

Social Psychological
and Personality Science

**White's Perceptions of Biracial Individuals' Race Shift When
Biracials Speak Out Against Bias**

Journal:	<i>Social Psychological and Personality Science</i>
Manuscript ID	SPPS-16-0587.R1
Manuscript Type:	Original Manuscript
Keywords:	Racial Identity, Prejudice/Stereotyping, Multiracial Identity, Intergroup Relations, Impression Formation
Abstract:	<p>Previous research suggests that a person's racial identity shapes the way others respond when that person speaks out against racial prejudice. In the present research, we consider instead how speaking out against racial prejudice shapes people's impressions of a confronter's racial identity, such as experiences with discrimination, stereotype enactment, and even phenotype. Two experiments found that White perceivers evaluated a Black/White biracial person who spoke out against (versus remained silent to) racial prejudice as more stigmatized and Black-identified, and as having more stereotypically Black (vs. White) preferences and Black (vs. White) ancestry when they confronted. The faces of biracial confronters (vs. non-confronters) were also recalled as more phenotypically Black (vs. White; Study 2). This evidence suggests that speaking out against bias colors Whites' impressions of a biracial target across both subjective and objective measures of racial identity. Implications for interracial interactions and interpersonal perception are discussed.</p>

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts



Abstract

Previous research suggests that a person's racial identity shapes the way others respond when that person speaks out against racial prejudice. In the present research, we consider instead how speaking out against racial prejudice shapes people's impressions of a confronter's racial identity, such as experiences with discrimination, stereotype enactment, and even phenotype. Two experiments found that White perceivers evaluated a Black/White biracial person who spoke out against (versus remained silent to) racial prejudice as more stigmatized and Black-identified, and as having more stereotypically Black (vs. White) preferences and Black (vs. White) ancestry when they confronted. The faces of biracial confronters (vs. non-confronters) were also recalled as more phenotypically Black (vs. White; Study 2). This evidence suggests that speaking out against bias colors Whites' impressions of a biracial target across both subjective and objective measures of racial identity. Implications for interracial interactions and interpersonal perception are discussed.

Abstract Word Count = 146

Key words: biracial, multiracial, person perception, confronting, bias

White's Perceptions of Biracial Individuals' Race Shift When Biracials Speak Out Against Bias

Overt prejudice, such as comments that endorse racial stereotypes or jokes with racist undertones, persists in intergroup interactions (Gaertner & Dovidio, 2005; Sue, 2010; Swim, Hyers, Cohen, Fitzgerald, & Bylsma, 2003) and may even be on the rise (Lichtblau, 2016). Therefore, it is critical to understand both the drivers and consequences of speaking out to address prejudice. The prejudice confrontation literature has documented when and why people confront bias and how to do so effectively (Good, Moss-Racusin, & Sanchez, 2012; Rattan & Dweck, 2010; Stone, Whitehead, Schmader, & Focella, 2011). It has also explored the intrapersonal and interpersonal consequences of speaking out to address bias for both targets and observers. This work has focused on members of stigmatized groups (e.g., monoracial minorities and women) engaged in intergroup interactions and majority group members responding to an ingroup members' bias. It has also primarily considered either the effectiveness of the confrontation, the ease of the interaction (e.g., levels of anger or hostility), or interpersonal evaluations outside the realm of race (e.g., how positively the confronter is rated; Czopp, Monteith, & Mark, 2006; Swim & Hyers, 1999; Kaiser & Miller, 2001, 2003; Schultz & Maddox, 2013; Shelton, Richeson, Salvatore, & Hill, 2006; Woodzicka & LaFrance, 2001). The present research extends this important work in two ways. First, we explore the consequences of speaking out for biracial individuals who hold both minority and majority group identities, a group that has to date been overlooked by prejudice confrontation research. Second, we explore a novel consequence of speaking out to address bias. Specifically, we explore how speaking out against bias constructs in observers' minds important facets of a biracial individual's racial identity, such as experiences with discrimination, stereotype enactment, and even phenotype.

CONFRONTING COLORS

3

The Consequences of Condemning Bias

Speaking out against bias is an important vehicle for prejudice reduction (Rokeach, 1973). For example, after being confronted for displaying prejudice, perpetrators stereotyped less and expressed less prejudice (Czopp et al., 2006). However, people often do not confront prejudice when the opportunity to do so arises, even if they generally affirm the value and necessity of doing so (Kawakami, Dunn, Karmali, & Dovidio, 2009; Swim & Hyers, 1999).

When people do speak out to address bias, targeted group members are particularly derogated and disliked, while anti-bias messages are received more smoothly when they come from majority group members (Munger, 2016). People derogate racial minorities who confront discrimination, labeling them as “complainers” and evaluating them negatively (Kaiser & Miller, 2001, 2003), yet individuals still expect racial minorities to speak out when bias occurs (Crosby, Monin, & Richardson, 2008). In contrast, when White actors speak out to address bias, people feel less discomfort and annoyance than when racial minorities engage in the same action (Czopp & Monteith, 2003; Gulker, Mark, & Monteith, 2013; Schultz & Maddox, 2013). This is particularly the case when White perceivers evaluate the confronter.

