5-2022

"All Skinfolk Ain't Kinfolk": Attributions of Race-Based Discrimination When an Ingroup Member is the Perpetrator

Christin Alexandra Mujica
University of Arkansas, Fayetteville

“All Skinfolk Ain’t Kinfolk”: Attributions of Race-Based Discrimination When an Ingroup Member is the Perpetrator

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts in Psychology

by

Christin A. Mujica
Tufts University
Bachelor of Science in Clinical Psychology and Community Health, 2017

May 2022
University of Arkansas

This thesis is approved for recommendation to the Graduate Council.

Ana J. Bridges, Ph.D. Thesis Director	Scott Eidelman, Ph.D. Committee Member
Ivan Vargas, Ph.D. Committee Member	Brandon Jackson, Ph.D. Committee Member

Abstract

Most research addressing racial/ethnic discrimination is focused on instances perpetrated by White people or someone not of the same race or ethnic background as the target (i.e., outgroup discrimination). However, based on theories of ethnic identity development and internalized racism, it is possible for people of color to discriminate against people in their own racial or ethnic group. The current study used a qualitative approach to 1) understand what people of color believe about racism and discrimination broadly and based on the race of the perpetrator, 2) describe under what situations (e.g., race of perpetrator or overtness/subtlety of the act) race-related negative behavior would be attributed to discrimination or racism, and 3) examine emotional responses to ingroup vs. outgroup discrimination. Adults of color in the United States (N = 39; 54% women), with average to high ethnic identity, were interviewed about their experiences with ingroup and outgroup discrimination. Results suggested that: (1) people of color believe that ingroup members can perpetuate racism and act in a discriminatory fashion towards other people of color, (2) racial discrimination through overt and subtle behaviors leads to more dispositional attributions of behavior for White perpetrators compared to more situational attributions of behavior for ingroup perpetrators, and (3) ingroup racial discrimination can lead to more feelings of hurt and betrayal due to its shocking nature compared to the expected nature of White perpetrated racism. The implications of this study suggest that white supremacy is insidious and affects people of color in ways (e.g., internalization of racism) that can lead to the perpetration of racism in their own communities.

Keywords: ingroup discrimination, attribution theory, internalized racism

Table of Contents

Introduction 1

Discrimination and Racism 2

Ethnic Identity Development and White Supremacy 3

Attributions of Behavior 7

Ingroup Bias 10

Value Violations: The Black Sheep Effect and Group Dynamics 11

Racist Discrimination Attribution Research 15

Emotional Responses to Discrimination and Cultural Betrayal 20

Previous Research on Psychosocial and Stress Responses to Ingroup Discrimination 22

Limitations of the Research 23

Current Study 24

Method 25

Participants 25

Recruitment 25

Procedure 26

Debriefing 26

Positionality 27

Measures 27

Demographic Information 27

Ethnic Identity 27

Experiences with Ethnic Discrimination 28

Acceptability of Racial Microaggressions Scale 29

Interview 30

Data Analysis 32

Preliminary Analyses 32

Qualitative Analyses 32

Results....32
Descriptives....32
Qualitative....33
Theme 1: Racism: Power and Systemic or Interpersonal....34
Power and Systemic....34
Interpersonal....35
Theme 2: Discrimination: Bias and Negative Action....35
Theme 3: Historical Origins and Intersectionality....36
Sociopolitical History....36
Intersectionality....37
Theme 4: “All Skinfolk Ain’t Kinfolk”....39
Theme 5: Overt is Clearly Discriminatory....40
Theme 6: Subtle: It’s Different from People of Color....41
Theme 7: “They Should Know Better”: Shocked, Betrayed, and Hurt....43
Theme 8: More Empathy for Ingroup Members....45
Theme 9: Racism from White People: Expected but Angering and Frustrating....46
Discussion....48
Strengths and Limitations....54
Future Directions....56
Conclusion....56
References....58
Tables....65
Appendix A: Advertisement for Study in Community....69
Appendix B: Demographic Measure....70
Appendix C: Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure-Revised....74
Appendix D: Consent Form....76

Appendix E: Brief Perceived Ethnic Discrimination Questionnaire- Community Version 78
Appendix F: Acceptability of Racial Microaggressions Scale 80
Appendix G: Interviewer Guide.....81
Appendix H: Debriefing Form.....84
Appendix I: Institutional Review Board Approval.....87

Introduction

"All Skinfolk Ain't Kinfolk": Attributions of Race-Based Discrimination When an Ingroup Member is the Perpetrator

Between 50% and 75% of people of color (e.g., Black, Latinx, Asian, and Native American/Indigenous) have reported experiencing some form of racial/ethnic discrimination in their lifetime (Lee et al., 2019; Lopez et al., 2018; Pérez et al., 2008). Discrimination experiences are not only unpleasant, they also confer measurable health risks for targets. Pascoe & Richman (2009) conducted a meta-analysis of 192 studies that addressed gender and racial/ethnic discrimination; most of these studies find that increased discrimination is associated with negative physical and mental health consequences. When looking specifically at racial/ethnic discrimination or racism, research shows that individuals who report higher levels of racial/ethnic discrimination experience higher levels of hypertension (Dolezsar et al., 2014), adverse cardiovascular outcomes (Lewis et al., 2014), and depression and anxiety (Pascoe & Richman, 2009; Williams et al., 2019) compared to people who report lower levels of discrimination. These negative health consequences are evident when discrimination is overt *and* when it is subtle (Jones et al., 2016; Magallares et al., 2014; Noh et al., 2007).

Extant research makes clear that discrimination contributes to negative health outcomes. However, racial/ethnic discrimination is usually defined as perpetrated by a White person or someone not of the same race or ethnic background as the target. Based on theories of racial/cultural identity development (Cross, 1971; Sue & Sue, 1999), people of color who are in early stages of racial identity may perpetuate the ideas and values of the majority culture (i.e., White dominance and supremacy). This means that people of color can potentially be discriminatory toward people of their own racial/ethnic group (labeled in this document as ingroup

racial/ethnic discrimination). Zora Neale Hurston's famous quote, "All skinfolk ain't kinfolk," suggests that some people of color may be agents of white supremacy and may actively discriminate against people of their same racial group.

While much is known about the negative consequences of outgroup racism, research on ingroup racial/ethnic discrimination is minimal. The purpose of this study was to expand research on ingroup racial/ethnic discrimination and describe situations and contexts (e.g., racial identity of perpetrator and/or the subtle or overtness of the behavior) in which negative behavior by an ingroup member is attributed to racial/ethnic discrimination.

Discrimination and Racism

Race-based or racial/ethnic discrimination refers to the unequal treatment of people because they are of a certain racial or ethnic background and may include both overt and subtle behaviors reflecting negative attitudes toward that racial/ethnic group (National Association of School Psychologists, 2019). Therefore, race-based discrimination is the *individual* act of treating a racial/ethnic minority member in an inequitable fashion but is the result of the larger structure of racism. Racism in general refers to the *systemic and structural* subordination of members of racial groups who have relatively little power in the United States (i.e., Blacks, Latinxs, Native Americans, and Asians) by the members of the dominant racial group who have relatively high power (Whites) (Wijeysinghe, Griffin, & Love, 1997). Racism can be perpetuated through race-based discrimination by individuals when they share beliefs, attitudes, or commit actions that perpetuate the superiority of Whites and the subordination of minority racial/ethnic groups. People often uses race-based discrimination and racism interchangeably. While historically racism has been practiced through overt forms of discrimination and racial terrorism such as lynchings, yelling slurs, and burning crosses, scholars believe we have moved to an era where racism is

practiced more frequently through more covert methods that are often ambiguous in form. This "new racism" has been called color-blind racism (Bonilla-Silva, 2017), modern racism (McConahay, 1986), and aversive racism (Dovidio & Gaertner, 2004). Throughout this document, when reviewing research on discrimination I use the terms used by study authors. However, that the reader should keep in mind racism is not just about an individual's behavior but is also defined by structural and institutional policies that create a racial/ethnic hierarchy, keeping people who are not White at a lower place in society (Kendi, 2019).

Ethnic Identity Development and White Supremacy

Much of the research on race-based discrimination has focused on White people being the perpetrator. This is understandable and important research given that Whites hold a position of power and privilege in the United States (Bergsieker et al., 2010; Frantz et al., 2004; Krueger, 1996; Vorauer et al., 1998). This power structure is a result of white supremacy. The system of white supremacy is defined as a multidimensional system of white domination that encompasses myriad spheres, including: juridico-political (e.g., governing bodies and laws promoting White authority), economic (e.g., capitalism, wealth, and racial exploitation to maintain wealth), cultural (e.g., Eurocentrism and media dominance), cognitive-evaluative (e.g., racist ideology and White normativity), and somatic (e.g., standards of beauty) (Mills, 2003). These spheres interact with one another and contribute to the perpetuation of white domination and supremacy.

Even though research on race-based discrimination perpetuated by White people will continue to be critical, it is important to understand how race-based discrimination from ingroup members may be perceived by people of color. People of color (whether Black, Latinx, Asian, or Native American) are not a monolithic group. Within their own communities, there is variation in thoughts, experiences, and behaviors, including differences in awareness of one's own

race/ethnicity and its meaning relative to dominant narratives from a white supremacist culture. Scholars have proposed many different stages of Black (Cross, 1971) or ethnic (Atkinson et al., 1983; Hoffman & Hoffman, 2006; Phinney, 1989; Sue & Sue, 1999) identity development. The theories of ethnic identity development may use different titles for each stage of identity development, but in general these theories reflect a common process from a lack of awareness of race and a buy-in to the dominant culture (at the earliest stages) to an increased awareness and recognition of race from a historical and critical lens. These stages are summarized in Table 1.

To outline this common path of identity development, I will use Sue and Sue's (1999) stages of racial/cultural identity development as a model. Most people of color begin their ethnic identity development in the first stage of *conformity*. In this first stage, people of color raised in a society with systemic racism and white supremacy show a preference for the dominant (White) cultural values over those of their own culture and may experience internalized racism (described further below). In the second stage, *dissonance,* the person of color starts to reflect on experiences or situations that are inconsistent with previously held beliefs (Sue et al., 2019). They may begin to recognize that racism does exists and that there are both negative and positive aspects of the majority (White) culture. Additionally, negative views about their own culture begin to be questioned. In the third stage, *resistance and immersion,* the person of color may reject values of dominant (White) society and culture while fully embracing and immersing themselves in their own racial/ethnic culture (Sue et al., 2019). A person in this stage might feel guilt and shame for having contributed to the oppression of their own group. They are angry at racism and oppression and working toward self-discovery (Sue et al., 2019). Importantly, there is both an embracing of one's own culture and a strong rejection of the majority culture, which is seen as oppressive and problematic. Stage four, *introspection,* occurs when the person discovers that anger toward White

society is draining and they look toward a way to be more balanced in their views and values (Sue & Sue, 1999; Sue et al., 2019). In the final stage, stage 5, *integrative awareness*, the person of color develops an inner sense of security and can appreciate aspects of their own culture and some aspects of the dominant culture (Sue & Sue, 1999; Sue et al., 2019). This is accompanied by having a strong commitment to eliminating all forms of oppression (Sue et al., 2019).

People may be at any given stage of racial/ethnic identity development at any given point in their life: the models are developmental but not yoked to particular age groups. Furthermore, not everyone will go through all stages. People in the first stages, such as the stage of conformity in Sue et al. (2019), are typically conforming to the majority culture and ideals, including ideals about White dominance and beauty standards, and thus are likely to be experiencing internalized racism. More specifically, internalized racism occurs when someone from an oppressed racial group supports the supremacy of the dominant group by holding attitudes or ideologies and behaving in ways that maintain the dominant group's power (Bivens, 1995). People who are in the first stages of identity development may exhibit internalized racism and may privilege White standards of beauty (e.g., suggesting that lighter skin tone and straight hair are more desirable than a darker skin tone and kinky hair). In this stage we may also see people of color adopting prejudiced opinions of their own groups (e.g., thinking that people of color are lazy and more violent than White people) (Sue et al., 2019). Internalized racism that may define these initial stages of identity development may also lead some people to behave in a discriminatory manner toward people of their own racial/ethnic group. People of color who have internalized racism and some degree of power (e.g., police officers, congresspeople, or university deans) may also support or create structural and institutional policies that systemically affect people from their own racial/ethnic group (Kendi, 2019).

