year-old African American, was questioned by police after a local convenience store was burglarized.
   a.) Young African-American men are more likely to commit crimes than young white men.
   b.) African-American men are more likely to go to prison than to college.
   c.) African-American men are violent.

4) Six African-American teenagers were walking in a downtown neighborhood while listening to loud music.
   a.) Young African-American men are likely to be involved in street gangs.
   b) Most African-Americans live in urban ghettos.
   c.) Most African-Americans like rap music.

5). Joe, a 32-year old African-American, is a bus driver.
   a.) Most African-Americans are likely to have blue-collar jobs.
   b.) Most African-Americans do not have a college degree.
   c.) Most African-Americans are not ambitious.
Appendix G: Affect Measure

Please indicate how much it describes how you are 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>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Happy</td>
<td>Doesn’t apply at all</td>
<td>Doesn’t apply at all</td>
<td>Very much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilty</td>
<td>Doesn’t apply at all</td>
<td>Very much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Doesn’t apply at all</td>
<td>Very much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shameful</td>
<td>Doesn’t apply at all</td>
<td>Very much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energetic</td>
<td>Doesn’t apply at all</td>
<td>Very much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embarrassed</td>
<td>Doesn’t apply at all</td>
<td>Very much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>