To date, research has only explored the impression formation consequences of confronting racism in the context of monoracial identity, and scholars know nothing about the consequences of confronting in the context of biracial identity. The lack of research on this topic is a significant omission. Biracial individuals are among the fastest-growing population segments in the U.S. and U.K., and they are most commonly members of both targeted and non-targeted groups (Gaither, 2014; Humes, Jones, & Ramirez, 2011). As noted above, existing research suggests that a confronter’s racial identity is intimately related to perceivers’ responses. This raises theoretical and practical questions concerning how interpersonal perception processes

CONFRONTING COLORS

4

1
2
3 unfold when biracial individuals confront (or remain silent to) expressions of prejudice. Given
4
5 that speaking out to address bias has such potential for positive intergroup consequences – but
6
7 that there are also many challenges to harnessing this potential – efforts to uncover a more
8
9 complete understanding of the consequences of experiencing and censuring bias among
10
11 individuals who are subject to it are vital.
12
13

14
15 We consider a new consequence of speaking out to address bias: shifting perceptions of
16
17 racial identity. We focus on perceptions of racial identity as outcomes because the consequences
18
19 of being perceived as more minority in terms of racial identification or physical appearance are
20
21 serious for racial minorities. For example, African Americans who have higher levels of racial
22
23 identification endure more racial discrimination (Kaiser & Pratt-Hyatt, 2009; Sellers & Shelton,
24
25 2003). Darker skin tone is also associated with social rejection and greater negative stereotyping
26
27 (Hebl, Williams, Sundermann, Kell, & Davies, 2012; Maddox & Gray, 2002). Similarly, being
28
29 stereotyped, even in a “positive” manner, can negatively impact individuals (Cheryan &
30
31 Bodenhausen, 2000; Shih, Ambady, Richeson, Fujita, & Gray, 2002). If the consequences of
32
33 confronting prejudice relate to group memberships, then understanding the consequences of
34
35 confronting prejudice for biracials centers on first understanding how others view their racial
36
37 identity if and when they speak out.
38
39
40
41
42

43
44 We propose that, because the act of confronting racial bias is normatively a behavior
45
46 more associated with minority (versus majority) group members” (e.g., Crosby et al., 2008;
47
48 Gulker, et al., 2013), observers may view biracial individuals who speak up against bias as
49
50 “more minority. Although people tend to believe that race is something that cannot be shifted
51
52 (Smedley & Smedley, 2005), perceptions of a biracial person’s race can be malleable (for a
53
54 review, see Gaither, 2014). Thus, this research also extends work on the interpersonal perception
55
56
57
58
59
60

CONFRONTING COLORS

5

of racial identity, which encompasses social perception generally and the perception of biracial identity more specifically. In doing so, it also contributes to challenging existing assumptions that have developed based on decades of research in intergroup relations that has largely focused on monoracials (c.f., Shih & Sanchez, 2005).

Current Research

The current research examined whether speaking out about racial inequality shapes the way White individuals perceive and remember White/Minority biracial individuals' race. We hypothesized that speaking out to address prejudice (versus remaining silent) would cause observers to construe biracial individuals as more minority. This prediction was tested in two experiments that operationalized race perceptions using subjective measures, including impressions of a biracial individual's affiliation with his minority identity (S1), stereotypical preferences (e.g., music, friendships, S1), amount of White and minority ancestry (S2), and racial stigmatization (S1-2). The research also explored whether the confrontation of prejudice would similarly shift Whites' objective perceptions of biracial faces (S2). If so, this pattern would suggest that prejudice confrontation is seen as a minority prototype. All together, we expected to find that prejudice confrontation colors Whites' perceptions of biracials' race.

To assess whether shifting perceptions of race are unique to biracials, rather than all racial minorities, we also assessed Whites' perceptions of a Black monoracial person who either speaks out or remains silent after an incident of prejudice. We did not include a White target for comparison because our hypothesis was directional: we predicted that biracials would be viewed as more minority if they confronted. All study measures and manipulations are reported and posted on the Open Science Framework at <https://osf.io/ha54w/>¹.

Study 1

CONFRONTING COLORS

6

1
2
3 Study 1 hypothesized that when White perceivers observe a Black/White biracial person
4 confront a specific instance of racism (vs. remain silent), they will view him as more identified
5 with his Black identity. It also explored whether they would assume he has experienced more
6 stigmatization, an experience that is associated with minority (and particularly Black) identity
7 (Kaiser & Pratt-Hyatt, 2009; Sanchez, Good, & Chavez, 2011). It also investigated the extent to
8 which prejudice confrontation leads Whites to apply minority group stereotypes to biracial
9 people, in this case stereotypes about Black American's preferences for athletics (Stone, Lynch,
10 Sjomeling, & Darley, 1999), music (Phelan & Rudman, 2010), and friendship networks (Wout,
11 Murphy, & Steele, 2010). These three dimensions of stereotyping were selected because they are
12 not overtly negative and thus less likely to be affected by social desirability concerns.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

Participants

27
28
29 Based on an a priori power analysis seeking to capture 80% statistical power and medium
30 effect size (.25) for a two-way ANOVA, our goal was to recruit a minimum of 128
31 undergraduates in a single wave before analyzing the data. One hundred thirty White
32 undergraduates completed the study in their classrooms in exchange for extra class credit. Three
33 participants were excluded from analyses for failing to pass a manipulation check (see below),
34 leaving a final sample of 127 ($M_{age} = 22.57$, $SD_{age} = 4.67$; 68.5% female; 31.5% male)
35 participants.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