While some people of color may remain in the first stage of racial/ethnic identity development for a long period of time, many (and perhaps most) people of color progress to later stages and develop a strong identification with their race or ethnicity. Racial/ethnic identity has been conceptualized by researchers as a multidimensional construct that is just one part of a person's self-concept. Racial/ethnic identification is developed through awareness and increasing knowledge of one's membership in an ethnic or racial group (Phinney, 1992). This construct is also connected to the emotion, behaviors, and values that are attached to belonging to a racial or ethnic group. Strong identification with one's ethnic or racial group has been correlated with higher levels of perceived discrimination (Gonzales-Backen et al., 2018) but also is protective against the negative consequences of this discrimination (Lee, 2005; Romero & Roberts, 2003; Torres & Ong, 2010; Tynes et al., 2012).

Bonilla-Silva (2017) has asserted that because of the dominant nature of racism (what he refers to as color-blind ideology), most people must at least partially accommodate to the views of this dominant ideology, even if they are a "subordinate" member of that society. Considering society advantages Whites over other racial/ethnic groups and given theories of racial/ethnic identity development, it is reasonable to suggest that people of color may exhibit race-based discrimination against members of their own racial/ethnic group. Therefore, there is a growing need to understand how race-based discrimination may affect people of color not only when Whites are perpetrators but also when experienced from those perceived to be ingroup members or of the same race/ethnicity. It is possible that what is attributed as racist discrimination can vary by the identity of the perpetrator, the type of behavior or statement (overt or subtle), and the identity of the perceiver, as reviewed next.

Attributions of Behavior

Attribution refers to the process a person uses to infer the causes or intentions of someone else's behavior (Pennington, 2012). There are two main types of attributions: dispositional and situational. Dispositional attributions are when one attributes a person's behavior to internal characteristics and who they are as a person (Pennington, 2012). Meanwhile, situational attributions are when one attributes a person's behavior to things occurring in their environment. For instance, imagine you are driving and someone, abruptly and without warning, merges in front of you, nearly causing an accident. A dispositional attribution would lead you to conclude that this person nearly caused an accident because they are rude and inconsiderate (or a very poor driver). A situational attribution might lead you to conclude that the person either did not see you or merged to avoid another obstacle in the road. Therefore, when you make a dispositional attribution, you are making assumptions about the kind of person someone is or their personality traits. Meanwhile, a situational attribution focuses less on who the person is and more on the context that may lead someone to behave in a certain way (Pennington, 2012).

Whether a person makes a situational or dispositional attribution can depend on various factors and are often biased or even erroneous. One of these biases is the actor-observer bias. The actor-observer bias suggests that people often attribute their own behaviors to situational or external causes, while attributing the behavior of others to more internal or dispositional causes (Nisbett et al., 1973; Wilson et al., 1997). For example, if you received a 100% on an exam you might attribute this to your having been well-prepared or to the test having been easier than you expected. However, if your friend received a 100% on an exam, you might say it was because they are smart. Nisbett et al. (1973) tested this theory using college students. They provided a questionnaire where participants were given different personality traits (i.e., energetic vs. relaxed;

skeptical vs. trusting) and the option "depends on the situation." Students were then asked to circle which of the three choices best described their own personality, their best friend, their father, and a popular television personality. The results confirmed the actor-observer bias as students circled "depends on the situation" more frequently for themselves and one of the two traits for other people.

However, research suggests that the actor-observer bias may be contextual (Taylor & Koivumaki, 1976). In fact, Taylor and Koivumaki (1976) conducted three studies with married participants who rated behaviors as dispositional or situational for an acquaintance, a friend, their spouse, and themselves. The results, which were replicated in all three studies, suggested that people were more likely to rate positive behaviors as dispositional regardless of their relationship to the person. However, when the behavior was negative, participants were more likely to attribute the behavior of people closer to them as situational rather than dispositional. Taylor and Koivumaki (1976) suggest that when a person is disliked, they may be viewed as more responsible for their negative behavior, using dispositional attribution, compared to their positive behaviors, which are more attributed to situational factors. Taylor and Koivumaki (1976) suggested attributions are affected by many factors and are more complicated to predict than the actor-observer bias suggests.

Additional research suggests that the actor-observer bias may not be as common or as strong as the fundamental attribution error (Malle, 2006). According to the fundamental attribution error (Heider, 1958; Ross et al., 1977), people overestimate the importance of dispositional (personal) factors and underestimate situational influences when making judgments about someone's behavior. For example, Jones and Harris (1967) had participants read essays for and against Fidel Castro and then rate what they believed the attitude of the essay authors were in

reality. In this situation, participants rated those who wrote essays for Castro as people who really liked Castro and his policies. Jones and Harris (1967) then told participants that the positions of the writers were determined by a coin toss, meaning participants did not actually have to hold the opinions they were writing about. Regardless, participants still rated those who wrote essays for Castro as people who have positive attitudes towards him (i.e., made a dispositional attribution). Researchers suggest that making situational attributions may be more cognitively demanding than dispositional attribution because you would need to consider all the relevant factors of that person's situation rather than just making an assumption based on observed behavior (Newman & Uleman, 1989; Uleman et al., 2005).

The ultimate attribution error (Pettigrew, 1979) expands the idea of the fundamental attribution error to include ingroup bias. The ultimate attribution error suggests that when an outgroup member does or says something that is undesirable or negative, it is often attributed to dispositional factors, whereas when an ingroup member does the same, the behavior is attributed to situational factors. In short, much like the fundamental attribution error suggests we give ourselves the benefit of the doubt for bad behavior (e.g., I failed the exam because the professor wrote bad questions) but do not extend that benefit of the doubt to others (e.g., He failed the exam because he is not smart), we give people in our ingroup but not our outgroup the benefit of the doubt. For example, Duncan (1976) showed 100 White undergraduates a video of a person (either White or Black) ambiguously shoving another person (also either White or Black). They found that the White participants tended to attribute the shove to dispositional factors when the perpetrator was Black compared to when the perpetrator was White. The authors concluded participants were more likely to make excuses for negative behavior when the behaviors come from people of our own group than from an outgroup, perhaps because they had more knowledge

about the context surrounding ingroup members' behavior. In contrast, for outgroup members they lacked context and thus relied on making personality or dispositional assumption. Given this, it is possible that when people from our same racial/ethnic group behave in a discriminatory way, we may attribute that behavior to situational factors rather than make an attribution to racism (a dispositional attribution). The ultimate attribution error functions as an extension of the ingroup bias, reviewed next, in order to protect the group.

Ingroup Bias

General social psychology principals related to group dynamics suggest that an ingroup bias exists which leads to ingroup favoritism (e.g., viewing a member of one's group more favorably than an outgroup member) (Castano et al., 2002; Lindeman, 1997; Messick & Mackie, 1989; Tajfel, 1982). Ingroup bias is thought to be a method of self-enhancement for the group identity as it preserves a positive differentiation of the ingroup compared to the outgroup (Tajfel, 1978; Turner, 1975; Turner, 2010). Ingroup bias has been found in both experimental and real-world settings.

In experimental settings, researchers have arbitrarily created groups based on unimportant and small characteristics, such as shirt color (Lazerus et al., 2016). Even in these minimal groups, participants favor members of their own group over members of another group. In a real-world setting, Brewer and Campbell (1976) studied 30 ethnic groups in East Africa and found that people rated their own ethnic group high in positive dimensions like trustworthiness and honesty compared to how they rated other ethnic groups.

Ingroup bias may also account for some racism and discriminatory acts. For example, studies show that White people are more likely to hire other White people over Black or Latinx people because of ingroup favoritism (Bendick, 2007; Bendick et al., 2010). Indeed, it appears that

some discrimination is less about harming outgroup members than favoring ingroup members (Brewer, 1999).

Value Violations: The Black Sheep Effect and Subjective Group Dynamics

While ingroup bias is seen in many intergroup interactions, other group dynamics may occur. For example, when a person considered part of the ingroup violates a group value (labeled as deviance), they may be rated more harshly or negatively than a member of the outgroup who engages in the same violation. This phenomenon has been called the black sheep effect and is thought to be a form of ingroup favoritism (Jetten & Hornsey, 2014; Marques et al., 1988). Subjective group dynamics expands the black sheep effect and suggests that when deviance occurs, the group further differentiates between deviant ingroup members and non-deviant ingroup members. This differentiation and judgement of deviant ingroup members from non-deviant ingroup members helps to maintain a positive intergroup distinction (Pinto et al., 2010). Specifically, the black sheep effect states that ingroup members will judge agreeable ingroup members more positively, and unlikeable ingroup members more negatively, than similar outgroup members (Marques et al., 1988).

Marques et al. (1988) conducted three experiments demonstrating the black sheep effect. In their first experiment they recruited Belgian undergraduate students to rate other students on 62 trait descriptors. These other students were presented as neutral Belgian or North African students, unlikeable Belgian or North African students, or likeable Belgian or North African students. Marques et al. (1988) found that Belgian students rated other likeable/agreeable Belgian students more positively than likeable/agreeable North African students. They also found that Belgian students judged unlikeable Belgian students more negatively compared to unlikeable North African students. In short, deviant ingroup members received the harshest ratings compared to

likeable ingroup members and deviant or likeable outgroup members. Preserving the positive image of the ingroup may be driving this effect.

In their second experiment with Belgian undergraduate students, Marques et al. (1988) replicated the black sheep effect. They had Belgian students rate people and behaviors on five positive trait descriptors using a 7-point Likert scale. Students were randomized to rate students who were presented as likeable-general Belgian or North African (students who always lend lecture notes to others), unlikeable-general Belgian or North African (students who never lend lecture notes to others), likeable-exclusive Belgian or North African (students who put having fun before studying), and unlikeable-exclusive Belgian or North African (students who put studying before having fun). Results suggested that Belgian students were more likely to make more extreme judgements about members of their own group compared to how they judged North African students.

In the final experiment, Marques et al. (1988) had Belgian undergraduate students answer a questionnaire on soccer and violence. This occurred after a riot occurred between British and Italian soccer supporters at a Belgian soccer stadium. Participants were told to imagine that this riot had occurred between Belgian and German soccer supporters and then evaluated these supporters using trait descriptors. Participants also answered a series of questions that determined their familiarity with soccer and soccer supporters. The authors found that even with low familiarity of a situation, people judged members of their own group who behaved negatively more harshly than those of an outgroup member. This effect has been replicated by others using people of varying nationalities (Pinto et al., 2010) and groups (e.g., people of different political parties) (Abrams et al., 2013; Matthews & Dietz-Uhler, 1988).

Subjective group dynamics proposes that deviant ingroup members are a threat to the group's positive identity and therefore non-deviant group members develop strong derogatory reactions toward deviant members. This has been shown to be especially true when ingroup members have been in the group for a longer time and are thought to be "full" members, or members who uphold the group's core beliefs and values, versus new or marginal members of the group. The complementary aspect of subjective group dynamics suggests that full members who are normative or non-deviant are instead likely to be viewed more positively than new or marginal normative ingroup members.

Pinto et al. (2010) tested the theory of subjective group dynamics in a series of experiments. For the first experiment, they recruited 50 undergraduate students from a Portuguese university and informed them that the present study concerned the way students viewed their contribution to educational reform. They were led to believe that their responses would help decide which of several candidates would represent the ingroup and outgroup in an upcoming debate. After providing their position on a set of seven assertions about student participation in the improvement of the university system, they had a 2-week break (Pinto et al., 2010). When they returned, researchers provided participants with target student profiles (these served as the experimental manipulations). The target profiles were essentially the same and included responses to the same questions that the participants answered. The target profiles varied on whether they were an ingroup (attending the same course) or outgroup (attending another course) member and on how long they have been attending the course (i.e., 6 months only – new member; 4 years – full member). Additionally, to manipulate deviance they had target profiles have a normative response ("students should join together and negotiate") or a deviant response ("students are not mature enough to know what is best") (Pinto et al., 2010). After reading the profile, participants evaluated

the target on various traits. Results suggested that people are more likely to derogate deviant ingroup full members than deviant new ingroup members.

