WHITES' RACIAL AFFECT: UNDERSTANDING THE ANTIRACIST
TYPE

BY

KATHLEEN KORDESH

THESIS

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Science in Educational Psychology
in the Graduate College of the
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2011

Urbana, Illinois

Master's Committee:

    Associate Professor Lisa Spanierman, Chair, McGill University
    Professor Helen Neville
    Professor James Rounds

Abstract

To learn more about the antiracist racial affect type, as measured by the Psychosocial Costs of Racism to Whites scale (PCRW; Spanierman & Heppner, 2004), the researchers conducted two focus groups. One group was comprised of White students ($n = 5$) whose scores reflected the antiracist racial affect type, whereas the other was comprised of White students ($n = 6$) who did not score as antiracist. Using a modified version of the Consensual Qualitative Research method (Hill, Thompson, & Williams, 1997), analysis revealed six topic domains: (a) manifestations of racial awareness, (b) experiences with diversity while growing up, (c) experiences with diversity at the university, (d) emotional responses to racial issues, (e) perceptions of the former racialized mascot of the university, and (f) expressions of racism. Further validating the PCRW, findings indicated that White students who scored as antiracist differed in important ways from those who did not score as antiracist. Moreover, the students in the antiracist affect type demonstrated a number of similarities to how antiracists have been described in the broader interdisciplinary literature.

Keywords: antiracists, White racial attitudes, costs of racism to Whites, racism

Table of Contents

Chapter 1

Introduction

Scholars in psychology, education, and sociology have begun to explore White racial justice allies, or White antiracists (Kivel, 2002; O'Brien, 2001; Smith & Redington, 2010). Emerging conceptual and empirical scholarship attributes common characteristics to White antiracists, which include exhibiting awareness of structural racism and White privilege, rejecting color-blind racial ideology, and taking action to disrupt racism, (Ayvazian, 2004; Barry, 2008; Kivel, 2002; McKinney & Feagin, 2003; O'Brien, 2001; O'Brien, 2003; Smith & Redington, 2010; Trepagnier, 2010). These characteristics, derived primarily from conceptual scholarship and qualitative research, are described more fully below. The qualitative exploration in the present study builds on previous research on White antiracists and provides us with a deeper understanding of White antiracist university students.

In a related area of inquiry, research emphasizes the importance of racial affect for understanding the complexity of racial attitudes among White university students (Spanierman, Poteat, Beer, & Armstrong, 2006; Spanierman, Todd, & Anderson, 2009; Todd, Spanierman, & Aber, 2010). Moreover, researchers delineated five racial affect types and identified a particular affect type for White antiracists. An examination of racial affect among White racial allies, specifically, might enhance our understanding of these students and inform diversity and equity education interventions geared toward facilitating antiracist awareness and action. In the present study, White antiracist students were identified using a quantitative measure of racial affect. The present study examines the extent to which the antiracists identified by this measure match the characteristics of White antiracists described in the literature, as well as whether these antiracists are in fact different from the other four racial affect types that were identified in previous

research. If we find support for the above questions, we can use this measure as an expedient means of identifying White antiracist students.

Antiracists in the Interdisciplinary Literature

Scholars have described White antiracists as individuals who possess a critical understanding of racism (Kivel, 2002; McKinney & Feagin, 2003; O'Brien, 2001). In a qualitative study among 18 White antiracist activists, Smith and Redington (2010) found that participants acknowledged that structural racism is maintained through laws, institutional policies, and the dominance of White culture. In another qualitative study among 30 White women, Frankenberg (1993) found that White antiracists generally regarded colorblind racial attitudes as oppositional to antiracist efforts. Similarly, O'Brien (2001) interviewed 30 White antiracist activists. Her findings suggested that these individuals acknowledged that Whites often claim that they "don't see color" as a strategy to deny or minimize the existence of racism.

Researchers also found that White antiracists are aware of their racial privilege, or the unearned power and privilege that White individuals receive in society (Smith & Redington, 2010). Upon acknowledging White privilege, researchers suggest that an actively antiracist stance includes the perception that White individuals, as dominant group members, bear most of the responsibility for ending racism (McKinney & Feagin, 2003). Other experts on this group argue, in conceptual works, that White antiracists acknowledge the importance of using their racial privilege to challenge racism (Ayvazian, 2004; Kivel, 2002). White antiracists must also serve as role models to other Whites by showing them that there are White people who actively oppose racism, despite their relative invisibility in dominant culture (Ayvazian, 2004; Kivel,

2

2002; Tatum, 1994; Wise, 2011). Thus, racial awareness is a necessary, but insufficient, criterion for the White antiracist identity.

According to the scholarly literature, White antiracists also engage in behaviors that intentionally, strategically, and consistently challenge racism (Ayvazian, 2004; Kivel, 2002). Such behaviors most often pertain to serving as allies to people of color and teaching other White individuals about racism. In terms of being allies, White antiracists might support people of color who are in leadership positions (Kivel, 2002; O'Brien, 2003) and speak out against racism and White privilege (Barry, 2008; Feagin & McKinney, 2005). White antiracists also discuss racial issues with other White individuals and challenge racist beliefs and actions (Trepagnier, 2010). Research has demonstrated that White antiracists often have developed strategies for talking to other Whites (Smith & Redington, 2010), such as interrupting racist jokes (Kivel, 2002) or writing letters to local organizations or newspapers (O'Brien, 2001). Scholars suggest that White antiracists understand that their social justice behaviors are particularly powerful *because of* their racial privilege (Ayvazian, 2004; Kivel, 2002). While much of the empirical literature on this population has examined professional antiracist activists, White individuals do not have to participate in antiracist organizations in order to be antiracists because they can do so through a commitment to challenging racism in everyday interactions (Trepagnier, 2010). Although these descriptions of White antiracists begin to provide broad characteristics of these individuals, relatively little is known about White antiracists among the undergraduate student population. Therefore, in the current investigation we explore whether a psychometric measure might help university personnel to identify White university undergraduate antiracists; and, we use qualitative methods to examine the characteristics of such students.

White Students' Emotional Reactions to Racism

Scholars assert that White individuals' racial attitudes are connected to strong emotional reactions to the existence of societal racism (Ancis & Szymanski, 2001; Feagin, Vera, & Batur, 2001; Goodman, 2001; Kivel, 2002; Spanierman et al., 2008). These emotions have largely been studied individually and can include fear of people of color (Jensen, 2005; Kivel, 2002); sympathy and empathy (O'Brien, 2003; Iyer, Leach, & Crosby, 2003; Wang et al., 2003); guilt, shame, and embarrassment (Ancis & Szymanski, 2001; Arminio, 2001); and other reactions such as anger, frustration, and disgust (Spanierman, Oh et al., 2008). Research suggests that White individuals experience a complex mixture of these feelings which, considered together, have been referred to as White racial affect (Todd et al., 2010). Research suggests that these emotions might be particularly important for understanding White individuals' racial attitudes and behaviors (Spanierman et al., 2009; Todd et al., 2010).

The Psychosocial Costs of Racism to Whites scale (PCRW; Spanierman & Heppner, 2004) was designed to measure three dimensions of racial affect, which include White empathy, guilt, and fear. White empathy refers to reactions such as anger, sadness, disgust, and frustration about the existence of societal racism and White supremacy. White guilt reflects feelings of remorse about receiving unearned advantages on the basis of race; remorse may in turn be linked to a sense of personal responsibility (Goodman, 2001; Todd et al., 2010). With regard to the PCRW, White fear refers to mistrust of people of color and perceptions of being unsafe in the presence of people of color. Past research on these emotional reactions to racism has revealed links with important race-related constructs such as affirmative action (Beard, Spanierman, & Todd, 2011; Iyer et al., 2003), colorblind racial ideology (Spanierman et al., 2006), ethnocultural empathy (Spanierman & Heppner, 2004), racial prejudice (Case, 2007; Swim & Miller, 1999),

and multicultural counseling competence (Spanierman, Poteat, Wang, & Oh, 2008). Given the complex nature of White racial affect, exploring emotional reactions in combination provides more meaningful information than simply examining levels of White guilt or empathy in isolation (Spanierman et al., 2006). Using cluster analysis, Spanierman and colleagues (2006) identified five distinct PCRW patterns in the ways White students experience racial affect. The five patterns, or racial affect types, have been replicated in several subsequent studies (e.g., Spanierman et al., 2009) and are described briefly below.