Procedure

46
47
48 The research employed a 2 (race condition: Black vs. Biracial) x 2 (confront condition:
49 confront vs. no confront) between-subjects design with participants randomly assigned to
50 condition. Upon providing informed consent, participants were told they would review and form
51 impressions of a student at another U.S. university based only on a short background information
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

CONFRONTING COLORS

7

1
2
3 sheet and personal essay; these materials were previously validated by past research on prejudice
4
5 confrontation (from Study 1, Kaiser, Hagiwara, Malahy, & Wilkins, 2009). Participants were
6
7 told that the student completed this information as a part of a previous experiment. To bolster the
8
9 story, the student's last name and college dormitory were ostensibly anonymized. Participants
10
11 were told to pay close attention to this background information, as they would be asked questions
12
13 about it later. Of course, these materials were used to convey the experimental manipulations.
14
15

16
17 Other than the experimental manipulations of race and confrontation, all information
18
19 presented about the student was the same across conditions. He was always described as a 19-
20
21 year old male named Will whose responses to a short survey on college life indicated he was
22
23 adjusting well. The race manipulation was presented among other demographic information. In
24
25 the Black condition, the student selected only the "Black/African American" box, and in the
26
27 Biracial condition he selected both the "Black/African American" and "White/Caucasian" boxes.
28
29 In response to the prompt, "please write about a significant life experience," the student's short
30
31 essay always described a situation in which an acquaintance made several unambiguously racist
32
33 comments (e.g., a bigoted joke; a question about why Black students were moving into a dorm
34
35 that housed several honors students) at a college party. In both conditions the student identified
36
37 the comments as racist and indicated disagreement with what was said; however, the student
38
39 either described himself as confronting the biased statement (Confront condition) or remaining
40
41 silent despite disagreeing with the biased statement (No Confront condition). After reviewing
42
43 this information, participants completed a short manipulation check to ensure that they correctly
44
45 remembered the target's race and gender. Then, they evaluated the target on all dependent
46
47 measures described below, as well as filler items (e.g., favorite movie or book; personality
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

CONFRONTING COLORS

8

characteristics) unrelated to the present hypotheses designed to mask our interest in race impressions. Finally, participants reported their age, gender, and race, and were fully debriefed.

Materials

The scale anchors for all dependent measures were 1 (*not at all likely*) and 7 (*extremely likely*).

Perceived Black identification ($\alpha = .96$; 3 items). Participants indicated the extent to which they viewed the target as identifying with his Black identity by responding to the following three questions: “How strongly do you think the author identifies with being Black?,” “To what degree do you think the author identifies with being Black?,” and “How strongly do you think the author sees himself as being Black?”

Perceived stigmatization ($\alpha = .90$, 3 items). Participants indicated the extent to which they expected he had been a target of racial discrimination by indicating how likely or not the target “experienced a lot of racial discrimination,” “encounters a lot of racial prejudice,” and “has likely experienced racial discrimination.”

Perceived Black stereotypicality ($\alpha = .77$; 7 items). Participants indicated the extent to which they ascribed preferences stereotypically associated with Black identity to the student. Five items assessed how much participants applied stereotypes commonly associated with Black identity, including sports, music, and friendship preferences (e.g., “How likely is it that the author’s favorite music is rap?”; “How likely do you think it is that the author’s best friends are Black?”) and two items tapped into cultural stereotypes commonly associated with White identity (e.g., “How likely is it that Will’s favorite music is rock n’ roll?”). The White stereotyping items were reverse coded and scores were calculated such that higher scores indicate greater Black identity.

CONFRONTING COLORS

Results

Preliminary analyses revealed that participant gender was unrelated to the main results; women viewed the Black student as more stigmatized than the biracial student, $p = .01$, and all other main effects and interactions with participant gender were nonsignificant, $ps > .10$.

Turning to our focal analyses, to examine whether confronting racism affected Whites' race perceptions, ANOVAs were conducted separately on perceived Black identification, perceived stigma, and perceived Black stereotypicality, with race condition and confronting condition as the between-subjects factors. All interactions are interpreted with LSD posthoc analyses; significant interactions are graphed in Figure 1.

Perceived Black identification. There were two significant main effects of race condition, $F(1, 123) = 11.44, p = .001, d = .56$, and confronting condition, $F(1, 123) = 15.32, p < .001, d = .65$. However, the predicted interaction between race and confrontation conditions, $F(1, 123) = 3.79, p = .05, \eta^2_p = .03$, qualified these main effects. As expected, White observers viewed the biracial student as more Black-identified when he confronted ($M = 5.38, SD = .88$) versus remained silent, ($M = 4.15, SD = 1.34$), $p < .001, d = 1.09$, 95% CI [.64, 1.82]. Confronting ($M = 5.68, SD = 1.34$) versus remaining silent ($M = 5.26, SD = 1.11$) did not affect perceptions of the Black student's Black identification, $p = .17$. Additional analyses showed that, in the no-confrontation condition, observers rated the Black student as more Black-identified than the biracial student, $p < .001, d = .90$, 95% CI [.54, 1.70]. However, in the confront condition, participants did not view the Black and biracial student as differently Black-identified, $p = .32$.