In the second experiment, Pinto et al. (2010) kept the procedure essentially the same with some adaptations as the participants were high school students. In this second experiment, they also found that deviant ingroup full members were derogated more than outgroup members, whether deviant or normative. In the final experiment, students in postgraduate courses followed essentially the same procedure as the previous two experiments. However, they had the participants believe that they were going to help decide which students, from the target profiles, would be accepted to participate in the debate. Pinto et al. (2010) found that participants were more likely to suggest a more punishing response toward a deviant ingroup full member compared to any other member.

Other real-world examples have also illustrated this phenomenon. For example, consider individuals who have been part of a certain political party for years, such as former New Jersey governor Chris Christie in the Republican party. When Governor Christie praised President Obama, a Democrat, for his response to Hurricane Sandy, which devastated New Jersey, and physically embraced him, other Republicans reacted as if they had been betrayed by Governor Christie. On Fox News, a historically conservative news station, Governor Christie was ridiculed and even blamed for President Obama's winning his subsequent election.

Taken together, the research on ingroup values violations has produced interesting and consistent results suggesting that ingroup members rate ingroup deviants – who were previously perceived to hold the same values - more harshly than outgroup members who perform the same unfavorable behaviors (Bettencourt et al., 1997; Glasford et al., 2009; Marques et al., 1988; Pinto et al., 2010). Therefore, it may be that a person who witnesses an ingroup member behaving in a

way that is perceived as overtly discriminatory will attribute that behavior to race-based discrimination rather than situational factors, undermining the ultimate attribution error and further confirming the fundamental attribution error, actor-observer bias, subjective group dynamics, and black sheep effect theories. However, subtle race-based discriminatory behaviors may still allow ingroup bias to be upheld as the violation may not be perceived as egregious and lead to situational attributions as an attempt to mitigate the cognitive dissonance that may be experienced, further confirming the ultimate attribution error in these contexts. This is especially plausible given the ambiguous nature of subtle racism or discrimination, even when White people are the perpetrators (Reid & Birchard, 2010). Said differently, the ultimate attribution error would predict that racist discrimination by an ingroup member would be attributed to situation rather than dispositional factors; however, subjective group dynamics and the black sheep effect would predict that if the racist discrimination was severe in magnitude (i.e., very deviant), then a harsher dispositional attribution would be made to the perpetrator than would be the case if the perpetrator was an outgroup member.

Nevertheless, a gap exists in the literature related to specifically looking at issues of racial and ethnic values violations within a group and the attributions of these behaviors. The few studies in this area are reviewed next.

Racist Discrimination Attribution Research

Research regarding attributions of behavior to racism or discrimination have focused predominantly on White people as the perpetrators and Black people as the target. For instance, Wilson and Bennett (1994) wanted to know under what conditions negative behavior from White people toward Black people would be considered racist. To further study this, Wilson and Bennett (1994) recruited undergraduate students and provided them with scenarios where White police

officers attack a Black person (the target). These scenarios varied in both the level of provocation (low or high) from the Black person (the target) and the intensity of the attack from the White officer (low or high). They found that when the attack from the White officer was of high intensity, participants related this behavior more often to the person's race compared to when the attack was of low intensity. Additionally, when there was minimal provocation from the Black person (the target), participants were more likely to attribute the behavior of the police officer to racism (an internal or dispositional attribution of the perpetrator) than to the target's behavior.

Smith and Wout (2019) created a series of studies to understand how Black people's perception of a Biracial person's ingroup membership affected how they perceived social rejection and whether they would attribute rejection to discrimination. In their first study, Smith and Wout (2019) recruited Black American adults to understand attributions of discrimination when participants were rejected by a Black, White, or Biracial interaction partner. They also examined if attributions to discrimination would vary based on the degree to which participants perceived their interaction partner to be a racial ingroup member. These situations were creating using fake profiles of interaction partners which varied by how the partner identified racially (Black, White, or biracial). Participants were first asked to write a short response on the topic of "Why I Make a Good Friend." After writing their response, they rated to what degree they perceived their interaction partner to be a part of their racial group. Participants were then told they would be evaluated by their partner. All participants received negative feedback and were rejected by their interaction partners. After receiving this feedback, participants were asked the extent to which they believed a series of attributions (including the attribution of discrimination) influenced the feedback they received. Results indicated that participants considered Black and biracial partners as more of an ingroup member than a White partner. Additionally, participants were more likely

to attribute negative feedback to discrimination when the person providing the feedback was White versus Black or biracial. These findings are consistent with the ultimate attribution error.

In the second study, Smith and Wout (2019) further examined if the way a biracial person self-identified would impact the extent to which participants viewed them as an ingroup member and, in turn, affect attributions of discrimination to their rejection behavior. Following a similar procedure as Study 1, participants were shown one of three profiles that provided information on how an individual self-identified racially. For instance, the profiles said either 1) "Half Black/Half White, but I see myself as Black" (Black-identified), 2) "Half Black/Half White, but I see myself as White" (White-identified), or 3) "Half Black/Half White" (biracial-identified). They then completed the same tasks of writing a short response, evaluating the ingroup membership of the partner, and receiving negative/rejection feedback. Smith and Wout (2019) found that Black participants were more likely to rate profiles of biracial people who identified as Black or biracial as part of their ingroup than profiles of biracial people who identified as White. They also found that participants were more likely to attribute negative feedback about their short response to discrimination when the biracial person providing the feedback self-identified as White compared to the biracial-identified and Black-identified person. Again, findings support the ultimate attribution error because attributions about the behavior were harsher for an outgroup than an ingroup member.

O'Brien et al. (2012) created a series of studies to look how ingroup rejection may affect attributions to discrimination. In their first study, O'Brien et al. (2012) recruited White and Latinx participants from a university. These participants were led to believe that a member of their own ethnic group had rejected them for a co-manager position in favor of a member of a different ethnic group. Following the rejection, the participants were asked to indicate to what extent they believed

that the decision as to who received the co-manager position was fair, due to race/ethnicity, and/or due to discrimination. Overall, Latinx participants who were rejected from the co-manager position by a Latinx person in favor of a White person were more likely to attribute rejection to discrimination compared to Whites who were rejected by a White person in favor of a Latinx person (O'Brien et al., 2012). Latinx participants were also more likely to report feeling betrayed when they were rejected by an ingroup member compared to White participants. These findings are consistent with subjective group dynamics and the black sheep effect.

In their second study, O'Brien et al. (2012) recruited White and Latinx undergraduates to explore how attributions of discrimination might differ if participants were not the target but were instead an outside observer. They had White and Latinx participants learn about a manager (White or Latinx) who reviewed applications for a research assistant position. The applicants were manipulated to be either White or Latinx. In one condition, the manager was Latinx and rejected the Latinx applicant in favor of the White applicant. In the other condition, the manager was White and rejected the White applicant in favor of the Latinx applicant. Results from this study indicated that participants, regardless of race, who were in the condition with the Latinx manager made more attributions of discrimination than participants in the White manager condition (O'Brien et al., 2012). Furthermore, they found that Latinx participants in the Latinx manager condition attributed the behavior more to discrimination than Latinx participants in the White manager condition. This difference was not evident among White participants. Results support subjective group dynamics and the black sheep effect, since judgments about a deviant ingroup member were harsher than judgments about a deviant outgroup member.

In their final study, O'Brien et al. (2012) replicated some of the procedures in study two to examine if attributions to discrimination would be affected by the salience of loyalty norms

among Latinx participants. They first presented participants with either a loyalty or neutral prime. The loyalty prime included 15 sentences with words related to loyalty (i.e., allegiance and trustworthy). The neutral prime included 15 sentences that were not related to loyalty (e.g., *She likes fluffy cakes*). Then participants were exposed to a scenario where a Latinx manager had to choose between two equally qualified applicants (White or Latinx) for an open position. In one condition, the Latinx manager chose the Latinx applicant (outgroup rejection) and in the other condition the Latinx manager chose the White applicant (ingroup rejection). Results indicated that Latinx participants who were exposed to the loyalty prime before the scenario of ingroup rejection was presented made greater attributions of discrimination compared to those exposed to the neutral prime.

Overall, the three studies by O'Brien et al. (2012) suggest that there may be strong ingroup loyalty norms among marginalized groups such as Latinx people. Furthermore, when people in marginalized groups show less loyalty and favor a member of a dominant racial/ethnic group, it may lead to a greater sense of betrayal and more attributions of discrimination than when they favor a member of their own group (O'Brien et al., 2012). However, a limitation of these studies is that these scenarios were job-related and were not explicitly racially charged (e.g., the manager explicitly saying they rejected someone because of their race or using a racial epithet) and therefore the situation was ambiguous in terms of discrimination. It is possible that if the scenarios were more racially charged, attributions of discrimination would occur more often. Additionally, it would have been important to see how participants attributed the behavior of a White manager rejecting a Latinx applicant in favor of a White applicant. A full factorial design would have allowed for further comparisons about Latinx participants' attributions of discrimination.

Emotional Responses to Discrimination and Cultural Betrayal

In addition to the minimal research on how attributions of discrimination differ based on the racial identity of the perpetrator, there has been scant research regarding emotional reactions to these events. Most research has focused on the emotional reactions of racial and ethnic minorities when they experience discrimination from White or outgroup perpetrators. Overall, the consensus is that experiencing racism and racial discrimination promotes negative affective responses in victims such as feelings of anger, disrespected, frustration, hurt, and sadness (Bell et al., 2019; Bennett et al., 2004; Carter & Forsyth, 2010; Tao et al., 2017; Wang et al., 2011). Additionally, previous research highlights how targets of racism or racial discrimination often experience high levels of stress related to a racist event that persist from two months to a year after an event occurs (Carter & Forsyth, 2010). This suggests that experiences with racist or racially discriminatory events can impact someone's emotional and stress reactivity longer after the event itself has passed.

When looking at specific forms of discrimination, research suggests that more ambiguous or covert forms of discrimination are associated with more rumination and more affective reactivity (Bennett et al., 2004) than overt forms of discrimination. When these more ambiguous forms of discrimination occur, meaning making follows and calls for more cognitive and affective processing (Bennett et al., 2004). On the other hand, blatant or overt forms of discrimination produce initial high negative affect but the effects are reduced over time as the clear intentionality of the event requires less cognitive processing and makes it easier to ignore in most cases (Bennett et al., 2004).

Ultimately, there is no question that experiences with racism lead to negative emotional responses and higher self-reported stress. The question that remains about the emotional responses

to racial discrimination is whether people of color would respond similarly to ingroup discrimination. This seems to be particularly important given the fact that while people of color often work in predominantly White spaces, they often live and spend time in spaces that are predominantly of color due to systemic residential segregation (Bonilla-Silva, 2017; Charles, 2003).

While not solely related to ingroup discrimination, Gómez (2021) developed Cultural Betrayal Trauma Theory to explain the affective effects experienced by people of color when they are harmed by other people of color. According to Cultural Betrayal Trauma Theory, societal traumas like discrimination create the need for (intra)cultural trust or attachment and connection with other marginalized people. Gómez notes that this level of (intra)cultural trust between marginalized groups would not exist if it were not for the societal traumas of racism and discrimination faced by people of color. (Intra)cultural trust is like interpersonal trust and can create feelings of attachment, loyalty, and mutual responsibility between members of marginalized groups. These feelings, while largely protective and beneficial, leave people of color vulnerable to disappointment and hurt if that trust is violated. Therefore, when one experiences intra-racial trauma (e.g., traumatic experiences perpetuated by other members of marginalized groups), there is a violation of the (intra)cultural trust or, as Gómez defines it, cultural betrayal. Gómez (2021; 2019) found that cultural betrayal, often studied in the context of sexual assault perpetrated by a racial ingroup member, is associated with post-traumatic stress symptoms and dissociation. Additionally, aside from the psychological consequences of cultural betrayal, Gómez (2020) highlighted how personally experiencing cultural betrayal can lead to feelings of hurt and generally experiencing emotional pain.