Students in the *Antiracist* type, one of the least common among the five types (Spanierman et al., 2006), report the highest levels of White empathy and guilt, with the lowest levels of White fear. Findings have indicated that women are more likely to exhibit the antiracist affect type than men (Beard et al., 2011). Among the five racial affect types, antiracist is considered the most desirable because it has been linked to: the greatest levels of racial awareness, cultural sensitivity, and understanding of White privilege (Spanierman et al., 2006; Spanierman et al., 2009); and strongest support for affirmative action (Beard et al., 2011). Students reflecting this type reported the greatest racial diversity among their friends (Spanierman et al., 2009) and the highest levels of multicultural education (Spanierman et al., 2006). It is not yet known whether the antiracist affect type is consistent with the ways in which White antiracists are characterized in the broader scholarly literature.

In prior quantitative research, the other four racial affect types (i.e., *Empathic but Unaccountable*, *Fearful Guilt*, *Oblivious*, and *Insensitive and Afraid*) have exhibited some similarities to the antiracist type, but they also have differed in important ways. For example, individuals in the *Empathic but Unaccountable* type, which is the most common of the five types, reported high levels of White empathy with low levels of White guilt and White fear.

5

They expressed support for affirmative action policies (Beard et al., 2011). They also reported having diverse friends and were aware of blatant racial issues; but they were less aware of institutional racism, compared to the antiracist type. Students in the *Fearful Guilt* type exhibited high White guilt and fear, with moderate White empathy. These individuals were aware of White privilege, but expressed irrational fear of people of color and lacked interracial friendships (Beard et al., 2011; Spanierman et al., 2006). *Oblivious* individuals demonstrated a relative lack of racial affect, namely low White empathy and guilt with moderate White fear. They generally had little multicultural education and lacked awareness of racial privilege (Spanierman et al., 2009). Participants in the *Insensitive and Afraid* type expressed the lowest levels of White empathy and guilt along with the highest levels of White fear (Spanierman et al., 2006). These individuals reported the lowest support for affirmative action and least exposure to people of color (Spanierman et al., 2009).

Initial research on racial affect types is promising, but additional inquiry is warranted to further understand the nuances and complexities that comprise the five types. In particular, because the antiracist type has been linked to important diversity and social justice outcomes, it would be useful to use qualitative methods to explore how students who score in the antiracist type differ from those who reflect the other four PCRW types. If the PCRW measure is able to differentiate between White antiracist students and others, this could provide an expeditious means of identifying White antiracist students. University staff and administrators could use the PCRW as a practical means of identifying antiracist White students to build ally networks or for other campus antiracist efforts.

The Present Study

To design effective diversity education that will facilitate the development of critical racial awareness among White students, it is important to explore the attitudes and experiences of White students in general, and White antiracist students in particular. Qualitative investigation is an especially appropriate method for this line of inquiry because it focuses on participants' lived experiences, described using their own language, and it allows for a nuanced understanding of the phenomenon of interest (Polkinghorne, 2005). For instance, qualitative investigation could provide a nuanced portrayal of how White antiracist students are similar to and different from White students who represent the other four racial affect types. In addition, qualitative investigation of the White racial affect type could provide further validation to the PCRW scale as an effective tool by which to identify White antiracist students.

As such, the purpose of the present investigation was two-fold. First, we explored the ways in which White students in the antiracist type were similar to and different from the other four racial affect types (e.g., *Empathic but Unaccountable*, *Fearful Guilt*, *Oblivious*, and *Insensitive and Afraid*). Second, we sought to understand whether students in the PCRW antiracist type were similar to how White antiracists have been characterized in the scholarly literature. To this end, we conducted two focus groups in which we asked White university students about their diversity attitudes and experiences. One group consisted of students who scored as antiracist on the PCRW, whereas the other group was comprised of those who scored as one of the other four types. The Consensual Qualitative Research method, which utilizes a consensus process among research team members to reduce bias and distribute power unilaterally among team members, was used to analyze the data (Hill et al., 1997).

Chapter 2

Methods

Participants

Antiracist students. The antiracist focus group was comprised of four women and one man between the ages of 21 and 22 ($M = 21.80$; $SD = .45$), all of whom self-identified as White. All were fourth-year students at a large, predominantly White Midwestern university. Their scores on the PCRW scale reflected the combination of high White empathy and guilt, and low White fear, as suggested in previous studies (Spanierman et al., 2006). Participants completed an average of 5.75 ($SD = 1.89$) diversity courses across their college years. See Table 1 for a breakdown of individual participant information.

Non-antiracist students. The second focus group was comprised of self-identified White students who scored in one of the four remaining PCRW types. This group consisted of three women and three men between the ages of 21 and 22 ($M = 21.67$; $SD = .52$), all of whom were fourth-year students at the same university. Half reflected the empathic but unaccountable type (i.e., the most common type), one exhibited the fearful guilt type, one the oblivious type, and one reflected the insensitive and afraid type. These participants reported varied combinations of low, moderate, or high White empathy, guilt, and fear, although never identical to the antiracist participants. They completed an average of 0.66 ($SD = .81$) diversity courses across their college years. See Table 1 for a breakdown of individual participant information.

Researchers. The primary research team consisted of a White female undergraduate student who continued on the project as a graduate student in counseling psychology and a White female Associate Professor of counseling psychology. They facilitated the focus group interviews and conducted the initial data analysis. In addition to the primary team, a Black

female Professor of counseling psychology and African American studies, with noted expertise in the study of racial attitudes, served as the external auditor. The primary investigators and auditor had prior experience with the CQR method. As suggested by the originators of the CQR method (Hill et al., 1997), the researchers discussed their biases and assumptions prior to conducting the study, and at various points throughout. Given their antiracist stance and familiarity with relevant scholarly literature, the researchers expected that the antiracist students would demonstrate a more critical understanding of institutional racism and White privilege than would the non-antiracist students. Although the team maintained their antiracist stance, they presented a neutral and nonjudgmental manner during focus group facilitation to remove the effects of personal bias on participants' comments (Stewart, Shamdasani, & Rook, 2007). Finally, given the power differential among the researchers as suggested by Hill and colleagues (1997), the team engaged in open discussions about power; this process helped to create a climate in which the student researcher could have an equal voice in the data analyses.

Measures

   Demographic Form. Participants completed a brief demographic form immediately before participating in their respective focus group. Information about participants' age, gender, race, year in school, and the number of multicultural courses taken during the course of their entire university experience was collected.

   Psychosocial Costs of Racism to Whites scale (PCRW; Spanierman & Heppner, 2004). The PCRW is a self-report instrument designed to measure White individuals' affective responses to racism. In the current study, we used the scale to identify students' racial affect types. The 16-item scale uses a 6-point Likert-type response, ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*)

to 6 (*strongly agree*). Three subscales comprise the PCRW, including measures of White empathy (6 items; "I become sad when I think about racial injustice."), White guilt (5 items; "Being White makes me feel personally responsible for racism."), and White fear (5 items; "I am distrustful of people of other races."). Higher scores on each subscale represent a higher experience of empathic, guilty, or fearful responses to racial issues. The PCRW has garnered psychometric support in a number of studies (see Spanierman & Soble, 2010 for a review).

      Focus Group Protocol. The focus group protocol was designed to elicit discussion about participants' experiences and attitudes toward diversity, race, and racism. The interview questions asked participants to reflect on their: (a) experiences with diversity in their hometown context, (b) experiences with diversity at the university, and (c) attitudes about racism on campus and in society in general. When appropriate, follow-up probes were used for clarification or to request elaboration. Questions followed a semi-structured format to allow the interviewees to guide the course of discussion. See Appendix A for interview questions.