Perceived stigmatization. Two significant main effects of race condition, $F(1, 123) = 4.46, p = .04, d = .36$, and confronting condition, $F(1, 123) = 5.37, p = .02, d = .39$, emerged.

CONFRONTING COLORS

10

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

However, they were qualified by the predicted race condition x confrontation condition interaction, $F(1, 123) = 4.00, p = .05, \eta^2_p = .03$. As hypothesized, participants viewed the biracial student as more stigmatized when he confronted ($M = 5.06, SD = 1.12$) versus remained silent ($M = 4.13, SD = 1.17$), $p = .003, d = .81, 95\% CI [.33, 1.55]$. Perceptions of the Black student's stigmatization did not vary depending on whether he confronted ($M = 5.09, SD = 1.17$) or remained silent ($M = 5.02, SD = 1.40$), $p = .82$. Examining the data in another way, in the no-confrontation condition, the Black participant was viewed as more stigmatized than the biracial participant, $p = .004, d = .69, 95\% CI [.30, 1.49]$, whereas in the confront condition the Black and biracial students were not viewed differently, $p = .94$.

Perceived Black stereotypicality. Two significant main effects of race condition, $F(1, 123) = 15.71, p < .001, d = .70$, and confronting condition, $F(1, 123) = 4.32, p = .04, d = .34$, were found. As predicted, race condition and confronting condition also interacted significantly, $F(1, 123) = 7.35, p = .01, \eta^2_p = .06$. As expected, the Biracial student was viewed as more stereotypically Black more strongly when he confronted ($M = 4.29, SD = 0.58$) versus remained silent ($M = 3.66, SD = .87$), $p = .001, d = .85, 95\% CI [-1.01, -.26]$. The Black target's perceived Black stereotypicality did not vary depending on whether he confronted ($M = 4.46, SD = 0.65$) or remained silent ($M = 4.55, SD = .85$), $p = .66$. Analyses also revealed that, in the no-confront condition, the Black participant was viewed as more stereotypically Black than the biracial participant, $p < .001, d = 1.03, 95\% CI [.52, 1.26]$, whereas the Black and biracial targets were not viewed differently in the confront condition, $p = .39$.

CONFRONTING COLORS




Figure 1. Interaction of race condition and confronting condition on perceived Black identification, perceived stigmatization, and perceived stereotypicality; error bars represent standard errors. $ps \leq .01$.

Discussion

Study 1 offers initial support for the hypothesis that addressing prejudice shifts Whites' perceptions of biracial individuals' race. When told he had confronted prejudice, Whites viewed a biracial student as more Black identified and stigmatized, and attached more stereotypically Black preferences to him, than when told he had remained silent. Shifting race perceptions were not found for the Black monoracial target. When the biracial person was described as having confronted prejudice, Whites' impressions of him did not significantly differ from their impressions of the Black target, in terms of his Black-identification and experiences with stigmatization.

Study 2

CONFRONTING COLORS

12

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Study 2 sought to conceptually replicate and extend this research to test whether confronting prejudice also influences physical perceptions with an objective assessment of face perception. The prediction was that the act of confronting prejudice (rather than remaining silent) leads White observers to see a biracial person as more Black, both in terms of basic physical features and biological ancestry.

Participants

Again, our predetermined goal was to recruit a minimum of 128 undergraduates in a single wave before the end of term. One hundred forty-seven White undergraduates volunteered to participate in this study. Twenty-seven participants were excluded from analyses for failing to pass a manipulation check², leaving a final sample of 120 ($M_{\text{age}} = 20.10$, $SD_{\text{age}} = 2.28$; 51.3% male; 48.7% female) participants.

Procedure and Materials

Participants completed the study on a computer in a laboratory (on either a voluntary basis or for extra class credit). Study 2 followed the procedures of Study 1 for manipulating race (Black versus Biracial) and confrontation (Confront versus No Confront) conditions. New to Study 2, they were shown a photograph of the student before they reviewed his background information. The photograph was always a 50/50 morph of a phenotypically White and a phenotypically Black face. This face represented the midpoint of a larger series of nine photographs ranging from 100% White-100% Black phenotypicality in set increments (from Freeman, Pauker, & Sanchez, 2016). Because Study 2 participants completed the survey on a computer, they were able to look at the photograph for as long as they chose, but it was removed from participants' view while they evaluated the student's information and completed the dependent measures in the order listed below.

CONFRONTING COLORS

Perceived stigmatization. Participants completed the same measure as in Study 1 ($\alpha = .85$).

Objective facial judgment. Participants were shown the full array of all nine photographic morphs and were asked to identify the original photograph of the student (see Figure 2). The first photograph (1 on the scale) represented a phenotypically 100% Black/0% White morph, the middle photograph (5 on the scale) represented the phenotypically 50% Black/50% White morph and was the photo previously presented as the student, and the last photograph (9 on the scale) represented a phenotypically 0% Black/100% White morph. All intermediate photographs shifted in phenotypicality in set increments.



Figure 2. These photographs show the nine faces, ranging in Black-White phenotypicality, that were shown to participants for the objective facial judgment measure. The photograph denoted with an asterisk (*) is the face that was identified to participants as the target before they reviewed his information.