Taken together, emotional responses to discrimination and cultural betrayal show that both discrimination and ingroup negative experiences can have significant impacts on the emotional and psychological health of people of color. However, cultural betrayal has been studied exclusively in the context of sexual assault and by only one scholar. However, it is consistent with a larger body of work on psychosocial responses to ingroup discrimination. I review these studies next.

Previous Research on Psychosocial and Stress Responses to Ingroup Discrimination

Neblett & Roberts (2013) recruited African American college students to examine how racial identity may interact with the race of the perpetrator and the type of racism (i.e., subtle vs. blatant) to influence physiological response to racism. The researchers presented vignettes of various racially-charged interactions with a police officer or authority figure and measured cardiovascular psychophysiology using an electrocardiogram (ECG). The racially-charged vignettes were divided into three conditions with two scenarios: blatant racism (e.g., where a police officer uses a racial slur related to the individual's race); neutral condition (e.g., someone asking for directions from a policer officer); and subtle racism (e.g., a security guard being suspicious of and following a Black individual around a store). The researchers also manipulated the race of the police officer/security guard (White or Black). The researchers found an interaction between perpetrator race and racism condition. Participants in the Black perpetrator racism conditions evinced a higher stress response than did participants in the White perpetrator racism conditions (Neblett & Roberts, 2013). However, given the experimental nature of this study, there was no indication from participants as to why this may have occurred or how they were interpreting the vignettes.

Mata-Greve (2016) collected survey responses from a community sample of Latinx adults. These surveys measured self-reported experiences of ingroup and outgroup discrimination and self-reported symptoms of depression, anxiety, and alcohol use. Results suggested that ingroup discrimination predicted depression and anxiety symptoms above and beyond outgroup discrimination (Mata-Greve, 2016). Results highlight the importance of measuring ingroup discrimination in addition to outgroup discrimination.

Limitations of the Research

Research on ingroup discrimination experiences is nascent but important to understanding experiences of people of color. The extant literature is limited in a few ways. Much of the research focused on attributions of ingroup discrimination (e.g., O'Brien et al., 2012; Smith & Wout, 2019) has not addressed situations that are explicitly race-related. The scenarios and situations that participants were exposed to in these studies were often ambiguous and not racially charged. However, it is important to understand how people may attribute behaviors in situations that are explicitly race-related. Additionally, the research to date that has examined race-based situations has used specific scenarios (e.g., police encounters; job decisions) that may not be salient to the participant. Allowing participants to describe in their own words situations of ingroup discrimination would elicit information about when people actually attribute negative behavior to discrimination (dispositional factors) versus situations factors in real-world settings.

Furthermore, there is a lack of exploration into the phenomenological experience of ingroup versus outgroup racist discrimination. Most research focuses on perpetration of discrimination from White people towards people of color, but theories of ethnic identity development and the lived experiences of people of color emphasize that discrimination is also possible by ingroup members. Research is also lacking information as to what people may be

feeling when ingroup discrimination does occur. A qualitative study further exploring experiences of racism might illuminate why certain behaviors from ingroup members are labeled as discriminatory compared to those same behaviors from outgroup members or vice versa. It will also allow researchers to understand if there are different emotional reactions to discrimination based on the racial/ethnic identity of the perpetrator.

Accordingly, here I explored a previously understudied experience of ingroup discrimination using a qualitative approach. This method allowed for the collection of rich information about people's real-world experiences with discrimination. It also allowed for further articulation of the contexts and situations in which people of color may attribute behavior to discrimination/racism versus to situational factors. By recounting these events in an interview, participants could describe their emotional states and thought processes as they reflected on these past events, helping articulate what may be common themes or contexts that elicit dispositional versus situational attributions for ingroup discrimination and the emotional impact of these events.

Current Study

Based on the background research, the aims of this exploratory study were to: 1) understand what people of color believe about racism and discrimination broadly and based on the identity of the perpetrator, 2) describe under what situations (e.g., identity of perpetrator or overtness of the event) race-related negative behavior would be attributed to discrimination or racism, and 3) understand how emotions would be affected by ingroup vs. outgroup discrimination. The study hypotheses are informed by social psychological theories (ultimate attribution error, subjective group dynamics, the black sheep effect and cultural betrayal trauma theory). I hypothesized an interaction effect between the perpetrator of the race-based behavior and the intensity of the behavior. I expected participants would attribute race-based behavior as reflecting discrimination

on the part of the perpetrator when the behavior was either (a) perpetrated by an outgroup member, or (b) overt/highly deviant. In contrast, I expected that participants would attribute race-based behavior as reflecting situational factors when the behavior was both (a) perpetrated by an ingroup member and (b) subtle in nature. I further expected ingroup discrimination that was overt to result in the highest degree of emotional hurt, consistent with cultural betrayal trauma theory.

Method

Participants

Participants in the study (N = 39) self-identified as a person of color. In order to participate in the study, participants needed to score at or above the mean (3.41) of the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure – Revised (MEIM-R; Phinney & Ong, 2007). This inclusion criterion was added because (1) the research suggests that people of color with strong ethnic identification are more likely to report higher levels of perceived discrimination (Gonzales-Backen et al., 2018), and (2) those who report higher ethnic identification are likely to be further along in the developmental trajectory of the ethnic identity development models discussed previously, suggesting they can recognize the presence of white supremacy and internalized racism among their peers. The average ethnic identity score of participants was 4.31 (SD = 0.31). Participants resided in a variety of states spanning the continental United States including New York, California, and Georgia. The age range for participants was 18 – 51 years-old (M = 25.72, SD = 5.57). See Table 2 for a more complete breakdown of participant demographics.

Recruitment

The study was advertised using a flyer distributed online through various groups that reach across the United States (Appendix A). The flyer was posted on email listservs, Facebook groups, Twitter, and shared with contacts at other universities (especially historically Black colleges and universities and Hispanic-serving institutions). I also contacted members of my

social network (friends and colleagues) who identified as people of color. Participants who were interested were directed to a Qualtrics survey screener which included demographics information (Appendix B) and a measure of ethnic identity (Appendix C).

Procedure

Participants (i.e., adult participants of color whose MEIM-R score was at or above the normative mean) were contacted via email and sent a link to an online survey. The online survey included a consent form (Appendix D), a measure of experiences with ethnic/racial discrimination (Appendix E), and a measure of the acceptability of microaggressions (Appendix F). Participants were also asked to provide their availability for scheduling a video conferencing or phone interview.

During the scheduled interview, the experimenter (the study author) reviewed the consent form (Appendix D) that was previously signed and confirmed that the individual still wished to participate. If the individual decided to participate, the experimenter began the interview and recorded the session. The interview was semi-structured with a set of structured stem questions all participants received (Appendix G) and some suggested (but flexible) follow-up questions that were asked in a more idiographic way, allowing the participant to discuss issues they found relevant. The interview on average took about one hour to complete. Participants were awarded a $30 e-gift card for the completion of the online questionnaires and an hour-long interview.

Debriefing

At the end of the interview, the experimenter provided the participants with a debriefing form (Appendix H) that discussed the purpose of the study and listed information about resources available related to experiencing race-related trauma and discrimination. Additionally,

participants had the option to provide an email address that would be kept separate from their study data if they wanted to receive de-identified results from the study.

Positionality

I am a Queer White Latina who was born and raised in Miami, Florida. Growing up in a predominantly Latinx community and in a privileged body, I often assumed our community was beyond racism. It was not until I left my hometown for college that I began to understand the complexities of multiple intersecting identities, how one is racialized in a predominantly White setting, and how skin color can impact one's experiences. I found that the 2016 election further highlighted what a divide there was within Latinx (and other people of color) communities, even in my own family. I approached this research with my growing understanding and personal experiences of how people of color can harm other people from their same racial group. It is through these experiences that the questions for this qualitative study were formed and later reinforced by theoretical concepts in the psychological literature.

Measures

Demographic Information

Participants completed a demographic form with information about their gender identity, race/ethnicity, age, sexual orientation, marital status, language use, socioeconomic status, employment status, educational attainment, and year in school (for students only) during the screener (Appendix B). They included an email address used to contact them if they were eligible for participation.

Ethnic Identity

Ethnic identity was measured with the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure – Revised (MEIM-R; Phinney & Ong, 2007). The MEIM-R (Appendix C) comprises six items reflecting

two subscales (exploration and commitment), which can be combined to yield a total score. The items are rated by participants on a scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). The following sample items are included in the measure: (1) "I have spent time trying to find out more about my ethnic group, such as its history, traditions, and customs.", (2) "I have a strong sense of belonging to my own ethnic group.", (3) "I understand pretty well what my ethnic group membership means to me." Coefficient alpha for the total was .81, indicating good internal consistency reliability (Phinney & Ong, 2007). Yoon (2011) tested the content and construct validity of the MEIM-R using a confirmatory factor analysis in a sample of 290 students. The results confirmed the two-factor structure in both European Americans and a mix of racial/ethnic minorities, suggesting good construct and content validity. In the current study, coefficient alpha was 0.65 for the total score.

Previous research conducted with a diverse sample of 1,463 women (i.e., Asian, White, Black, Latinx, and multi-ethnic) using the MEIM-R has indicated an overall mean full-scale score of 3.41 with a standard deviation of 0.83 (Brown et al., 2014). Given that there does not seem to be significant differences in MEIM-R full scale scores by gender, I used the mean and standard deviation from Brown et al. (2014) as a reference. Because I was interested in only including participants who score high on ethnic identity, I created a cut-off score with the mean of 3.41. Therefore, participants had to score 3.41 or higher on the MEIM-R to be included in the study.

Experiences with Ethnic Discrimination

During the initial screener, I collected information on previous experiences of discrimination using the Brief Perceived Ethnic Discrimination Questionnaire – Community Version (BPEDQ-CV; Brondolo et al., 2005). The BPEDQ-CV (Appendix D) was used given its

strong validity when using both community and university student samples. The BPEDQ-CV also demonstrates good convergent validity ($r = .61$, $p < .001$) with the widely used and researched Perceived Racism Scale (Brondolo et al., 2005; McNeilly et al., 1996). Additionally, coefficient alpha for the full group (community and student sample) was .87, indicating good internal consistency reliability. In the current study, the coefficient alpha was 0.87.

In the current study, participants were asked how often the items related to them on a scale from 1 (*Never*) to 5 (*Very Often*). The following are sample items for the BPEDQ-CV: (1) "Have you been treated unfairly by teachers, principals, or other staff at school?" (2) "Have others thought you couldn't do things or handle a job?" and (3) "Have others threatened to hurt you (ex: said they would hit you)?" This questionnaire was used to allow participants to start thinking about discriminatory acts that may have occurred to them or someone they know and provide content for the interview.

Acceptability of Racial Microaggressions Scale

To further assess how people of color react to subtle forms of racism when the perpetrator is of their same race or White, I administered the Acceptability of Racial Microaggressions Scale (ARMS) (Mekawi & Todd, 2018). The ARMS (Appendix E) has a total of 34 items loading onto four factors: victim blaming, color evasion, power evasion, and exoticizing. Sample items include: "Lots of people worked their way out of poverty, why can't Blacks and Latinos do the same?" "I don't see your race, I see you as a person;" "Everyone has access to the same resources such as schools and hospitals;" and "You are so exotic." The ARMS demonstrates moderate to large positive correlations with the Modern Racism Scale (McConahay, 1986), indicating good convergent validity.

The original measure provides the following instructions for the participant to read before reviewing each of the 34 items: “Imagine that you are talking with a racially diverse group of peers about various topics, including race and ethnicity. Rate how ACCEPTABLE you think it would be for a White group member to say the following to a racial/ethnic minority group member.” However, for the purposes of this study, I had a statement that said “Imagine that you are talking with a racially diverse group of peers about various topics, including race and ethnicity. Rate how ACCEPTABLE you think it would be for someone to say the following to a racial/ethnic minority group member. Each column will have a member of a different racial/ethnic group and you will rate how ACCEPTABLE that statement would be for a person of that racial/ethnic group to say that statement to a minority group member.” Each item was rated on a scale from 1 (*totally unacceptable*) to 6 (*perfectably acceptable*) for two different racial groups separated through columns (i.e., White and their own racial/ethnic group). The items were presented in random order. In the current study, the coefficient alpha for the ARMS focused on White perpetrators was 0.98 and the coefficient alpha for the ARMS focused on same race perpetratos was 0.96.