Procedure

      Participants were solicited from a larger, four-year longitudinal study on racially diverse university students' racial beliefs and attitudes. The PCRW had been administered previously as part of the larger study. With regard to the present investigation, the researcher emailed White students from the original study who completed the fifth and final data collection point, and who agreed to be contacted for a follow-up focus group. The focus group interviews took place approximately three weeks after the final data collection, and participants' PCRW scores from this final data point were used to assign them to an appropriate focus group. Students were asked to participate as a means of elaborating upon their responses during previous survey data

collection. Although 28 students expressed interest in participating, we were able to accommodate only 11 students' schedules which were limited during the data collection period (i.e., finals week). This sample size, $n = 11$ (5 antiracist and 6 non-antiracist participants) is consistent with recommendations for both CQR, (8 – 12; Hill et al., 1997) and focus groups more broadly (4 – 12; Seal, Bogart, & Ehrhardt, 1998).

The researchers utilized focus groups, rather than individual interviews, because focus groups allow participants to guide discussion topics as a group. Focus groups are recognized as a viable method for generating meaning surrounding topics that have not yet been explored empirically (Krueger, 1994), including those related to race (Sue, Lin, Torino, Capodilupo, & Rivera, 2009). Participants were grouped with individuals who likely had similar attitudes, where it was believed they would engage in the most open discussion of their racial beliefs. As suggested by Krueger (1998), one researcher served as the discussion facilitator and the other researcher served as an observer and note taker. Focus groups interviews lasted approximately 90 minutes and were audio taped. The student researcher transcribed the audio tapes verbatim. Pseudonyms were used throughout the interviews and were included in the transcripts so that the researchers could distinguish among participants' comments during data analysis. Interviewees received $20 and pizza as compensation for their participation.

Data Analysis

To analyze the data, the researchers used a modified version of the CQR method, which emphasizes the consensus process among researchers to reduce researcher bias and enhance trustworthiness (Hill et al., 1997, 2005). Although CQR initially was designed to analyze individual interview data, a number of recent investigations have used it to analyze focus group

discussions centered on multicultural issues (e.g., Cruz-Santiago & Garcia, 2011; Sue et al., 2009; Williams, Wyatt, Resell, Peterson, & Asuan-O'Brien, 2004;).

During the initial phase, the primary researchers each read one of the transcripts independently and created a list of preliminary domains, as suggested by Hill and colleagues (2005). After completing this process for one transcript, each researcher repeated the process with the second transcript. The two primary researchers conducted multiple meetings to discuss preliminary domains until they arrived at consensus with a list of eight preliminary domains. The researchers then independently linked data from each transcript to the eight domains; again, they met several times to reach consensus on the most appropriate domain(s) for the raw data.

To control for researcher bias and identify important findings that may have been overlooked, the external auditor then read both of the transcripts along with the list of domains. She provided extensive feedback that resulted in modifications to some domains, such as consolidating two domains into one, changing the titles of domains to more accurately reflect the data and moving certain data into domains where they fit better. This process resulted in six final domains. Data that did not fit into one of the six domains were deemed no longer relevant to the focus of the study and were omitted (Hill et al., 1997). Next, the primary researchers identified the core ideas, or summaries, of each domain. Again, the external auditor reviewed their work and provided feedback. The primary researchers met with the auditor to discuss modifications to the analyses, such as altering the core ideas to better represent participants' meaning.

Chapter 3

Results

The researchers identified six domains, representing major content themes, which include: (a) manifestations of racial awareness, (b) experiences with diversity while growing up, (c) experiences with diversity at the university, (d) emotional responses to racial issues, (e) perceptions of the former racialized mascot of the university, and (f) expressions of racism. Notably, five domains appeared in both focus groups, whereas one (i.e., expressions of racism) appeared only in the non-antiracist group. Because the domains are interrelated, there is some content overlap. Below, we describe each domain and how it was expressed in each group.

Domain 1: Manifestations of Racial Awareness

Participants in both focus groups demonstrated some racial awareness, but the type of awareness was qualitatively different between the groups. Antiracist students demonstrated a more sophisticated understanding of racism than non-antiracist students.

Antiracist. Although both groups were aware of blatant, individual racism, the antiracist participants also demonstrated awareness of subtle and institutional racism. With regard to subtle racism, one antiracist student contrasted old-fashioned, blatant racism with a "new wave of racism where it's [racism] generally not spoken" or expressed explicitly. She went on to describe how White individuals attempt to deflect or disguise their racist attitudes by prefacing their comments with "I am not racist but … " before making racist remarks. This student explained that her White friends, who claimed that they were not racist, avoided a particular campus bar on a certain night of the week that draws "generally a more Black population." Similarly, another student observed, "I think there is denial that there is racism by a lot of White people even when

13

they are in the midst of practicing/taking part of it." These two students noted that White individuals harbor racist attitudes but often claim that they are not racist and use different strategies to avoid appearing racist, so they express their racism in subtle ways.

The antiracist students also noted that racism continues to operate insidiously through dominant institutions and culture. Two students highlighted an example of institutional racism in the local community. They explained how the dress code established by campus bars which prohibited patrons from wearing "hoodies", "do-rags", and "jerseys", discriminates against students of color. Two other students observed how the media functions as another form of institutional racism. In particular, they noted how President Obama was criticized in the media, sometimes as not having been born in the U.S. or being a Muslim, which implied that he was dishonest about his nationality and/or religion. These students understood the complexity of how racism continues to operate in both institutions and culture.

Participants in the antiracist group also expressed a complex understanding of other forms of discrimination, such as sexism. For example, one young woman reflected on how her awareness of institutional discrimination stemmed from her experience in a Catholic high school. She stated, "We talked about … how historically women are silenced in the church.… [This lesson] opened my eyes to [question] … what is the history that is not being told? Whose story is not being told?" Moreover, she connected her increased awareness of institutional sexism to her increased awareness of racism. Discussing gender and women's studies courses, another student remarked that "within your … general curriculum everyone [professors] is supposed to teach gender and that was the assumption for why we [the university] don't have a specific gender requirement." However, most professors do not build material about gender and sexism into their courses.

14

Participants in the antiracist group engaged in explicit discussion about White privilege. Some discussed the role of White privilege in their own lives. One young woman, for example, described several situations where racial privilege gives her an advantage over people of color. She discussed how "going to a job interview and being a White girl, you have privilege there.… think about getting pulled over [by the police], how you might feel if you were a Black male versus a White female.… I definitely feel privileged." Another female participant compared White privilege to heterosexual privilege, describing them both as "unearned". Another student stated that he supports policies such as affirmative action because he perceives that White students are able to gain admissions to college without working as hard as students of color. Across a number of topics, the antiracist participants noted that being White provides them with unearned advantages over people of color.

Non-antiracist. Although they did not discuss subtle or structural forms of racism, participants in the non-antiracist group demonstrated awareness of blatant and individual instances of racism. One young man (*Empathic but Unaccountable*) noted hearing racist comments made by members of his fraternity. He stated, "I live in a fraternity and you get to a point … where you're all very close with one another.… You hear some pretty offensive [racist] things sometimes that … don't sit with you the right way." The same student discussed how White students on campus tell "very blatantly racist jokes," which he noted as one way that White individuals express their racist attitudes. One young woman (*Empathic but Unaccountable*) noted that people still express overt racism, but it is often "behind closed doors". She stated, "I heard a [racist] comment a couple weeks ago and the sliding door [was] open… you don't know who's walking outside." Another young man (*Empathic but Unaccountable*) reported that he argued with a previous White roommate who he described as a racist. Although

15

the non-antiracist students expressed discomfort with instances of individual, blatant racism, they did not exhibit awareness of the insidiousness of racism in society's dominant institutions.

Domain 2: Experiences with Diversity While Growing Up

The second domain refers to participants' discussions about their experiences with diversity in the communities in which they were raised. Participants in both the antiracist and non-antiracist groups spoke extensively about their experiences with diversity before they attended the university, including the racial and cultural contexts of their hometown neighborhoods and high schools, as well as their families and pre-college friends' racial views. Although some content was similar across groups, most often attitudes differed.