Perceived ancestry. Participants responded to the following question: “Which do you think best represents the target’s racial make-up?” The 11 scale anchors ranged in 10% increments from 0 (100% White/0% Black) to 10 (0% White/100% Black; modified from Sanchez, Good & Chavez, 2011).

Results

Preliminary analyses revealed that participant gender was unrelated to the main results; women viewed the student (regardless of his race) as more stigmatized than did men, $p = .002$, and all other main effects and interactions with participant gender were $p > .13$.

CONFRONTING COLORS

14

1
2
3 To examine whether the confronting racism affected Whites' racial impressions of the
4 target, ANOVAs were conducted separately on perceived stigmatization, objective facial
5 judgments, and perceived ancestry, with race condition and confronting condition as the
6 between-subjects factors. All interactions are interpreted with LSD posthoc analyses; significant
7 interactions are graphed in Figure 3.
8
9

10
11 **Perceived stigmatization.** There was a significant main effect of confronting condition,
12 $F(1, 116) = 13.80, p < .001, d = .69$, but not race condition, $F(1, 116) = .07, p = .79$. Notably, the
13 predicted interaction between race condition and confronting condition, $F(1, 116) = 8.43, p =$
14 $.004, \eta^2_p = .07$, emerged. As expected, the biracial student was viewed as more stigmatized when
15 he confronted ($M = 5.51, SD = 1.25$) versus did not confront ($M = 4.24, SD = 1.06$) the
16 perpetrator, $p < .001, d = 1.10, 95\% CI [.76, 1.80]$. Perceptions the Black student's
17 stigmatization did not vary depending on whether he confronted ($M = 4.90, SD = .82$) or
18 remained silent ($M = 4.74, SD = 1.03$), $p = .58$. Examining the interaction in another way, in the
19 no-confront condition, the Black target was viewed as more stigmatized than the biracial target, p
20 $= .07, d = .48, 95\% CI [-.03, 1.05]$, though this effect did not reach significance. New to Study 2,
21 we also found that in the confront condition, the biracial student was rated as more stigmatized
22 than the Black student, $p = .03, d = .58, 95\% CI [-1.15, -.07]$.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 **Objective facial judgments.** There was a significant main effect of confronting
44 condition, $F(1, 116) = 12.99, p < .001, d = .68$, but not of race condition, $F(1, 116) = .76, p = .39$.
45 Importantly, the predicted significant interaction between race condition and confronting
46 condition emerged, $F(1, 116) = 18.52, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .14$. As hypothesized, the Biracial student
47 was remembered as having more phenotypically Black features when he confronted bias ($M =$
48 $5.80, SD = 1.30$) versus remained silent ($M = 4.26, SD = .83$), $p < .001, d = 1.41, 95\% CI [1.01,$
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

CONFRONTING COLORS

2.06]. Perceptions of the Black student's phenotype did not vary depending on whether he confronted ($M = 5.13$, $SD = 1.17$) or remained silent ($M = 5.27$, $SD = .87$), $p = .63$. That is, participants accurately remembered the Black student's face regardless of condition, but they misremembered the Biracial student's face depending on whether or not he spoke out against bias. Examining the interaction in another way, in the no-confrontation condition, the Black student was remembered as having more phenotypically Black features than the biracial student, $p < .001$, $d = 1.19$, 95% CI [.46, 1.55]. Consistent with the pattern of data observed for the perceived discrimination variable, we also found that in the confront condition, the biracial student was also remembered as having darker skin tone than the Black student, $p = .02$, $d = .54$, 95% CI [-1.21, -.13].

Perceived ancestry. Two significant main effects of confronting condition, $F(1, 116) = 11.00$, $p = .001$, $d = .63$, and race condition, $F(1, 116) = 3.78$, $p = .05$, $d = .37$, emerged. The hypothesized interaction between race condition and confronting condition, $F(1, 116) = 10.36$, $p = .002$, $\eta^2_p = .08$, was significant. As expected, the biracial student was evaluated as having greater Black/African American ancestry when he confronted ($M = 7.20$, $SD = 1.92$) versus remained silent ($M = 5.15$, $SD = 1.60$), $p < .001$, $d = 1.16$, 95% CI [1.20, 2.90]. Ancestry perceptions of the Black student did not vary by confronting condition, ($M_{confront} = 6.80$, $SD_{confront} = 1.86$, versus $M_{silent} = 6.77$, $SD_{silent} = 1.39$), $p = .95$. Additionally, pairwise comparisons revealed that when they remained silent, the Black student was perceived as having greater Black/African American ancestry than the biracial target, $p < .001$, $d = 1.08$, 95% CI [.74, 2.51]. The Black and Biracial students did not vary in perceived ancestry when they confronted, $p = .37$.

CONFRONTING COLORS

16




Figure 3. Interaction of race condition and confronting condition on perceived stigmatization, facial judgment, and perceived ancestry; error bars represent standard errors. * $p_s \leq .01$.

Discussion

Study 2 suggests that speaking out against bias shifts Whites' perceptions of biracial individuals' physicalized race. When Whites were told that a biracial student spoke out against prejudice, they remembered his face as being more phenotypically Black, compared to when they were told he had remained silent. These perceivers also estimated that the biracial person who confronted (versus remained silent) had greater amounts of Black (versus White) ancestry.