Interview

The interview for this study was semi-structured. Open-ended were designed to elicit a variety of responses from participants (Appendix G). The development of this interview began after a thorough review of the literature surrounding racism and race-based discrimination. After the review, I generated a list of questions related to experiences with racism and discrimination that I believed would allow participants to share their experiences openly and would yield themes that would answer the main study questions and aims. These questions were reviewed with a doctoral-level psychologist and content expert. Once the redundant questions were

removed and additional questions were added for clarity, I piloted the interview with three individuals of color (a Black man, an Indian man, and a Latina woman). Following the pilot, some questions were edited for clarity and an additional question was added. On the whole, these pilot interviews suggested the study aims would be met with the interview questions and format. The interview was reviewed a final time with a doctoral student who has content expertise in the area of race, racism, and discrimination.

The interview began with questions about the participants' definitions of racism, racial/ethnic discrimination, and differences between subtle and overt racism. These warm-up questions allowed space for establishing rapport, generating participants' definitions of these constructs, and permitting the researcher to clarify the content of the interview if there were questions or doubts about the meaning of these words.

The main portion of the interview focused on experiences of racism and discrimination (both subtle and overt) participants had experienced in the past (or someone close to them had experienced), how the participant thought, felt, and reacted to these experiences, and whether these responses would have differed had the perpetrator been different (i.e., same race if describing a White perpetrator, or different race if describing an in-group perpetrator).

Following the main portion of the inteview, if there were still questions about how the participant might feel about ingroup versus White perpetrators of racist discrimination, I discussed the participant's responses to the ARMS from the pre-interview questionnaire. If this was needed, I specifically probed responses that varied in acceptability based on the race of the perpetrator in order to further understand the participants thought process. The concluding question explicitly stated "What are some differences in how you perceive racism depending on the race (for example White vs someone of your racial background) of the person who does it?"

Data Analysis

Preliminary Analyses

General descriptive statistics were computed to provide an overview of the data and the demographics of the sample. For gender, race, year in school, and highest level of educational attainment, I calculated frequencies. For age, the MEIM-R, BPEDQ-CV, and ARMS, I calculated means, medians, and standard deviations.

Qualitative Analyses

To analyze the rich qualitative data provided by the interviews, I used thematic analysis as outlined by Braun and Clarke (2006). There are six steps or phases to conducting a thematic analysis. First, I familiarized myself with the data by transcribing all recorded interviews and reading through the data. Second, I started to generate initial codes by coding any interesting features that emerged in the data across the entire data set. Each data extract or quote was tagged with the relevant code. Third, I collated codes into themes, ensuring that all data or quotes relevant to that theme were under the correct theme. Fourth, I reviewed the themes and checked if the themes worked in relation to the coded quotes and the data set as a whole. Fifth, I refined, defined, and named themes so that the analyses told a cohesive story. Sixth, I wrote the report and selected relevant and compelling data extracts that helped to highlight the themes. Importantly, thematic analysis is not typically concerned with inter-rater reliability; instead, it is common for one person to develop themes and organize qualitative data based on their personal interpretations.

Results

Descriptives

The demographics of the sample were discussed in the methods section about the participants and are in Table 2. In addition to the demographics, participants completed measures

of ethnic identity, experiences with discrimination, and the acceptability of racial microaggressions. The means, standard deviations, and medians for the additional scales are reported in Table 3. Overall, using the Brief Perceived Ethnic Discrimination Questionnaire – Community Version (BPEDQ-CV; Brondolo et al., 2005), participants on average reported experiencing discrimination sometimes. Additionally, for the Acceptability of Racial Microaggressions Scale (ARMS) (Mekawi & Todd, 2018) with White perpetrators, participants, on average, found these statements to be moderately unacceptable for White people to say. Participants also found the ARMS statements said by same race perpetrators as moderately unacceptable to say.

Qualitative

The following section discusses the themes extracted from the data relevant to each aim of the study. The aims for this study were: 1) understand what people of color believe about racism and discrimination broadly and based on the identity of the perpetrator, 2) describe under what situations (e.g., identity of perpetrator or overtness of the event) race-related negative behavior would be attributed to discrimination or racism, and 3) understand how emotions would be affected by ingroup vs. outgroup discrimination. In total, there were nine overarching themes: four themes under the first aim, two themes for the second aim, and three themes for the final aim. The themes for aim 1 were: (1) Racism: Power and systemic or interpersonal; (2) Discrimination: Bias and negative action; (2) Historical origins and intersectionality; and (4) "All skinfolk ain't kinfolk." For aim 2, the themes were: (5) Overt is clearly discriminatory; and (6) Subtle: It's different from people of color. For aim 3, the themes were: (7) "They Should Know Better:" Shocked, betrayed, and hurt**;** (8) More empathy for ingroup members; and (9) Racism

from White people: Expected but angering and problematic. Table 3 provides for a quick review of the themes and their descriptions.

Theme 1: Racism: Power and Systemic or Interpersonal

Definitions of racism varied across participants. Participants had definitions of racism that included ideas of power and systemic issues, but also definitions that focused solely on interpersonal interactions based on skin color or other phenotypical features.

Power and Systemic. Participants who used a power or systemic definition viewed racism as something that is perpetuated by those in power and affects all of society (i.e., is systemic). This type of definition is described by an 18-year-old Black woman in this quote:

> "Um, I would say racism is perpetuated by someone who has power and usually it's like systemic power. So, it's like power that's rooted in the system and they use that as leverage against someone who does not have that equal amount of power in the system. And they can use it to like belittle the person or use it against the person in any manner. Yeah, so that's what I say, that's what my definition of racism is."

A 29-year-old South Asian woman also defined racism in a more comprehensive power and systemic way by highlighting how policies and larger ideologies like white supremacy are involved in maintaining it.

> "Racism is any behavior, any policy, any act that disproportionality affects another group and oftentimes it comes from this perspective that one group so for example a racial group is inferior to another racial group and a long time it's been kind of thought of within the context of white supremacy and kind of white supremacy against all other racial groups."

A 25-year-old South Asian man further added that racism can affect multiple parts of functioning in society, such as accessing health care resources.

> "So like, it's basically a specific- like it's a type or form of manifestation of power imbalance in society- obviously, you know, changes across context and time- that places certain people at an advantage and others at a disadvantage to pretty much anything. Accessing resources, experiences, physically and mental health, health in general, just pretty much anything out there. And it can manifest in both systemic- I mean, at all levels basically- systemic, community, societal,

> individual. Yeah, that's how I see it. And obviously intersects with a lot of other identities, which can shape the experience of racism itself."

Interpersonal. Compared to the previous power and systemic focused definitions of racism, some participants focused on interpersonal interactions where people may engage in stereotypes or treat people negatively because of their racial or ethnic background. An example of this comes from a 26-year-old Latino man who defined racism as:

> "…When a specific group of people targets another group and- stereotypes…Or basically assumes in a negative way some of the actions, some of the beliefs, some of the culture aspect of them and treats them wrong because of it. Um, yeah, it could be from small to very harmful ways."

Another participant, a 26-year-old Black man, simply stated "Well, racism is judging someone solely based off how they how they look, whether it's positive or negative." Similarly, a 21-year-old Black woman stated, "The discrimination from a privileged majority to a less privileged minority." These participants' definitions of racism focused more on interactions between people and less on the pervasive effects of racism in other areas of society.

Theme 2: Discrimination: Bias and Negative Action

Definitions for discrimination were similar across participants. There is an understanding that discrimination is based on any identity and includes an action such as unfair treatment of a specific group which disadvantages the target group. As an 18-year-old Indian woman stated:

> "Discrimination is an act that disadvantages someone unfairly based on any identity that they might hold. And specifically unequal treatment, so that someone in the same position, just with a different identity, would be treated better."

A 24-year-old woman who identifies as a multi-racial Arab defined discrimination similarly:

> "Yeah, I guess to me, I think of racism more of like a kind of idea or a concept, and it can manifest in an act of discrimination, so that would be like an individual action against someone else or group of people or again, like a systemic thing that blocks or like inequitably treats people based on their identity."

A 24-year-old Latina also described discrimination as an action:

> "Discrimination would be a physical action that actively prevents someone from fulfilling whatever it is they were doing, whether it is applying for a job or reporting some sort of crime. If someone is actively prevented from doing something or passively from doing an action, then that is discrimination."

These quotes highlight the idea of discrimination being a negative action that prevents someone from doing something (i.e., getting a job, securing a loan, or buying a house) and shows bias towards that person with a minoritized identity.

Theme 3: Historical Origins and Intersectionality

Participants generally called on historical origins when discussing why perpetrators of the same racial/ethnic background might engage in racial discrimination or racism, but not when discussing incidents from White perpetrators. These historical origins mostly have to do with sociopolitical issues such as region conflicts or colonialism/imperialism. Additionally, participants viewed issues such as colorism or classism within their racial/ethnic group as racism or racial discrimination, highlighting that the intersection of other identities may lead to discrimination within a group.

Sociopolitical History. Region conflicts, colonialism, and imperialism were all aspects of sociopolitical history that were mentioned by some participants to explain why some people of color may engage in racist behavior. For example, a 19-year-old Indian man went into detail about the history of colonialism in India and how lighter skin came to be cherished. Additionally, he used this to indicate that it's not the fault of older generations since they grew up with these ideas.

> "I think it really again all just comes back to white supremacy because we were under British colonialism for hundreds of years. Again, who instilled that idea of if you're dark that's a bad thing and if you're light that's a good thing? It was them. Those sorts of colorist sentiments did not exist prior to British colonialism. So, because of colonialism like we have these sentiments ourselves that are internalized. It's not those aunties' faults, the adults that tell us not to play out in the sun for too long, it's not their fault. It's generational trauma and it's a result of colonialization that we think like this. We have all of this internalized you know

> colorism and now we continue to perpetuate it. So, again I can't even blame those aunties because that's how they were raised and that's how it's really a generational thing."

Similarly, a 35-year-old Black woman discussed how the history of slavery played a role in promoting colorist ideas, or the preferencing of lighter skin tones, within Black communities.

> "Um, well just like historically like every older Black person you know, it's just literally been something that is just is passed down from generation to generation and it like literally is just something that's left over. It's like a remnant from slavery because you had lighter, you had the mulattos who were either children of the slave master or you know the overseer and so there was like a caste system within slavery and that's just something that I feel like African-Americans have internalized and that's not something that we've been able to shake. It's like so deeply ingrained and so like we're all just like internalizing all of this stuff that like has been unintentionally passed down to us. Like it's like no matter what like in my family when a baby is born people ask, what's their complexion and it's just like what does it matter? Like we're all from the same family, like we're all obviously Black, does the shade matter? So yeah I think it's just when you look at the larger historical context it's just, we're just having a hard time shaking that."

A 27-year-old Taiwanese man recalled sociopolitical struggles in Taiwan with Japan and China. He suggested that history may be one reason why people can be racist to each other.

> "Japan is another good example for us. They colonized Taiwan for a little bit during World War II, and there's obviously a lot of um, a lot of pain there. So same thing of a lot of Chinese to... Chinese and the Taiwanese people. Yeah. They have a say a lot of negative things about Japan because of that."

A 25-year-old Indian man also reflected on how even regional conflicts can lead to stereotypes and ingroup discrimination:

> "Like certain places, certain regions, states, and cultures, and stuff like that have certain stereotypes associated with them. Oh, these people are Marathi, that's why they're really shrewd in their business mindset and stuff like that. So automatically, there's a judgment associated with that, I think. Not all the time, but most of the time there is. Especially when you are kind of reproducing stereotypes."

Intersectionality. Participants often viewed themselves as a person with multiple layers and identities. While they all identified as people of color, participants had varying levels of power and privilege in other aspects of their lives such as skin tone, socioeconomic status, and

gender. Participants identified that ingroup discrimination can often happen towards people of color who may experience less power and privilege in a certain identity sphere. An 18-year-old Black woman discussed how colorism affects multiple communities of color:

> "I know this is a really prominent problem in the Black community as well as like the Indian or South Asian community, but like colorism specifically when people like prefer the lighter shades than darker shades and that's like also comes like heavily, heavily from the media and just like growing up and seeing images of like lighter is better. And also in Africa, I know it's definitely not approved, but they sell a lot of lightening cream to like lighten your skin tone so that's like another instance."