Antiracist. Participants in the antiracist group demonstrated awareness of racism and other forms of oppression in their reflections on experiences with diversity while growing up. Primarily, these students demonstrated awareness by observing contrasts in their surrounding environments. Most often, contrasts reflected differences between their families' racist attitudes and participants' experiences outside of the family that countered those attitudes.

Some antiracist participants described having racial attitudes that contrasted sharply with those of their friends and families. One male participant reported conflict between himself and his own family, describing an incident during which his mother asked him to refrain from discussing LGBT rights, the former racialized mascot of the university, and feminism during an upcoming family event because of inevitable arguments. Another young woman reported similar conflict within her immediate family. She stated:

> Recently [I have] been having problem with my parents, my mom specifically because she is very racist and … doesn't care if anyone knows it. [She] doesn't want to come to our graduation because the founder of the Harlem Globetrotters is speaking.… It's like I have to fight against that and so it's [support for racial diversity] not very welcomed even

16

in my home or even among my siblings at all. And, so I feel like I am the outsider in my family.

This young woman's stance on racism often led to interpersonal conflicts with other Whites, particularly her family, which resulted in a sense of isolation. Another young woman emphasized how the contrasting racial climate of her high school, which was accepting of racial diversity, and the university, which segregated by racial group, changed her ideas about the prevalence of racism. She stated, "I went to high school and I had Black friends and different races of friends but I never really thought … that people were really so racist until I came here [to the university]."

When reflecting on experiences with diversity in their home communities, several antiracist participants also noted the link between early life experiences and later racial attitudes. Several participants shared the sentiment that one's family largely shapes their racial attitudes in adulthood. For example, one young woman argued that "You are more likely to be more conservative if you grew up in a family who is conservative and has money." Another participant shared a different perspective when she discussed how children's experiences with peers may counter racist attitudes in their families:

> It's not necessarily because you were born in a conservative family you are more likely to be conservative but the experiences you had. Like, you go to school and the one Black kid in the class and you decide you guys just click and that will change your perspective immediately, even if your parents are saying that they don't like Blacks.

This student suggested that a critical incident related to race, during which a White person's stance on race is challenged by person of color in some way, might influence one's racial attitudes, above and beyond the influence of family. Overall, the major themes that emerged in this domain demonstrated that these White students were aware of race and racism.

Non-antiracist. Non-antiracist students also demonstrated some awareness of racism and salient diversity issues in their hometown communities, but they did not report subsequent interpersonal conflicts as did the antiracist students. One woman (*Insensitive and Afraid*), for example, explained that she was born in a somewhat racially diverse town, and then moved to a "predominantly White, sometimes racist town." While describing the racial makeup of these communities, her report was purely descriptive and lacked critical analysis. Non-antiracist participants reported that it was common for White individuals in their hometowns to express racism. One woman (*Empathic but Unaccountable*) recalled, "We talked about [how] our town is changing a lot, the demographics.… It wasn't like 'oh there's so many more Black people,' but when a bunch of crimes occurred [people would say] 'well the demographics are changing.'" This participant neither agreed nor disagreed that the increase in crime was related to a higher number of African Americans, though she indicated that expressing racial prejudice was prevalent in her community.

Similar to the antiracist group, non-antiracist participants discussed the contrast between their hometowns and the university. They explained that interacting with students of color at university prompted greater awareness of racism. However, their racial awareness was limited to individual acts of blatant racism. For example, as a result of interacting with students at university, one woman (*Empathic but Unaccountable*) retrospectively realized that comments made by her friends from home were racist. She stated:

> Stuff from back home that friends would say … I didn't even realize they were really racist … until you're with other people and you really know people that [are not White] … and they tell you that it's … hurtful or racist.… [At home] the idea that you could just label people and stereotype people … was kind of ok.

In addition to highlighting the contrast between home and the university, she also described how racism was the norm in her predominantly White neighborhood.

Domain 3: Experiences with Diversity at the University

Students across both focus groups described their experiences with diversity at the university in the context of formal (e.g., university courses and campus-sponsored events) and informal campus spaces (e.g., residence halls and the Quad). Antiracist students highlighted positive experiences with diversity, whereas non-antiracist students reported negative experiences.

Antiracist. Participants in the antiracist group reported mostly positive experiences with diversity in university courses and places of residence. Notably, these students reported taking far more diversity courses than their non-antiracist counterparts. One antiracist student, for example, reported that she appreciated learning about diversity and different perspectives in the classroom. Another young woman reflected on the courses related to race and gender that she had taken. She stated, "[I took] 'Race in America' and a couple of other race classes, and my psych classes were really good for me because we studied gender." One young man argued that classrooms are an especially important place for students to talk about multicultural issues. He stated:

> You have to get people together to talk.… In comfortable spaces you learn things, like gender and women's studies classes [where] you have to write about perspectives.… I think for ways to improve [students' cultural sensitivity] is to have people do these things [discuss multicultural issues in classes] without really a choice.

Notably, antiracist participants expressed unanimous support for compulsory diversity education at the university.

Antiracist students reported positive experiences with peers of color in residences; and, they also reported some negative experiences with White roommates' racist and anti-Semitic behaviors. Describing her positive experiences living in a predominantly African American residence hall, one student stated that she and her roommate "had discussions about race," "became really good friends," and "still talk" with each other. This same student was also sensitive to the fact that her roommate had a negative experience the prior year with a racist White roommate, and was worried about living with another White woman. In contrast to this experience, another young woman reported not wanting to spend time with, or even "be associated with" an "incredibly anti-Semitic" White roommate.

Although the antiracist students predominantly reported positive experiences with diversity on campus, they did mention negative experiences that pertained to apathy on campus about social justice issues. One female student, for instance, expressed frustration about the lack of student interest in campus protests in which she was involved. Another young man described his disappointment with how the university administration handled significant issues with racism on campus. In particular, he criticized the insufficient administrative response to an incident in which a fraternity and sorority hosted a racist-themed party:

> Remember when we had the sorority who dressed up as pregnant Mexican girls, and the Chancellor didn't send an e-mail? … I went to the forum on race [a student-organized event to stop oppression on campus] and the way the university addressed [the students] was not sufficient at all … there's just this huge group of people who are feeling the effects of racism on campus and we aren't really doing anything about it.

In sum, antiracist students experienced interactions with diversity in classrooms and living spaces positively, but they also reported negative experiences related to instances of racism and the campus community's general lack of interest in racial justice issues.

Non-antiracist. Although they discussed campus diversity experiences in the same formal and informal contexts, non-antiracist students emphasized negative experiences with diversity. Sometimes these negative experiences were related to instances of blatant racism. For example, one young man (*Empathic but Unaccountable*) described living with an overtly racist White roommate. He stated, "My roommate freshman year was completely racist, it was the worst I'd ever seen.… There were several times we fought about it."

In contrast to the antiracist students, most of the non-antiracist students reported being uncomfortable discussing racial issues on campus. Sharing her perceptions about a classroom discussion on affirmative action, one young woman (*Empathic but Unaccountable*) explained, "It was a very uncomfortable debate and people were very hesitant to speak up for either side.… I wrote a two-page paper on it and felt fine. But, speaking in class was a little more uncomfortable." Other students were frustrated by displays of social activism, such as a young man (*Oblivious*) who had strong negative reactions to certain protests on the Quad. He attributed his reaction to "the way they're protesting," stating that there can be "bad experiences with culture." This student suggested that it is problematic to call attention to social justice issues in public settings.

Not all diversity experiences were interpreted negatively by non-antiracist students, and some reported positive experiences in informal living spaces and at campus events. One student (*Fearful Guilt*) reflected positively on her time living in the residence hall with mostly students of color. She stated that her experience living in the residence hall was "really good." She explained:

> We were all friends so we felt open enough to ask each other questions [such as] 'Why do you [Black individuals] do this? [and] 'Do you feel like a minority?' That sort of stuff … I just think it was beneficial to actually put it out there.