General Discussion

The present research showed that Black/White biracial individuals are viewed as more Black when they speak up to address racial bias. Study 1 found that White observers viewed a biracial person who spoke out (vs. stayed silent) against racial bias to be more Black-identified and to have experienced more discrimination. It further found that Whites ascribed more stereotypically Black preferences to the biracial person when he was described as confronting

CONFRONTING COLORS

1
2
3 prejudice, rather than remaining silent. Study 2 investigated how physicalized these effects might
4
5 be. It found that confronting shaped Whites' impressions of the biracial student's racial ancestry
6
7 and their perception of what he looked like. Indeed, when they learned he had confronted
8
9 prejudice just once, Whites recalled the student as more phenotypically Black, and also estimated
10
11 that they had more Black ancestry.
12
13

14
15 These studies advance understandings of prejudice confrontation by exploring for the
16
17 first time people's responses to biracial' prejudice confrontation, and by offering new insights
18
19 into how prejudice confrontation can impact perceived racial identity. Given that group
20
21 memberships exert meaningful influence on both the effectiveness of and backlash from
22
23 confronting prejudice, understanding how biracials' perceived group memberships shift as a
24
25 function of their confronting behavior was an essential first step. Our results suggest that biracial
26
27 individuals, like monoracial minorities, may face negative evaluations when they confront, and
28
29 investigating this directly is a natural next step for future research. They also identify shifting
30
31 race perceptions as a unique consequence of confronting for biracial targets; observers'
32
33 impressions of a Black individual did not vary based on whether he spoke out or remained silent.
34
35
36
37
38

39 This research also suggests that confronting racial prejudice may be viewed as a minority
40
41 prototype, and as distanced from the concept of Whiteness. Indeed, this research consistently
42
43 found that when the biracial and Black student were described as confronting racism, they were
44
45 viewed as equally Black-identified and stigmatized, and as having similarly stereotypically-
46
47 Black preferences. Perceivers only distinguished between the Black and biracial student when he
48
49 was described as not having confronted bias; when he was silent in the face of bias, observers
50
51 evaluated the biracial person as less Black-identified and less stigmatized, and as having fewer
52
53 stereotypically Black preferences and less Black (vs. White) ancestry, than the Black person.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

CONFRONTING COLORS

18

1
2
3 Thus, the present research may highlight a previously unidentified barrier to racial progress;
4
5 future studies should investigate whether the psychological separation of “confronting” and
6
7 “Whiteness” may be one factor driving Whites’ reluctance to discuss race and confront racial
8
9 bias (Kawakami et al., 2009).
10
11

12
13 Furthermore, in the existing racial prototypicality literature, researchers have examined
14
15 how looking more or less like a typical group member affects the way racial minorities are
16
17 treated (e.g., Hebl et al., 2012; Maddox & Gray, 2002). Rather, our works suggests that
18
19 prototypicality judgments may occur even sooner, before perceivers see a target, if perceivers are
20
21 exposed to social information about the target’s actions in different situations (e.g., gossip). Our
22
23 work is also some of the first to suggest that judgments of prototypicality are shaped by
24
25 behaviors, not just phenotypic physical characteristics. By definition, the biracial target did not
26
27 exhibit high phenotypical stereotypicality, but the present results suggest that White perceivers
28
29 viewed speaking out to address prejudice as “acting Black,” to enough of a degree that it even
30
31 shaded this physical perception. This is important because people, in general, may be reluctant to
32
33 confront prejudice when they know confrontation may risk being stereotyped or subsumed into
34
35 the stereotype of prejudiced targets (e.g., Kroeper, Sanchez, & Himmelstein, 2014).
36
37
38
39

40
41 The present research presents an essential first step in understanding the dynamics at play
42
43 when biracial individuals address prejudice. Future research should address some of the
44
45 limitations of the current research by examining whether or not the effects observed in the
46
47 present research would also be observed in actual interpersonal interactions involving direct
48
49 confrontations of racial bias. It should also examine whether biracial individuals, like monoracial
50
51 minorities, are dismissed as complainers and thus less effective confronters than majority group
52
53 members (c.f. Kaiser & Miller, 2001; 2003), and whether or not these effects would generalize to
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

CONFRONTING COLORS

1
2
3 perceptions of biracial individuals with other component racial identities (e.g., White/Asian
4
5 biracials) or among non-White perceivers. Research could also explore how biracial individuals
6
7 experience their racial identity when confronting bias or staying silent, or whether Whites might
8
9 evaluate and experience positive messages about racial equality (rather than negative messages
10
11 about racial discrimination) that come from biracial targets as less threatening. Research should
12
13 also seek to identify potential mediators to explain why White perceivers view biracial
14
15 candidates as more Black. For example, a study could directly test whether a measure assessing
16
17 the perceived psychological disconnect between “confronting” and “Whiteness” discussed above
18
19 – such as normative beliefs about who should confront racism – accounts for the relationship
20
21 between confronting and perceived Blackness. Additionally, given that previous research finds
22
23 that individuals respond more positively to confrontations that come from members of their own
24
25 racial group (Czopp & Monteith, 2003; Gulker et al., 2013; Schultz & Maddox, 2013), future
26
27 research should also explore individual characteristics or ideologies that might prevent Whites
28
29 from viewing biracial individuals as outgroup members when they address prejudice.
30
31
32
33
34
35