Additionally, an 18-year-old Indian woman reflected on how colorism has been present in her life since she was a kid. She recalls comments on skin color from both students of color and White students:

> "I remember in 6th grade that is when I went to a particularly White, wealthy school. And it was a private school and I was on financial aid, so there was just a lot of differences, like I felt different. But I remember some people making fun of me, saying that my skin looked like the color of poop and like yeah, all those, so yeah. I remember a lot of overt colorism towards me when I was younger."

This idea of lighter skin tone being better was also present in the Latinx community as noted by a 24-year-old Latina who stated: "In many Latinx countries, there is a real form of supremacism if the color of your skin is White and the darker it gets the less respect you get."

An additional topic that came up when participants were asked about ingroup discrimination or racism was that of class differences. Class differences were especially pronounced and used as examples of ingroup discrimination in communities of color that had a caste system (e.g., South Asia). For example, a 29-year-old Indian woman recalled how she overheard people in her family get upset over someone marrying a person from a lower caste.

Finally, gender was often mentioned by participants as an important factor when thinking about racial discrimination from an ingroup member. One participant, age 51, noted how as a Native American woman she felt she was stereotyped and exoticized when a Black man sexually

assaulted her in high school. Similarly, when a 25-year-old Latina woman recalled being cat-called, she noted:

> "I had some friends be like, oh, maybe they just did it because you were a woman. And I'm like, yeah, that could be it. But it could also have been like, I'm a woman of color which then makes it a racist and a gendered act as well."

Theme 4: "All Skinfolk Ain't Kinfolk"

An additional theme that was identified with regards to racism and discrimination from ingroup members was "All skinfolk ain't kinfolk." While not all participants agreed that people of color can be racist (some participants noted specifically that people of color lack systemic privilege, which they described as a necessary component of being racist), there was unanimous agreement that people of color can endorse racist ideas and often enact racism through discrimination and prejudice. This discrimination was most often labeled anti-Blackness when targeted toward Black people and internalized racism or hate when targeted towards their own racial or ethnic group.

When asked if people of color can be racist or discriminatory towards other people of color, a 22-year-old Chinese man highlighted that anti-Blackness is prevalent in the Asian communities that he is a part of. He also highlights how, in the racial hierarchy, Asian folks are closest to Whiteness and seemed to suggest that discrimination toward Black people may be a way to assert this proximity to Whiteness.

> "Yes, absolutely [they can be racist] to other people of color, I think. Um, I see this a lot in the Chinese community. I think east- there's a really fucked up idea that Asians are kind of like next in line for whiteness, right. And there's a lot of anti-Blackness in the Asian American community and colorism in like all POC [people of color] cultures honestly, right. Yeah, I think you can absolutely be racist. But the thing is that a lot of that racism...that a lot of that racism still does more for the White man than it does for Asian Americans. Like when me, a Chinese American, is being racist towards a Black person say right, I'm upholding my own position of catering to White people while also subjugating Black people, for White people."

An 18-year-old South Asian woman, when asked the same question, responded that people of color cannot be racist towards everyone. In particular, she mentions that people of color cannot be racist towards White people but can be racist to other people of color. She mentions that she is uncomfortable with the term racism for this type of interaction and suggests that most of this in-group discrimination is internalized. Her return to the definition of racism from the first part of the interview highlights that this is the frame she is using to interpret whether something can be racist or not.

> "Yeah, I think they can. Just because I think again, that in different situations people do have different amounts of power and race is really about- racism is really about power. So, I mean there's- I do think that people of color can be racist towards other people of color, but I don't think people of color can be racist towards White people. That's just not how it works to me because race is about subjugating other groups that are lower than you or oppressing them in some way and people of color can't really oppress White people because they're the colonizers and they're always on top without fail. But yeah, I would say that there can be like- I wish there was a different, I don't know. I feel like it would be helpful to have a distinction in words. Because a lot of it is also internalized, but there absolutely is, I would say, in-between groups, racism within people of color."

Theme 5: Overt is Clearly Discriminatory

Overt discriminatory behaviors such as using racial slurs, engaging in harmful stereotypes, or violently targeting someone because of their racial/ethnic background were often described as discriminatory regardless of the racial background of the perpetrator. Participants noted that with overt discrimination, there is no doubt that the behavior was racist. Of note, most experiences described as overtly discriminatory by participants were instances of racism perpetrated by White people. Overt discrimination experiences perpetrated by people of color are discussed further in Theme 8.

When asked to define overt discrimination, a 21-year-old Latina stated that the behavior is not being hidden and has clear intentions:

> "I feel like overt is like you're not hiding it; you're not trying to make yourself look better I guess by like your racist actions. I feel like it's the kind of things where you see at Trump rallies where they're like yelling the *n* word or like doing crazy things like that."

A 26-year-old Black man echoed this sentiment but added a mention of dispositional traits, attributing overt discrimination behaviors to a person's natural tendency to subjugate others. The participant highlighted that people who engage in overt discriminatory acts are just racist and want to view themselves as superior.

> "And overt, I would say, just kind of, I guess, blatant racism, like you have a, I guess a natural tendency to specifically target and point out the differences in people in more kind of subjugate in your mind that a specific grouping of people, no matter Black, Hispanic, Asian descent, are lower, and you use language specifically to basically make them feel down, make them look inferior, and overall, make yourself look more superior of a human being."

The most commonly used example to highlight overt experiences of discrimination were the use of racial slurs. For example, a 26-year-old Black man described this situation:

> "I guess I can pick ever since we started things in 2016. When you wear a Black Lives Matter shirt and I'm approached and "nigger, you don't know what you're talking about." Whoa. Like, what do you what am I expected to do in that situation?"

A 21-year-old Japanese man also described hearing a racial slur as an overt experience of discrimination:

> "I am finishing my senior year at [college] right now and I just remember jogging around the area and just like I've gotten yelled at like oh, chink and stuff like that by people just driving. I didn't even see their faces but that sort of stuff is really overt."

Theme 6: Subtle: It's Different from People of Color

Statements that are viewed as microaggressions when White people are the perpetrators were likely to be labeled as motivated by curiosity, a form of building connection, or just joking around if they were said by people of the participants' own racial/ethnic group. Said differently, participants were more likely to make situational attributions in these instances and not view

these statements as discriminatory at all. In contrast, when White people engaged in microaggressions, those behaviors were more likely to be seen as ill-intentioned and backhanded, thereby leading to more dispositional attributions from the receivers.

A 19-year-old South Asian man spoke about his perception of statements that are typically labeled as microaggressions (e.g., "your English is so good.") when they are coming from someone of the same racial or ethnic background vs. a White outgroup member. The participant used a very contextualized lens when trying to understand why a person from the same racial/ethnic group said a statement, leading him to find it more genuine rather than backhanded.

> "So, I think when they ask, it comes from a genuine place of curiosity and wanting to find common ground with me and get to know me. Sometimes older Bengali adults will sometimes say 'wow, your English is so good' and it's a genuine compliment because they are also immigrants and they have had to go through the assimilation. You know learning a whole new language and figuring out a new country so when they say it… it's a genuine like 'I am proud of you for like you know learning the language and like speaking it so well' and less of a 'oh, you don't have an accent? Like that's surprising because people who look like you have accents.'... So, I feel like when other South Asian people make these comments it's not backhanded."

The same participant further clarified at another point in the interview that behaviors and statements deemed as microaggressions when said by White people are not microaggressions when they are said by people of the same racial/ethnic background or a person of color. He finds that White people say these statements to make you feel alienated and othered because they have preconceived notions.

> "So, I'm sure I made this pretty clear but a lot of those things that would be deemed microaggressions or something like that from someone who's also South Asian like me, I know it's not coming from a place of malintent. Pretty much 9 out of 10 I know it's not coming from a place of malintent and more so curiosity, genuine curiosity. Just looking for someone to connect with because it's so hard to find South Asian people, especially given the context of where you are in the United States…. When other people of color ask me questions that would be deemed as microaggressions or things like that, again I think it comes from a place of genuine

> curiosity and not you know I have these preconceived notions about you. But then obviously when a White person does it it's like you're actively making me feel othered and alienated. Yeah, just from personal experiences, that's how I feel."

A 20-year-old Latino man also described being annoyed when White people questioned the spelling and pronunciation of his name but if Latinos made comments, he found it to be more joking in nature. He said, "it's just like a sense in the Latino community to joke about something and not be offended."

An 18-year-old Black woman reported on an experience where a White student indicated the only reason the participant got into college was because she is Black. When asked how she might have felt if this comment was made by another Black person, she reported that it would not be as hurtful, and she would be less shocked.

> "I think I would be less shocked actually if a Black person said it because then I guess where they would be coming from would be like, a lot of these top schools are majority White schools and there's like very few Black students at these schools. So, them accepting me is kind of like trying to hit their 4% mark."

Theme 7: "They Should Know Better": Shocked, Betrayed, and Hurt

Participants often noted that more overt, compared to subtle, forms of discrimination perpetuated by people from within their racial/ethnic group were instances of racial or ethnic discrimination and led to feelings of betrayal. This seemed to be the case because they felt that people from marginalized groups "should know better" since they too are recipients of similar forms of discrimination. Because of the similar experiences with discrimination among people of color, there seems to be a sense of solidarity among other people of color and when ingroup solidarity is violated, there is more shock. However, these experiences with overt ingroup discrimination while hurtful still often led to participants attributing the behaviors to historical or sociopolitical issues (Theme 3), or being a victim of white supremacy, and therefore allowing for more empathy towards ingroup perpetrators (Theme 8).

An 18-year-old South Asian woman recalled a discriminatory experience from her elementary school years where an East Asian girl called her skin "dirty." The participant reflected that the "dirty" comment coming from another person of color was not expected and that it violated an expectation she had that people of color should be in solidarity with one another, regardless of racial/ethnic background. She stated that White people have made comments about her skin before, but they did not stand out as much as a comment from another person of color:

> "I mean I think that I- especially looking back- it almost would have made more sense coming from a White person. But like having someone in- that you would consider- I mean I- that's what sucks in general about like people of color racism towards other people of color is like you don't expect it and there's supposed to be solidarity and then there's still hierarchy within, within people of color. So, it was really surprising for that reason. I think I've experienced like White girls before like making fun of my skin, but this definitely stood out to me because of that."

When asked if she experiences racial discrimination from a Black perpetrator differently from a White perpetrator, a 35-year-old Black woman stated:

> "Yeah, they're definitely experienced differently. I can still be angry, but I'm usually angry for a different reason…like when it's Black people, 'it's like you should know better' like we have enough outside discrimination like we don't need to be doing it in our group, we need to like stick together."

A 25-year-old Latina woman recalled a "frustrating and angering" experience where a White male coworker stated, "oh thank god Columbus went and did all that stuff so we could have a day off." When asked to reflect how she would have felt if another Latinx person said the same thing, she reported that she would be still be angry but provided some additional reasoning for this anger.

> "I think that would have still pissed me off. Especially if it came from a Latino for sure because I would have been like, how can you, knowing our history and knowing everything that has happened, like how can you still say that? So, I think that one would still…I would have still been pretty pissed off."

Overall, these quotes highlight an expectation of group solidarity and empathy from people of the participants' same racial or ethnic backgrounds specifically, and from other people of color generally.

Theme 8: More Empathy for Ingroup Members

While participants reported feeling shocked, hurt, and betrayed when people of color were perpetrators of overt actions of discrimination, they also reported feeling bad for them. Participants often identified that they had more empathy towards people of color engaging in discrimination towards other people of color. They reported feeling the need to question, educate, and give more grace. This often goes back to participants noting an understanding of the roots of where the internalization comes from, regarding media portrayals and representation of White people compared to people of color and the history of colonialism and imperialism (Theme 3).