21

Although she enjoyed these conversations, her comment reflects her expectation that people of color should educate White individuals about racial issues and speak on behalf of their entire racial group. Another young woman (*Empathic but Unaccountable*) shared her positive reactions to a performance on campus about racial stereotypes titled N* W* C*. In this performance, three men of color act out a variety of negative racial stereotypes about their own racial groups with little critique. This student "enjoyed" the experience, and stated, "There's a lot of critiques of it.… [but] it's just interesting … hearing the people who are the ones with diversity.… A lot of discussion came out of that production. I thought it was positive." Although these women experienced these diversity interactions positively, their interpretation of each situation lacked critical awareness of power, privilege, and racial oppression, and further conceptualized diversity as something situated in people of color.

Domain 4: Emotional Responses to Racial Issues

Participants described a range of emotional reactions to race-related issues. Emotional responses differed markedly by group with regard to type and intensity. Participants in the antiracist group expressed a greater variety of emotional reactions to racial issues than did the non-antiracist students, and they experienced these emotions more intensely.

Antiracist. Guilt and embarrassment emerged among White antiracist students. One young woman, for instance, felt guilty for the times in which she was a passive bystander to other White individuals' racist comments. She explained, "I feel guilty that I didn't sit them down and say something." Another participant described feeling guilt in response to acknowledging her White privilege. She stated that she felt "guilty for being privileged in many

22

ways, [such as] having a really nice apartment [and having] parents helping me out with utilities and food … I think that does tie into race.… I feel guilty for all the things I have been given." Yet another participant discussed how thinking about her White privilege makes her feel guilty. She also described feeling embarrassment "When [she is] with other [White] people who don't recognize their privilege." Antiracist students also expressed embarrassment about other Whites' racist and intolerant behaviors, especially when coming from friends or family. For example, one participant stated, "My roommate … she's incredibly anti-Semitic.… every time she drinks she says something and you are embarrassed… [I think to myself] 'I don't want to be associated with you.'"

Antiracist students also expressed empathic reactions, which include anger, sadness, disgust, and frustration about the existence of societal racism. One participant described his anger toward White friends who made excuses about not getting into graduate school because "a minority must have taken [their] spot.… It just really really really bothers me, and I have actually screamed at a few people." Another female student stated that it "really upsets" her when she considers the racist dress codes established by local bars, which state that patrons cannot enter while wearing "do-rags", "jerseys", or "sweatpants". One young woman stated, "It's most frustrating when the people closest to you participate in [making racist comments].… To have family members, close friends, say [racist] comments, that's where I really speak up." Similarly, a student described that continually seeing racism on campus is "frustrating and depressing" because it makes one wonder, "Is this ever going to change?" Indeed, racial issues on campus, particularly those related to racism, elicited a range of emotional responses for the White students in the antiracist group.

Non-antiracist. With notable exception described below, students in the non-antiracist group expressed one dominant emotional response to racial issues (i.e., White fear), and they did so repeatedly. In particular, they expressed fear of racial minorities, or neighborhoods associated with racial minorities. One participant (*Insensitive and Afraid*) stated that she was more afraid of African American than White individuals because she knows "people [who] have been attacked by African Americans." Other participants expressed similar White fear, such as the young man (*Oblivious*) who stated that he might cross the street if a person of color is walking towards him. A young woman (*Empathic but Unaccountable*) explained that she is fearful while passing through "the bad part of Chicago," which referred to predominantly African American and Latino neighborhoods. These comments indicated a pattern of irrational fear and mistrust of people of color among the non-antiracist participants.

The only exception to pervasive expressions of White fear occurred when one participant (*Oblivious*) expressed anger, referring explicitly to a survey question in an earlier phase of the study that asked whether he ever felt guilty about being White. He responded, "I was so angry when I was filling that out! [The researchers were] asking me if I was ashamed of who I am…. Just the fact that the question was even put out there was just really frustrating to me."

Domain 5: Perceptions of the Former Racialized Mascot of the University

Participants in both focus groups discussed the university's former racialized mascot extensively. Antiracist participants mostly opposed the mascot, whereas students in the non-antiracist group mostly expressed support. Additionally, several students across both groups expressed ambivalent attitudes toward the mascot.

Antiracist. Although the facilitators did not ask any questions that pertained to the former university mascot, students in the antiracist group spontaneously discussed this controversial issue. Antiracist students linked the racialized mascot to racism, power, and privilege. More specifically, these students discussed how supporters of the mascot mostly have been White individuals who do not understand how the mascot is a racist stereotype or how it negatively affects American Indians and other students of color. One antiracist student observed:

> The t-shirts are still here.… The symbol is gone but that feeling and that racist tradition is still there.… It's literally 90% White people crying [for the loss of the mascot] … I thought it was this mob mentality, these people can do whatever they want whenever they want and that is scary to me.… The [mascot is] gone, but it's really not. That culture is still present.

She noted how White individuals have the social power on campus to continue to publicly celebrate the mascot even though it has been removed, and the university does not intervene. This same student refused to wear a bar crawl T-shirt created by her friends and coworkers with the mascot's image printed on it, and she also refused to sign a pro-mascot petition presented to her by a White student.

Another antiracist student connected the mascot to stereotyped images of other racialized groups. She commented that racist stereotypes of African Americans would be perceived as blatantly offensive but that racist stereotypes of American Indians remain socially acceptable:

> I think that it's also interesting that [American Indians are] such a minority [at the university] that if there were a White male in Blackface Crip walking in the middle of a football field it would be this huge deal. But, the fact that it's this really, really small population of people [makes] it OK to ignore their voices.

This student notes that the relative invisibility of American Indians in dominant society has allowed such racist images to persist as socially acceptable. Finally, one antiracist participant expressed an ambivalent attitude towards the mascot, stating that she did not have a strong

opinion about its presence and was receptive to the perspectives of those who both supported and opposed the mascot.

Non-antiracist. In contrast to the antiracist group, non-antiracist participants typically expressed support for the racialized mascot. Unlike the antiracist group these students did not discuss the mascot spontaneously. Instead, the facilitators asked about it toward the end of the discussion because they knew that the other group discussed it at length. One non-antiracist student (*Insensitive and Afraid*) perceived the mascot to be a positive representation of American Indian culture. She believed that the mascot was "not insulting" but instead "keeps the culture alive." Another student (*Empathic but Unaccountable*) concurred. He stated, "I thought the [mascot] was … a good representation.… I had never really spoken with anyone who's Native American who had a big opposition to [it]." This student questioned the legitimacy of the arguments made by those who worked to discontinue the mascot by suggesting that American Indians generally did not find it offensive.

Two participants in this group expressed neutral or ambivalent attitudes regarding the mascot. A female student (*Fearful Guilt*) who was mildly opposed to the mascot explained that she did not have a strong opinion one way or the other because she believed that a school mascot was not important enough to feel strongly about. A young man (*Empathic but Unaccountable*) described his ambivalent position as being supportive of the mascot but concerned with its divisiveness among the student body. He stated, "[The mascot] is such a divisive issue on this campus.… I was reluctant to get rid of it, but I'm ok with the fact that he's gone." Despite this ambivalence, the overall tenor in the non-antiracist group supported the mascot and was opposed to the university's decision to remove it.

26

Domain 6: Expressions of Racism

Expressions of racism emerged only among the non-antiracist students. Although at times blatant, most often their comments reflected indirect, and perhaps unintentional, forms of racism.

Antiracist. None reported.

Non-antiracist. Interestingly, only *Oblivious* and *Insensitive and Afraid* students asserted blatant racism. For example, one young man (*Oblivious*) expressed the belief that Black individuals were criminals. He stated, "[when] there's an African American person coming … I'm gonna step to this side of the sidewalk.… [because] things would get stolen out of our lockers in high school, and it was predominantly African Americans doin' it." Another participant (*Insensitive and Afraid*) reported that she perceives African American to be more dangerous than people of other racial backgrounds because she knows "people that have been attacked by African Americans."