Conclusion

36
37
38 The present research considers for the first time the unique psychological dynamics that
39
40 arise when biracial individuals speak out to address prejudice. It finds that confronting racial
41
42 prejudice colors Whites’ perceptions of White/Black biracial individuals’ race. In doing so, this
43
44 extends the study of prejudice confrontation, person perception, and intergroup processes
45
46
47
48 literatures in both theoretically and practically important ways.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

- Cheryan, S., & Bodenhausen, G. V. (2000). When positive stereotypes threaten intellectual performance: The psychological hazards of “model minority” status. *Psychological Science, 11*(5), 399-402.
- Crosby, J. R., Monin, B., & Richardson, D. (2008). Where do we look during potentially offensive behavior? *Psychological Science, 19*(3), 226-228, doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9280.2008.02072.x
- Czopp, A. M., & Monteith, M. J. (2003). Confronting prejudice (literally): reactions to confrontations of racial and gender bias. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29*(4), 532–544. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0146167202250923>
- Czopp, A. M., Monteith, M. J., & Mark, A. Y. (2006). Standing up for a change: Reducing bias through interpersonal confrontation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90*(5), 784–803. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.90.5.784>
- Freeman, J.B., Pauker, K., & Sanchez, D.T. (2016). A perceptual pathway to bias: Interracial exposure reduces abrupt shifts in real-time race perception that predict mixed-race bias. *Psychological Science, 27*(4) 502–517. DOI: 10.1177/0956797615627418
- Gaertner, S. L., & Dovidio, J. F. (2005). Understanding and addressing contemporary racism: From aversive racism to the Common Ingroup Identity Model. *Journal of Social Issues, 61*(3), 615–639. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.2005.00424.x>
- Gaither, S. E. (2015). “Mixed” results: Multiracial research and identity explorations. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 24*, 114–119. <http://doi.org/doi:10.1177/0963721414558115>
- Good, J. J., Moss-Racusin, C. A., & Sanchez, D. T. (2012). When do we confront: Perceptions of costs and benefits predict confronting discrimination on behalf of the self and others.

CONFRONTING COLORS

21

1
2
3 *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 36, 210–226.

4
5 Gulker, J. E., Mark, A. Y., & Monteith, M. J. (2013). Confronting prejudice: The who, what, and
6
7 why of confrontation effectiveness. *Social Influence*, 8(4), 280–293.

8
9
10 <http://doi.org/10.1080/15534510.2012.736879>

11
12 Hebl, M. R., Williams, M. J., Sundermann, J. M., Kell, H. J., & Davies, P. G. (2012). Selectively
13
14 friending: Racial stereotypicality and social rejection. *Journal of Experimental Social*
15
16 *Psychology*, 48(6), 1329–1335. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2012.05.019>

17
18 Humes, K., Jones, N. A., & Ramirez, R. R. (2011). Overview of race and Hispanic origin, 2010.
19
20 US Department of Commerce, Economics and Statistics Administration, US Census
21
22 Bureau.

23
24 Kahn, K. B., & Davies, P. G. (2011). Differentially dangerous? Phenotypic racial stereotypicality
25
26 increases implicit bias among ingroup and outgroup members. *Group Processes &*
27
28 *Intergroup Relations*, 14(4), 569–580. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1368430210374609>

29
30 Kaiser, C. R., Hagiwara, N., Malahy, L. W., & Wilkins, C. L. (2009). Group identification
31
32 moderates attitudes toward ingroup members who confront discrimination. *Journal of*
33
34 *Experimental Social Psychology*, 45(4), 770–777. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2009.04.027>

35
36 Kaiser, C. R., & Miller, C. T. (2001). Stop complaining! The social costs of making attributions
37
38 to discrimination. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 27(2), 254–263.
39
40
41 <http://doi.org/10.1177/0146167201272010>

42
43 Kaiser, C. R., & Miller, C. T. (2003). Derogating the victim: The interpersonal consequences of
44
45 blaming events on discrimination. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 6(3), 227–237.
46
47
48 <http://doi.org/10.1177/13684302030063001>

49
50 Kaiser, C. R., & Pratt-Hyatt, J. S. (2009). Distributing prejudice unequally: Do Whites direct
51
52

CONFRONTING COLORS

22

1
2
3 their prejudice toward strongly identified minorities? *Journal of Personality and Social*
4
5
6
7 *Psychologyocial*, 96(2), 432–445. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0012877>

8 Kawakami, K., Dunn, E., Karmali, F., & Dovidio, J. F. (2009). Mispredicting affective and
9
10 behavioral responses to racism. *Science*, 323(5911), 276–278.
11
12
13 <http://doi.org/10.1126/science.1164951>

14
15 Kroeper, K. M., Sanchez, D. T., & Himmelstein, M. S. (2014). Heterosexual men's confrontation
16
17 of sexual prejudice: The role of precarious manhood. *Sex Roles*, 70, 1-13. doi
18
19 10.1007/s11199-013-0306-z.