Participants from all racial backgrounds described having some understanding when people of color engaged in discriminatory behavior towards other people of color. When asked whether discriminatory behavior is worse from White people versus Black people, a 26-year-old Black man said:

> "So, it's worse for me of a Black person says that because that means, one, they've probably been hurt, too. They haven't dealt with it…. there's some scarring there and now they're outwardly lashing out to other people who don't deserve it."

This participant suggested that Black people saying discriminatory things towards other Black people is worse than a White person saying those same things because it suggests that they have gone through some difficult things in their lives. The participant expressed understanding and empathy towards the Black person who may have engaged in the discrimination but highlights that it still hurts other Black folks.

A 29-year-old Afro-Latinx man also stated: “I probably can find in my mind the ability to empathize a little bit more with people of color, like I can understand where you’re coming from.” In this quote, he is noting that he is more willing to contextualize overtly discriminatory behavior from people of color than when a White person engages in that same behavior. He further elaborated that when a White person engages in discriminatory behavior, there is more “intentional or implicit sort of like purposeful subjugation or implicit putting down.”

Theme 9: Racism from White people: Expected but Angering and Frustrating

Participants overwhelming agreed that racism that came from White people was expected. They reported less empathy towards White people who were racist compared to people of color who expressed racist ideas. They also mentioned getting angrier, ignoring the people who engaged in it, and finding it to be more problematic than if a person of color engaged in the same behavior. It seemed that the nature of the power White people hold in society and their ability to maintain ignorance on issues of race and ethnicity were particularly infuriating.

Participants were asked to compare how discrimination feels when it comes from a White person versus a person of color. A 24-year-old woman who identifies as a multi-racial Arab explained that she expects these racist comments from White people, but not people of color.

> “Because my expectation on the whole for a new White person is that they're going to be stupid or problematic. I feel like I almost have my guard up more and I'm ready for those kinds of comments and waiting for them and can better react to them. It's just sometimes it's like with a lot of fury, but whatever. Yeah, but yeah, I think when it comes from family or it comes from friends that are people of color. It's like. Yeah, it's kind of blinding. You're just like what, like where is this coming from?”

A 51-year-old Native American woman also expressed a similar sense of expectations of discrimination from White people compared to discrimination from Native Americans.

> “I’m more shocked when it's a Native person like being so overtly racist because it's just like you wouldn't expect that, like…but if it's like a White person doing something overt, is it more just like, oh, look, I kind of expect that from you.”

Participant responses also seemed to highlight an assumption of negative intentions from White perpetrators of discrimination. A 23-year-old Black woman expressed this when talking about exoticization:

> "Yeah, I just feel like… from a White person, it just it kind of goes back to intention. Like, I can't say what their intentions, but I feel like when White people say their intention with exotic, it's kind of like. More negative. But when people of the same race say it's kind of like uplifting, like I feel like I would take it more of a compliment, but with a White person, that would be more of an insult."

The previous quote highlights how some statements can be problematic when they come from a White person compared to a person of color. It also shows that there is a sense of mistrust towards White people, where the intention behind an act of subtle discrimination is not always trusted as a positive thing. In other words, a statement about how "sexy" a Black woman is may be innocuous and welcome coming from a Black person, but racist and problematic when coming from a White person.

When recalling a racist experience that occurred while he was in a predominantly White fraternity, a 24-year-old Black man expresses that White people are behaving exactly as one would expect regarding racist behavior. The specific event he discussed was having a White man write the letters "N I G G E R" on his own forehead. The participant noted:

> "The way that I really do talk about it now is like everything that they told me that I've heard about, the horror stories or whatever, not with hazing, nothing like that. But just like the way that White people behave when it's just them behind closed doors, that's exactly what they do."

This same participant highlighted that the experience was angering. He said, "I was really mad, and I was trying to like not fight him, but also just get him to like, rub this stuff off of him. Like, just wash it off." Another participant, a 26-year-old Black man, recalled an experience working in a large retail store. At this store, he found that White customers would often walk past him when asked if they needed help and go straight to the other White person who worked with him. When

asked about his emotions during that situation, he reported feeling "kind of sadness and frustration."

These feelings of frustration were echoed by multiple participants. It was especially prevalent in academic settings where participants were questioned on their abilities to succeed in their careers or academic field. A 31-year-old Black woman recalled an experience she called "frustrating but not shocking" where her advisor told her to consider Ph.D. programs other than Clinical Psychology.

> "Even applying to this PhD program, 'I don't know… have you considered counseling or public health? They're not as competitive,' because my GRE scores weren't stellar. And I was like, do not discredit my potential, number one, and my capability."

Discussion

Research shows that individuals who report higher levels of racial/ethnic discrimination experience higher levels of negative physical and mental health outcomes compared to people who report lower levels of discrimination (Dolezsar et al., 2014; Jones et al., 2016; Lewis et al., 2014; Magallares et al., 2014; Noh et al., 2007; Pascoe & Richman, 2009; Williams et al., 2019). Most research addressing racial/ethnic discrimination is usually focused on instances perpetrated by a White person or someone not of the same race or ethnic background as the target. However, based on theories of racial/cultural identity development (Cross, 1971; Sue & Sue, 1999), people of color who are in early stages of racial identity may also perpetuate the ideas and values of the majority culture (i.e., White dominance and supremacy) and can therefore potentially engage in racial discrimination within their group. The purpose of this study was to expand research on ingroup racial/ethnic discrimination and describe situations and contexts (e.g., racial identity of perpetrator and/or the subtle or overtness of the behavior) in which negative behavior by an ingroup member is attributed to racial/ethnic discrimination.

I expected there would be an interaction effect between the perpetrator of the race-based discriminatory behavior and the intensity of the behavior. I expected participants would attribute race-based behavior as reflecting racism on the part of the perpetrator when the behavior was either (a) perpetrated by an outgroup member, or (b) overt/highly deviant. In contrast, I expected that participants would attribute race-based behavior as reflecting situational factors when the behavior was both (a) perpetrated by an ingroup member, and (b) subtle in nature. I further expected ingroup discrimination that was overt to result in the highest degree of emotional hurt, consistent with cultural betrayal trauma theory. Based on the themes in this study, the interaction effect was not present, as even overt acts from people of color were generally afforded situational attributions. However, the hypothesis regarding overt ingroup discrimination leading to higher degrees of hurt was supported by the sample.

The themes that were identified in this study suggest that in my sample: 1) people of color believe that ingroup members can perpetuate racism and act in a discriminatory fashion towards other people of color (interpersonal rather than systemic), (2) racial discrimination through overt and subtle behaviors leads to more dispositional attributions of behavior for White perpetrators (*they are racist*) compared to more situational attributions of behavior for ingroup perpetrators (*they are a victim of white supremacy, colonialism, imperialism, etc*.), and (3) ingroup racial discrimination can lead to more feelings of hurt and betrayal due to its shocking nature compared to the expected nature of White perpetrated racism.

Participants in this study overwhelmingly agreed that "all skinfolk ain't kinfolk" (Theme 4). They often suggested that most people of color can be interpersonally racist or discriminatory but cannot be engaged in the perpetuation of systemic racism. Participants highlighted situations where people of their same racial or ethnic group acted in a discriminatory fashion toward someone

in the same group. When thinking about racial discrimination, participants understood colorism, classism, and sexism within their racial group as forms of racial discrimination due to the importance of the intersection of race and these other identities in the discriminatory act (e.g., targeting a woman of color with racially charged sexual harassment) (Theme 3).

Interestingly, ingroup discriminatory acts when considered "subtle" (statements often deemed as microaggressions from White perpetrators), were attributed to situational factors such as the perpetrator was joking around, the perpetrator was trying to connect or relate, or just genuine curiosity from the perpetrator (Theme 6). In fact, participants stated that most things considered subtle forms of discrimination from White perpetrators were not even considered discriminatory in nature at all from ingroup perpetrators. However, when taking into consideration the participants' responses to the Acceptability of Racial Microaggressions Scale (ARMS), this did not seem to translate quantitatively. On average, participants found the statements to be moderately unacceptable to say regardless of the race of the perpetrator. There may be a few reasons for these contradictory results. One possible reason may be that participants did not necessarily relate to the hypothetical person from the same racial group mentioned in the ARMS as much as they related to the perpetrator in the situations they recalled from their personal lives. Without this perceived connection to the perpetrator, the participants may not afford the same benefit of the doubt to the ingroup member in the hypothetical scenarios in the ARMS that they did when they experienced actual instances of microaggressions in their daily lives. A face-to-face interaction with someone from the same racial background can potentially lead to another level of connection that is not possible when reading about microaggressive statements in a survey. Maybe creating a more vivid image through the narrative process used in this study could have led to greater congruence between the qualitative

and quantitative findings from this study. Another possible reason for the discrepancies between ARMS responses and interview responses is that ARMS statements were brief and lacked nuance or context, whereas the situations participants described in the interviews were rich with context, history, and meaning. Finally, it may be that people have poor insight into their own behaviors or reactions. Indeed, researchers find low congruence between self-reported behavior and observed behavior in many social situations (e.g., Gosling et al., 1998).

Regardless of the contradictory quantitative results, the qualitative results suggest that White perpetrators were already expected to behave in racially discriminatory ways and be overall a "racist person" (dispositional attribution). Overall, there seems to be more empathy, a willingness to explain away behavior, and space to make situational attributions with ingroup members than with outgroup members (Theme 8). These results are consistent with previous theories of ingroup bias (Castano et al., 2002; Lindeman, 1997; Messick & Mackie, 1989; Tajfel, 1982) and the ultimate attribution error (Pettigrew, 1979) which indicate that people tend to give ingroup members the benefit of the doubt (situational attributions) compared to outgroup members (dispositional attributions). By giving ingroup members the benefit of the doubt and providing space to explain why a behavior may be discriminatory, it can protect the ingroup identity and the attachment and belonging one feels to other members of that group.

Moreover, when participants reported experiencing more overt forms of discrimination from ingroup members, they still tended to make situational attributions for the behavior, but the attributions changed in nature. Participants largely noted that overt ingroup racial discrimination perpetrated by ingroup members reflect historical struggles and/or internalized racism. In other words, they noted that the situations that gave rise to the discriminatory behaviors were the systems of white supremacy and domination (Theme 3). Furthermore, these attributions led to

empathy and understanding toward ingroup perpetrators (Theme 8). It seems that knowledge of these systems of white supremacy allowed participants to feel bad for the ingroup perpetrator and want to *approach* the person, to engage them in a conversation about the nature of the behavior, and further educate them about the insidious effects of white supremacy. The increased empathy felt by targets who were knowledgeable in the ways that white supremacy can affect people of color, may be a protective mechanism for the ingroup identity. Again, the usage of situational attributions for overt ingroup discrimination upholds the ideas of the ultimate attribution error (Pettigrew, 1979), but stands in contrast to the black sheep effect (Marques at al., 1988) and subjective group dynamics (Pinto et al., 2010), which would have predicted ingroup perpetrators of overt discrimination would be ostracized.

Furthermore, participants reported feeling more hurt and feeling higher levels of betrayal when overt discrimination was perpetrated by an ingroup compared to an outgroup member (Theme 7). They noted that when ingroup members were overtly discriminatory, it was shocking and unexpected. Participants also voiced the idea that ingroup members "should know better." Due to the shocking nature and violation of solidarity, it seemed that participants were more inclined to feel hurt and betrayed. These findings are supported by cultural betrayal trauma theory which suggests that the violation of (intra)cultural trust leads to harm and feelings of hurt and betrayal (Gomez, 2021). According to this theory, experiencing cultural betrayal trauma can be associated with posttraumatic stress symptoms. However, it's important to note that even while participants felt hurt, they still reported wanting to address the discriminatory behavior with the ingroup perpetrator. This would stand in contrast to a trauma frame, which would predict a desire to avoid in order to reduce distress and risk of re-traumatization. Rather than seeing ingroup overt racist discrimination as a traumatic event, this study suggests it was an

expectancy violation and the remedy was to approach the offender to resolve the violation. It is possible that by engaging with the perpetrator and educating them about issues regarding race, the hurt and betrayal may be reduced over time.