All of the non-antiracist participants expressed subtle, indirect forms of racism. They used several strategies to minimize the existence of racism in contemporary society and its damaging effects on people of color. Non-antiracist participants attributed their fear of particular persons and locations to factors other than race. For example, one participant (*Empathic but Unaccountable*) commented that he is wary of certain people who are "shady character[s]." He insisted that "it's not race" that makes him nervous. Rather, "it's just the type of person who's around you … it doesn't matter what color their skin is because they could be, you could be White, Black, you could be Asian, Mexican." Other participants used coded language about neighborhood or location. One young woman (*Empathic but Unaccountable)* stated that she is not afraid of people of color. Rather, she explained that she is "more fearful of location", though she acknowledged that these locations are mostly occupied by people of color. She described that

she would protect her belongings more vigilantly when riding the subway in the city because she was in "the bad part of Chicago…not because of who's around." Yet another student (*Oblivious*) discussed his belief that African Americans are more likely to steal, not because of their race, but because of socioeconomic status and he interpreted that stealing is "the easiest way to get something if you don't have it."

In a related vein, several participants wished that people of color would stop calling attention to race because, in doing so, they are creating the impression that racism is a larger societal problem than it really is. They downplayed the significance of racism's role in society and suggested that it would be better for everyone if people of color stopped talking about race and racism. For example, one young man (*Oblivious*) stated:

> When I fill out ethnicity [on a demographic form] … I usually say 'other' and write 'American'.… I feel like where you grow up is what you are.… We're all Americans here so why should we be trying to separate ourselves so much if we're trying to bring everything together.

He minimized race by suggesting that location is a more important social marker. Another participant (*Insensitive and Afraid)* attributed racial segregation on campus to students of color and promoted the idea of "treat[ing] everybody like equals." Furthermore, she stated, "It's kind of like … [people of color] segregating themselves … separating themselves … by saying they're different."

The non-antiracist students also expressed indirect racism by sharing their perceptions about what they perceived to be reverse racism, or racism against White people. Several participants (*Empathic but Unaccountable*, *Oblivious*, and *Insensitive and Afraid*) perceived that they were the victims of reverse racism through university and workplace affirmative action policies. One participant (*Insensitive and Afraid*) stated:

>They [employers] need to make their quota or else [people of color are] gonna claim there's racism.… If it's another person that's African American or of a different ethnicity that's going against me, they're gonna get the job … whoever's more qualified doesn't matter.

Similarly, one young man (*Empathic but Unaccountable)* perceived that people of color are racist against White individuals. He claimed that racist incidents perpetrated by White students draw attention on campus, which creates the false image that only White people are racist while people of color are not. He stated, "I've seen it [racism] both ways.… We get labeled as racist but nobody else does." Though at times blatant, the non-antiracist students mostly expressed subtle or indirect racism by using strategies to conceal their own racist attitudes and minimize the significance of racism in society.

<center>**Chapter 4**</center>

<center>**Discussion**</center>

Findings from the current study indicate that antiracist and non-antiracist students differ markedly in their responses to racial issues. Therefore, these findings provide additional validation for the PCRW scale as a tool with which to identify White antiracist university students. Additionally, findings suggest that White antiracist students identified by the PCRW are similar, though not identical, to the characterization of White antiracists in the interdisciplinary literature. Below, we underscore the key dimension of our findings with regard to differences between antiracist and non-antiracist participants' cognitive, affective, and behavioral responses to racism. Where appropriate, we link our findings to the broader scholarly literature. Next, we discuss limitations of the study and describe implications for research and practice.

Critical Understanding of Racism (Cognitive Responses to Racism)

Our findings strongly suggest that students who exemplify the antiracist type possess a more complex and nuanced understanding of racism and White privilege than their non-antiracist counterparts. Similar to White antiracists in previous empirical studies, these White antiracist students understood institutional and structural racism, evidenced in their discussion about the racist dress code established by campus bars, and they recognized White privilege (McKinney & Feagin, 2003; Smith & Redington, 2010). They demonstrated and applied this awareness flexibly, in a variety of physical and intellectual contexts. These contexts included classrooms, public campus spaces, hometown communities, high schools, and the debate over the university's racialized mascot. Similar to the antiracist activists in Smith & Redington's (2010)

<center>30</center>

study, the antiracist students were aware of themselves as racial beings and demonstrated a personal understanding of what it means to be White in U.S. society. Several antiracist participants also expressed support for affirmative action policies, which is congruent with antiracist Whites' accounts in previous studies (Frankenberg, 1993; O'Brien, 2001). In contrast, the non-antiracist students demonstrated a limited awareness of blatant racism and skewed perception that racism was perpetrated against Whites, which is consistent with previous findings non-antiracist Whites' (Spanierman, Oh et al., 2008).

Additionally, the antiracist students drew connections between their learning about other forms of oppression and coming to understand racism. The context of learning about sexism was particularly salient for the White antiracist students because they learned about power, privilege, and oppression. As they came to understand sexism, they also reported learning about racism, which included their role in racism as White individuals. Thus, gender and women's studies courses may be a useful vehicle for other White students to begin to grasp issues of power and privilege (Trepagnier, 2010).

Despite the numerous similarities the antiracist students shared with White antiracists in the broader literature, several differences emerged, particularly during the discussion regarding the university's discontinued mascot (Ayvazian, 2004; McKinney & Feagin, 2003). One young woman lacked the critical awareness to understand that the mascot is a racist, stereotyped image of an American Indian when she described an ambivalent stance on whether the university made an appropriate decision in retiring the mascot. Another participant, although strongly opposed to the racialized mascot, also endorsed the stereotype that American Indians were "wiped out" by White colonizers, which is a racial microaggression against American Indians "employing the logics of elimination and replacement" (Clark, Spanierman, Reed, Soble, & Cabana, 2010, p.

45). These differences suggest that White university students would benefit from continued antiracist and diversity education.

Interestingly, findings suggested some similarities between non-antiracist and antiracist participants' racial awareness, particularly among the *Fearful Guilt* and *Empathic but Unaccountable* students. Though not representing awareness of structural racial issues, the three *Empathic but Unaccountable* students were the only members of the non-antiracist group who discussed examples of blatant racism. Hints of more complex racial awareness emerged in the non-antiracist student who scored high in White guilt (i.e., *Fearful Guilt*). She noted that people of all races do not need to learn about White culture because it is the "predominant culture" in the U.S.; she also expressly opposed the former mascot. Additionally, she was the only participant in the non-antiracist group to support social activism. Her comments are consistent with previous findings that the *Fearful Guilt* type is associated with awareness of more complex racial issues, such as White privilege (Spanierman et al., 2006). Future research could explore further the *Fearful Guilt* and *Empathic but Unaccountable* types, which share some characteristics with antiracists.

Emotional (Affective) Responses to Racism

Our findings support previous studies that argue for a strong link between White individuals' racial attitudes and their emotional reactions to racism, as well as for the existence of a unique antiracist affect type (Spanierman et al., 2006; Spanierman et al., 2009). Though little prior research has focused on the emotions of White antiracists, much of the conceptual scholarship on White antiracism attends to the emotional costs of racism to Whites because understanding one's emotional reactions is a critical component in the process of becoming

32

antiracist (Feagin, Vera, & Batur, 2001; Kivel, 2002; O'Brien, 2001). We found that the antiracist students in this study experience emotional costs that are congruent with White individuals who have a complex awareness of racism, including frustration, anger, guilt, and feelings of helplessness. This pattern is consistent with Swim and Miller's (1999) findings that higher levels of White guilt were related to stronger support for affirmative action, as the participants who endorsed the highest levels of White guilt (*Antiracist*) were the only participants who expressed support for affirmative action.