20
21
22 Lichtblau, E. (2016, November). Retrieved from
23
24
25 http://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/15/us/politics/fbi-hate-crimes-muslims.html?_r=1

26
27 Maddox, K. B., & Gray, S. A. (2002). Cognitive representations of Black Americans:
28
29 Reexploring the role of skin tone. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 28(2), 250–
30
31
32 259. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0146167202282010>

33
34 Munger, K. (2016). Tweetment effects on the tweeted: Experimentally reducing racist
35
36 harassment. *Political Behavior*. doi:10.1007/s11109-016-9373-5

37
38
39 Phelan, J. E., & Rudman, L. A. (2010). Reactions to ethnic deviance: The role of backlash in
40
41 racial stereotype maintenance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 99(2), 265–
42
43
44 281. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0018304>

45
46 Rattan, A., & Dweck, C. S. (2010). Who confronts prejudice? The role of implicit theories in the
47
48 motivation to confront prejudice. *Psychological Science*, 21(7), 952–9.
49
50
51 <http://doi.org/10.1177/0956797610374740>

52
53 Rokeach, M. (1973). *The nature of human values*. New York: Free Press.

54
55 Sanchez, D. T., Good, J. J., & Chavez, G. F. (2011). Blood quantum and perceptions of Black-
56
57
58
59
60

CONFRONTING COLORS

White Biracial targets: The Black Ancestry Prototype model of affirmative action.

Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin, 37(1), 3–14.

<http://doi.org/10.1177/0146167210389473>

Schultz, J. R., & Maddox, K. B. (2013). Shooting the messenger to spite the message? Exploring reactions to claims of racial bias. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin*, 39(3), 346–58.

<http://doi.org/10.1177/0146167212475223>

Sellers, R. M., & Shelton, J. N. (2003). The role of racial identity in perceived racial discrimination. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84(5), 1079-1092. DOI:

10.1037/0022-3514.84.5.1079

Shelton, J. N., Richeson, J. A., Salvatore, J., & Hill, D. M. (2006). Silence is not golden: The intrapersonal consequences of not confronting prejudice. In S. Levin & C. Van Laar (Eds.), *Stigma and Group Inequality: Social Psychological Perspectives* (pp. 65 – 82). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Shih, M., Ambady, N., Richeson, J. A., Fujita, K., & Gray, H. M. (2002). Stereotype performance boosts: The impact of self-relevance and the manner of stereotype activation.

Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 83(3), 638-647. DOI: 10.1037//0022-3514.83.3.638

Shih, M., & Sanchez, D. T. (2005). Perspectives and research on the positive and negative implications of having multiple racial identities. *Psychological Bulletin*, 131(4), 569–91.

<http://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.131.4.569>

Smedley, A., & Smedley, B. D. (2005). Race as biology is fiction, racism as a social problem is real: Anthropological and historical perspectives on the social construction of race. *American Psychologist*, 60(1), 16-26. DOI: 10.1037/0003-066X.60.1.16

CONFRONTING COLORS

24

- 1
2
3 Stone, J., Lynch, C. I., Sjomeling, M., & Darley, J. M. (1999). Stereotype threat effects on Black
4 and White athletic performance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*.
5
6
7
8 Stone, J., Whitehead, J., Schmader, T., & Focella, E. (2011). Thanks for asking: Self-affirming
9 questions reduce backlash when stigmatized targets confront prejudice. *Journal of*
10
11
12
13
14
15
16 Sue, D. W. (2010). *Microaggressions in everyday life: Race, gender, and sexual orientation*.
17
18 Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
19
20 Swim, J. K., & Hyers, L. L. (1999). Excuse me—What did you just say?!: Women’s public and
21 private responses to sexist remarks. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 35(1), 68–
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- Swim, J. K., Hyers, L. L., Cohen, L. L., Fitzgerald, D. C., & Bylsma, W. H. (2003). African
American college students’ experiences with everyday racism: Characteristics of and
responses to these incidents. *Journal Of Black Psychology*, 29(1), 38–67.
<http://doi.org/10.1177/0095798402239228>
- Woodzicka, J. A., & LaFrance, M. (2001). Real versus imagined gender harassment. *Journal of*
Social Issues, 57(1), 15–30. <http://doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.00199>
- Wout, D. A., Murphy, M. C., & Steele, C. M. (2010). When your friends matter: The effect of
White students’ racial friendship networks on meta-perceptions and perceived identity
contingencies. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 46(6), 1035–1041.
<http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2010.06.003>

Footnotes

¹ For all studies, we decided a priori that participants who failed to correctly report the student's self-identified race after two tries would be excluded from analyses. All results remain unchanged regardless of whether excluded participants are included or excluded from analyses. Any data collected from participants who did not self-identify was excluded given our a priori hypotheses.

² Study 2 participants were volunteers who were asked to complete a 5-minute study after classes or participating in other research. Consequently, more Study 2 participants failed the manipulation check than Study 1 participants, who were recruited through an undergraduate research pool and thus allocated one hour to complete the research. We included exploratory measures of meta-perceptions (of the students' essentialism and racism and the confronted person's reaction); we only report the key race-related measures that tested the study hypotheses. We did not measure perceived Black identification or stereotypes, nor did we include filler items as included in Study 1, in favor of keeping the study appropriately brief.