Additionally, previous scholarship draws attention to the emotional and interpersonal toll that having an antiracist stance can have on White individuals (Kivel, 2002; O'Brien, 2003). Several antiracist students reported interpersonal conflict with friends and family due to their stance on racism, with one young woman reporting that she felt like an "outsider" in her own family. For these reasons, experts argue for the importance of White antiracists supporting one another. Although we did not specifically ask about feelings of hope, integrity, and relief, or other more positive emotions, prior research suggests that White antiracists experience these emotions in reaction to racial issues as well (O'Brien, 2001; Smith & Redington, 2010). Taken together, these findings strongly suggest that emotional reactions to racial issues are a critical component of a White antiracist identity that researchers should continue to explore.

Social Justice Activism (Behavioral Responses to Racism)

Similar to how antiracists are described in the broader scholarly literature, antiracists in the current study reported that they engaged in antiracist behaviors (Ayvazian, 2004; Kivel, 2002; Smith & Redington, 2010). For example, they reported that they talked explicitly about racism to White friends, family members, roommates, and classmates. Although these students

did not mention membership in antiracist organizations or groups, they discussed their commitment to challenging racism in their everyday interactions (Trepagnier, 2010). The participants in the antiracist group also described ways that they modeled White antiracist behavior for other White students. For example, they refused to wear a bar crawl t-shirt displaying an image of the racialized mascot, refused to sign a pro-mascot petition, and participated in social justice activism events around campus. Scholars have emphasized the importance of White individuals behaving in ways that challenge racism because they act as role models for other White people, even if they are not talking to them about racism directly (Ayvazian, 2004; Wise, 2011).

Relevant to the student population we interviewed in this study, these White antiracist students discussed taking diversity courses. In the context of discussing White antiracism, we consider these deliberate social justice behaviors because they are intentionally crossing certain racial boundaries (O'Brien, 2003; Trepagnier, 2010). In contrast to non-antiracist students, White antiracist students engaged in lengthy discussions about their diversity coursework, which they described as having a significant impact on their understanding of race and oppression. Accordingly, demographic data among our sample indicated that the antiracist participants completed an average of 5.75 courses and the non-antiracist students taking an average of 0.66 courses (See Table 1). Though we do not know whether the antiracist students arrived at the university already open to and valuing cultural diversity or they developed their antiracist attitudes as a result of taking such courses, prior research suggests that there is likely a combination of both of these factors at work for White antiracist students (Spanierman et al., 2009). Regardless, it is evident from the data in this study that diversity education and White antiracist identity are associated for White students. These results support previous findings on

the salient role of multicultural courses in the educational experiences of White antiracist students (Spanierman et al., 2006).

Limitations and Directions for Future Research

Although our findings provide a deeper understanding of the characteristics of White antiracist students, and offer support for the PCRW as a means of identifying White antiracist students, they are not without limitations. First, only one man participated in the antiracist focus group. Although the gender imbalance is congruent with the pattern found in previous PCRW studies that women score in the antiracist type more frequently than men (Beard et al., 2011; Spanierman et al., 2006), scholarship suggesting that men experience Whiteness differently than women necessitates that more men be included in future research (Scott & Robinson, 2001). The important intersection of gender and race suggests that it may be useful to conduct focus groups in which we explore each racial affect type by gender. In addition, although our sample did not permit such an analysis, it would be useful to have a focus group for each PCRW type because nuanced differences in racial attitudes exist among the four non-antiracist affect types. Similarly, future research could explore whether placing a non-antiracist student (i.e., *Fearful Guilt* or *Empathic but Unaccountable*) in a group with antiracist students would influence the non-antiracist student's reported racial attitudes. Though we cannot eliminate the possibility of researcher bias, we took steps to counter bias both before the interviews and in interpreting the data by openly discussing assumptions and expectations.

Another limitation is that, although antiracist students discussed behaviors related to social justice, it is possible that their self-reported antiracist actions do not reflect their actual behaviors. Future research could gather data on students' behaviors. For example, employing an

experimental design with a behavioral component might be a particularly useful means of comparing White students' self-reported antiracist actions with a measure of actual behavior. Finally, the scope of this study did not allow for the depth that such discussion would necessitate, but future research might focus on further exploring the process by which White antiracist students develop their racial justice stances (Barry, 2008; Smith & Redington, 2010).

Implications for University Personnel

The brief quantitative measure used in this study could serve as an efficient tool to identify White antiracist students, which has important implications for faculty, administrators, and other student affairs professionals. First, our findings suggest that White antiracist students would benefit from support on campus to cope with some of their interpersonal struggles, such as conflict with other Whites and experiencing social isolation. Prior research supports the notion that understanding and countering these negative consequences of higher racial awareness is an important step toward helping White individuals find meaning and reward in their worldview (Spanierman, Oh, et al., 2008). University personnel could create ally networks to provide such support (Ayvazian, 2004; Kivel, 2002; O'Brien, 2001). Similarly, university personnel could invite White antiracist community activists to serve as role models for White students on campus. Because we learned that gender and women's studies classes served as a bridge to understanding racism and racial privilege on a more critical level, faculty and administrators might consider incorporating this type of instruction during first-year orientation or in large-scale workshops. In light of the current findings that suggest that White antiracist students display active awareness of complex racial issues on campus (e.g., viewing racialized mascot as harmful to students of color and their allies), university personnel might enlist White antiracist students

as important role models for other White students on campus. For instance, with the appropriate support in place, these students might serve as discussion facilitators or paraprofessionals to raise other White students' awareness of racial issues and create a more welcoming campus climate for students of color.

<div align="center">**References**</div>

Ancis, J. R., & Szymanski, D. M. (2001). Awareness of White privilege among White counseling trainees. *The Counseling Psychologist, 29*(4), 548-569. doi:10.1177/0011000001294005

Arminio, J. (2001). Exploring the nature of race-related guilt. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 29*(4), 239-252.

Ayvazian, A. (2004). Interrupting the cycle: The role of allies as agents of change. In P. S. Rothenberg (Ed.), *Race, class, and gender in the United States: An integrated study* (6th ed.). New York: Worth Publishers.

Barry, M. L. (2008). White antiracist activists: The formation of activists. *Dissertation Abstracts International Section A: Humanities and Social Sciences, 68*(12-A), 5216.

Beard, J. C., Spanierman, L. B., & Todd, N. R. (2011). *Psychosocial costs of racism to Whites: Examining gender differences in types.* Manuscript submitted for publication.

Case, K. A. (2007). Raising White privilege awareness and reducing racial prejudice: Assessing diversity course effectiveness. *Teaching of Psychology, 34*(4), 231-235. doi:10.1080/00986280701700250

Chesler, M., Peet, M., & Sevig, T. (2003) Blinded by Whiteness: The development of White college students' racial awareness. In A. Doane and E. Bonilla-Silva (Eds.), *White out: The continuing significance of race* (pp. 215-230). New York: Routelage.

Clark, D. A., Spanierman, L. B., Reed, T. D., Soble, J. R., & Cabana, S. (2011). Documenting weblog expressions of racial microaggressions that target American Indians. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 4*(1), 39-50. doi:10.1037/a0021762

Cruz-Santiago, M., & Ramírez García, J. I. (2011). "Hay que ponerse en los zapatos del joven": Adaptive parenting of adolescent children among Mexican American parents residing in a dangerous neighborhood. *Family Process, 50*(1), 92-114. doi:10.1111/j.1545-5300.2010.01348.x

Feagin, J. R., Vera, H., & Batur, P. (2001). *White racism: The basics.* (2nd Ed.) New York: Routledge.

Frankenberg, R. (1993). *White women, race matters: The social construction of Whiteness.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Goodman, D. (2001). *Promoting diversity and social justice: Educating people from privileged groups.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Hill, C. E., Knox, S., Thompson, B. J., Williams, E. N., Hess, S. A., & Ladany, N. (2005). Consensual qualitative research: An update. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 52*(2), 196-205. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.52.2.196

Hill, C. E., Thompson, B. J., & Williams, E. N. (1997). A guide to conducting consensual qualitative research. *The Counseling Psychologist, 25*(4), 517-572. doi:10.1177/0011000097254001

Iyer, A., Leach, C. W., & Crosby, F. J. (2003). White guilt and racial compensation: The benefits and limits of self-focus. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29*(1), 117-129. doi:10.1177/0146167202238377

Jensen, R. (2005). *The heart of Whiteness: Confronting race, racism, and White privilege*. San Francisco, CA: City Lights.

Kivel, P. (2002). *Uprooting racism: How White people can work for racial justice* (Rev ed.). Gabriola Island, B.C.: New Society Publishers.

Krueger, R. A. (1994). *Focus groups: A practical guide for applied research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Krueger, R. A. (1998). *Analyzing & reporting focus group results.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

McKinney, K. D., & Feagin, J. R. (2003). Diverse perspectives on doing antiracism: The younger generation. In A. W. Doane & E. Bonilla-Silva (Eds.), *White out* (2nd ed., pp. 233-252). New York: Routledge.

Moon, D. & Flores, L. A. (2000). Antiracism and the abolition of Whiteness: Rhetorical strategies of domination among "race traitors." *Communication Studies, 51(2),* 97-115.

Neville, H. A., Lilly, R. L., Duran, G., Lee, R. M., & Browne, L. (2000). Construction and initial validation of the Color-Blind Racial Attitudes Scale (CoBRAS). *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 47,* 59–70. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.47.1.59

O'Brien, E. (2001). *Whites confront racism: Antiracists and their paths to action.* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

O'Brien, E. (2003). The political is personal: The influence of white supremacy on white antiracists' personal relationships. In A. W. Doane & E. Bonilla-Silva (Eds.), *White out* (2nd ed., pp. 253-270). New York: Routledge.

Polkinghorne, D. E. (2005). Language and meaning: Data collection in qualitative research. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 52*(2), 137-145. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.52.2.137

Poteat, V. P., & Spanierman, L. B. (2008). Further validation of the Psychosocial Costs of Racism to Whites scale among employed adults. *The Counseling Psychologist, 36*(6), 871-894. doi:10.1177/0011000007310002

Scott, D. A., & Robinson, T. L. (2001). White male identity development: The Key model. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 79,* 415–421.

Seal, D. W., Bogart, L. M., & Ehrhardt, A. A. (1998). Small group dynamics: The utility of focus group discussions as a research method. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice, 2,* 253–266. doi: 10.1037/1089-2699.2.4.253

Smith, L., & Redington, R. M. (2010). Lessons from the experiences of White antiracist activists. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 41*(6), 541-549. doi:10.1037/a0021793

Spanierman, L. B., & Heppner, M. J. (2004). Psychosocial Costs of Racism to Whites scale (PCRW): Construction and initial validation. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 51*(2), 249-262. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.51.2.249

Spanierman, L. B., Oh, E., Poteat, V. P., Hund, A. R., McClair, V. L., Beer, A. M., & Clarke, A. M. (2008). White university students' responses to societal racism: A qualitative investigation. *The Counseling Psychologist, 36*(6), 839-870. doi:10.1177/0011000006295589

Spanierman, L. B., Poteat, V. P., Beer, A. M., & Armstrong, P. I. (2006). Psychosocial costs of racism to Whites: Exploring patterns through cluster analysis. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 53*(4), 434-441. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.53.4.434

Spanierman, L. B., Poteat, V. P., Wang, Y., & Oh, E. (2008). Psychosocial costs of racism to White counselors: Predicting various dimensions of multicultural counseling competence. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 55*(1), 75-88. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.55.1.75

Spanierman, L. B., & Soble, J. R. (2010). Understanding Whiteness: Previous approaches and possible directions in the study of White racial attitudes and identity. In J. G. Ponterotto, L. A. Suzuki, J. M. Casas, & C. M. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of Multicultural Counseling* (3rd ed., pp. 283-300). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Spanierman, L. B., Todd, N. R., & Anderson, C. J. (2009). Psychosocial costs of racism to Whites: Understanding patterns among university students. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 56*(2), 239-252. doi:10.1037/a0015432

Stewart, D. W., Shamdasani, P. N., & Rook, D. W. (2007). *Focus groups: Theory and practice* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Sue, D. W., Lin, A. I., Torino, G. C., Capodilupo, C. M., Rivera, D. P. (2009). Racial microaggressions and difficult dialogues on race in the classroom. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 15*(2), 183-190. doi:10.1037/a0014191

Swim, J. K., & Miller, D. L. (1999). White guilt: Its antecedents and consequences for attitudes toward affirmative action. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 25*(4), 500-514. doi:10.1177/0146167299025004008

Tatum, B. D. (1994). Teaching White students about racism: The search for White allies and the restoration of hope. *Teachers College Record, 95*, 462-476.

Todd, N. R., Spanierman, L. B., & Aber, M. S. (2010). White students reflecting on Whiteness: Understanding emotional responses. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 3*, 97-110. doi:10.1037/a0019299

Trepagnier, B. (2010). *Silent racism: How well-meaning White people perpetuate the racial divide.* Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.

Wang, Y., Davidson, M. M., Yakushko, O. F., Savoy, H. B., Tan, J. A., & Bleier, J. K. (2003). The Scale of Ethnocultural Empathy: Development, validation, and reliability. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 50*(2), 221-234. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.50.2.221

Williams, J. K., Wyatt, G. E., Resell, J., Peterson, J., & Asuan-O'Brien, A. (2004). Psychosocial issues among gay- and non-gay-identifying HIV-seropositive African American and Latino MSM. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 10*(3), 268-286. doi:10.1037/1099-9809.10.3.268

Wise, T. (2011, August 12). Racism, violence and the irony of stereotypes. [Web log entry]. Retrieved from http://www.timwise.org

Table

Table 1

Participant Information

PCRW Type	Gender	Age	WE	WG	WF	MCC
1. Antiracist	F	22	5.7	3.8	2.0	7
2. Antiracist	F	22	5.5	4.6	2.6	7
3. Antiracist	F	22	5.5	3.8	1.2	3
4. Antiracist	M	22	6.0	4.4	1.6	6
5. Antiracist	F	21	5.7	3.4	2.0	NR
6. Empathic/Unaccountable	M	21	5.2	1.0	2.6	0
7. Empathic/Unaccountable	F	22	4.8	1.6	2.0	2
8. Empathic/Unaccountable	M	22	5.7	1.2	1.8	1
9. Fearful Guilt	F	21	4.7	3.4	3.2	1
10. Insensitive/Afraid	F	22	3.5	1.0	3.6	0
11. Oblivious	M	22	4.8	1.0	1.8	0

Note. WE, WG, and WF refer to scores on the three subscales of the Psychosocial Costs of Racism to Whites (i.e., White Empathy, White Guilt, and White Fear, respectively). Possible range of scores for each item is 1-6; scale scores are "average" scores (i.e., total score/number of items in scale). NR = Not reported. MCC = the total reported multicultural courses taken during the entire course of participants' university education.

PCRW Focus Group Interview Protocol

1. What has your overall experience at the university been like?

2. What were your experiences with diversity like while growing up? *(possible prompts below)*

   a. Did you have friends of other races? Did your parents?

   b. Did you ever talk about race in your family?

   c. Did you learn about race and/or racism in school?

3. What have your experiences with diversity been like on campus? *(possible prompts below)*

   a. Did you engage in diversity opportunities/activities while on campus?

   b. What encouraged you to do so (or to refrain)?

   c. What, if anything, did you get out of it?

4. Do you ever feel sad, upset, or angry about racism? *(possible prompts below)*

   a. Ask with regard to individual and institutional levels of racism?

   b. Any other feelings about racism?

   c. What do you do with these feelings?

5. When you hear the term "White privilege" what comes to mind? *(possible prompts below)*

   a. Are you ever afraid of losing privilege?

6. Do you ever feel guilty when you think about your race?

   a. If so, please tell us about it.

   b. Do you do anything in response to feeling guilty?

7. Do you ever feel afraid or mistrustful of people of other races?

   a. If so, in what situations?

8. Anything else you would like to share that we haven't asked about?