On the other hand, both overt and subtle experiences perpetrated by outgroup members were described by participants as expected and often leading to anger (Theme 9). Participants mentioned mostly expecting that White people would engage in racist behavior. This expectation was attributed to dispositional factors (i.e., that White person is racist). These dispositional factors led participants to want to create distance from White people or avoid/ignore the perpetrator. Therefore, while participants indicated they would engage with and educate perpetrators of color (ingroup members) they would not do the same with White perpetrators (outgroup members).

Taken together, the situational attributions afforded to people of color perpetrating overt and subtle acts of discrimination and the dispositional attributions afford to White perpetrators during both subtle and overt acts suggests that my original hypothesis of an interaction effect was incorrect. Instead, the results of this study suggest that the ultimate attribution error may play a larger role in interpretations of race-based discrimination than theories regarding the black sheep effect and subjective group dynamics. It is possible that making situational attributions for racially discriminatory behavior by people of color may be protective to the ingroup identity as well as to the emotional well-being of the target. While participants' responses reflected higher levels of hurt and betrayal when ingroup members were perpetrators of discrimination, participants indicated a willingness to engage and educate these perpetrators and showed empathy towards ingroup members. However, with outgroup perpetrators, participants did not

feel the need to engage or educate and often left the situation in anger and with no ability or desire to repair that relationship.

Strengths and Limitations

The present study has several strengths. For instance, this is one of the first studies to address the phenomenological experiences of ingroup vs outgroup racist discrimination. Using a qualitative approach, I was able to capture how people of color make sense of ingroup discrimination compared to outgroup discrimination. I was also able to capture the nuances of the emotional experiences of people of color when experiencing discrimination from ingroup vs outgroup members. Additionally, using an online video interviewing platform allowed me to include the experiences of people of color across different regions of the United States. Furthermore, this study included participants of color from various racial and ethnic backgrounds, thereby capturing the experiences of people who are often left out of psychological research.

Just as there are strengths, it is important to note the limitations of this study. To begin, there are limitations of generalizability. For instance, most participants were in their early to mid-twenties. This suggests that we may be missing the unique experiences of people of color that are older and may have very different experiences of discrimination. Additionally, for Native American and Middle Eastern groups, I only had two participants (one in each racial group). It is important to understand the experiences of these groups as they have unique histories of racial discrimination in the United States and may have different experiences of both ingroup and outgroup racial discrimination. Moreover, nearly all participants were college educated, which does not allow for any meaningful conclusions to be made regarding participants from this age-range or these racial/ethnic identities who are not college-educated.

Furthermore, while only including participants with high ethnic identity was purposeful (i.e., it provided me with participants who were more likely than those with low ethnic identity to be aware of discrimination and racism), it's possible that the attributions of ingroup vs outgroup racial discrimination may have been different if participants with lower ethnic identity were included.

Aside from the sample of participants, another potential limitation for the study was that I was the only one to code and identify themes. While this is a widely acceptable practice, it would be beneficial to include people from other backgrounds to help code and identify themes. This could have led to different themes being identified. An additional way this could have been done is presenting the themes to the participants prior to writing the report to get feedback or confirmation. Furthermore, while participants were able to indicate who was in their racial/ethnic ingroup when describing experiences, it is possible that they may not consider people who only hold the same identity in the racial category as their ingroup. In other words, due to the intersection of multiple identities, it is possible that an ingroup member may mean someone who is of the same race, gender, and sexual orientation rather than just the same race.

It is also important to note the time period of when interviews were collected. Interviews were conducted from August 2020 to December 2020. During this time period, the United States was undergoing a racial reckoning after the murders of George Floyd and Breonna Taylor at the hand of the state and Ahmaud Arbery murdered by White people. There was also global pandemic ongoing which highlighted racial disparities in health even further and led to increased racial discrimination toward people who identified as Asian and Asian American. These national and global tragedies led to widespread protest and media coverage and were therefore in the forefront of participants' minds when discussing issues of racism and discrimination. While this

may have been a prime time to be conducting research on the issues of racism and discrimination, it may have also been a time of heightened racial consciousness that could have influenced the results.

Future Directions

This study provides the groundwork for multiple future directions. With a review of previous studies, there is a need for more research regarding how targets attribute race-related behavior by perpetrators holding various racial or ethnic identities. An experimental study could assess if the ingroup is afforded situational attribution under all circumstances of if there are exceptions to this. Additionally, while race is still an important identity to many, other identities (e.g., gender, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status) influence how people of color navigate the world. Studies of ingroup and outgroup discrimination may want to examine these intersecting identities carefully. My study has implications regarding future interventions. It seems that education surrounding white supremacy, the history of slavery, colonialism, and imperialism may be protective for communities of color as it leads to more empathy towards ingroup perpetrators. Additionally, it's possible that with increased education, there may be less ingroup perpetration of discrimination as it may increase understanding of the insidiousness of white supremacy and internalized racism. This suggests that it may be beneficial to test the effectiveness of an educational intervention covering the history of race and racism on how people of color react to ingroup perpetrators as well as if there is a decrease in ingroup discriminatory behaviors.

Conclusion

Overall, I found that 1) people of color believe that ingroup members can perpetuate racism and act in a discriminatory fashion towards other people of color (interpersonal rather than

systemic), (2) racial discrimination through overt and subtle behaviors leads to more dispositional attributions of behavior for White perpetrators (*they are racist*) compared to more situational attributions of behavior for ingroup perpetrators (*they are a victim of white supremacy, colonialism, imperialism, etc*.), and (3) ingroup racial discrimination can lead to more feelings of hurt and betrayal due to its shocking nature compared to the expected nature of White perpetrated racism. These findings suggest the importance of the ultimate attribution error (Pettigrew, 1979) in situations regarding race-based discrimination as ingroup perpetrators were afforded more situational than dispositional attributions compared to outgroup perpetrators. The findings also suggests that cultural betrayal trauma theory (Gómez, 2021) provides a good framework to understand how race-based discrimination from ingroup members may lead to more feelings of betrayal and hurt than race-based discrimination from outgroup members. The implications of this study suggest that white supremacy is insidious and affects people of color in ways that can lead to the perpetration of racism in their own communities. However, with continued education about the origins of racism and white supremacy, it may be possible to minimize long-term experiences of cultural betrayal trauma by increasing empathetic understanding and the willingness of people of color to educate others in their own community.

References

Abrams, D., Palmer, S. B., Rutland, A., Cameron, L., & Van de Vyver, J. (2014). Evaluations of and reasoning about normative and deviant ingroup and outgroup members: Development of the black sheep effect. *Developmental Psychology, 50*(1), 258-270. doi:10.1037/a0032461

Atkinson, D., Morten, G., & Sue, D. W. (1983). Counseling American minorities. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C.

Bell, K. A., Kobayashi, I., Akeeb, A., Lavela, J., & Mellman, T. A. (2019). Emotional response to perceived racism and nocturnal heart rate variability in young adult African Americans. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research, 121*, 88–92. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpsychores.2019.03.180

Bendick, M. (2007). Situation testing for employment discrimination in the United States of America. *Horizons stratégiques*, (3), 17-39.

Bendick, M. J., Rodriguez, R. E., & Jayaraman, S. (2010). Employment discrimination in upscale restaurants: Evidence from matched pair testing. *The Social Science Journal, 47*(4), 802-818.

Bennett, G. G., Merritt, M. M., Edwards, C. L., & Sollers, J. J. (2004). Perceived Racism and Affective Responses to Ambiguous Interpersonal Interactions among African American Men. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *47*(7), 963–976. https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764203261070

Bergsieker, H. B., Shelton, J. N., & Richeson, J. A. (2010). To be liked versus respected: Divergent goals in interracial interactions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *99*(2), 248–264. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018474

Berry, J. W. (1997). Immigration, acculturation, and adaptation. *Applied Psychology, 46*(1), 5-34. doi:10.1111/j.1464-0597.1997.tb01087.x

Bettencourt, B. A., Dill, K. E., Greathouse, S. A., Charlton, K., & Mulholland, A. (1997). Evaluations of ingroup and outgroup members: The role of category-based expectancy violation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *33*(3), 244–275. https://doi.org/10.1006/jesp.1996.1323

Bivens, D. (1995). What is internalized racism? In M. Potapchuk, S. Leiderman, D. Bivens, & B. Major (Eds.), Flipping the script: White privilege and community building (pp. 43–52). Silver Spring, MD: MP Associates, The Center for Assessment and Policy Development.

Bonilla-Silva, E. (2017). *Racism without Racists: Color-Blind Racism and the Persistence of Racial Inequality in America*, (Fifth). Rowman & Littlefield.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative research in psychology*, *3*(2), 77-101.

Brewer, M. B. (1999). The psychology of prejudice: Ingroup love and outgroup hate?. *Journal of social issues*, *55*(3), 429-444. https://doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.00126

Brewer, M. B., & Campbell, D. T. (1976). Ethnocentrism and intergroup attitudes: East African evidence.

Brondolo, E., Kelly, K. P., Coakley, V., Gordon, T., Thompson, S., Levy, E., . . . Contrada, R. J. (2005). The perceived ethnic discrimination questionnaire: Development and preliminary validation of a community version. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 35*(2), 335.

Brown, S. D., Unger Hu, K. A., Mevi, A. A., Hedderson, M. M., Shan, J., Quesenberry, C. P., & Ferrara, A. (2014). The multigroup ethnic identity Measure—Revised: Measurement invariance across racial and ethnic groups. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 61*(1), 154-161. doi:10.1037/a0034749

Carter, R. T., & Forsyth, J. (2010). Reactions to racial discrimination: Emotional stress and help-seeking behaviors. *Psychological Trauma: Theory, Research, Practice, and Policy*, *2*(3), 183–191. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0020102

Castano, E., Yzerbyt, V., Paladino, M. P., & Sacchi, S. (2002). I belong, therefore, I exist: Ingroup identification, ingroup entitativity, and ingroup bias. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *28*(2), 135–143. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167202282001

Charles, C. Z. (2003). The dynamics of racial residential segregation. Annual review of sociology, 29(1), 167-207. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.29.010202.100002

Cross Jr, W. E. (1971). The negro-to-black conversion experience. *Black world*, *20*(9), 13-27.

Dolezsar, C. M., McGrath, J. J., Herzig, A. J. M., & Miller, S. B. (2014). Perceived racial discrimination and hypertension: A comprehensive systematic review. *Health Psychology, 33*(1), 20–34. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0033718

Dovidio, J. F., & Gaertner, S. L. (2004). Aversive racism. In *Advances in experimental social psychology, Vol. 36* (pp. 1–52). Elsevier Academic Press. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(04)36001-6

Duncan, B. L. (1976). Differential social perception and attribution of intergroup violence: Testing the lower limits of stereotyping of blacks. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *34*(4), 590. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.34.4.590

Frantz, C. M., Cuddy, A. J. C., Burnett, M., Ray, H., & Hart, A. (2004). A Threat in the Computer: The Race Implicit Association Test as a Stereotype Threat Experience. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *30*(12), 1611–1624. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167204266650

Glasford, D. E., Dovidio, J. F., & Pratto, F. (2009). I continue to feel so good about us: In-group identification and the use of social identity-enhancing strategies to reduce intragroup dissonance. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *35*(4), 415–427. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167208329216

Gómez, J. M. (2019). Group dynamics as a predictor of dissociation for Black victims of violence: An exploratory study of cultural betrayal trauma theory. *Transcultural psychiatry*, *56*(5), 878-894.

Gómez, J. M. (2020). Exposure to Discrimination, Cultural Betrayal, and Intoxication as a Black Female Graduate Student Applying for Tenure-Track Faculty Positions. *Presumed Incompetent II: Race, Class, Power, and Resistance of Women in Academia*, 204.

Gómez, J. M. (2021). Cultural betrayal as a dimension of traumatic harm: violence and PTSS among ethnic minority emerging adults. *Journal of Child & Adolescent Trauma, 14*(3), 347-356.

Gonzales-Backen, M. A., Meca, A., Lorenzo-Blanco, E. I., Des Rosiers, S. E., Córdova, D., Soto, D. W., . . . Unger, J. B. (2018). Examining the temporal order of ethnic identity and perceived discrimination among hispanic immigrant adolescents. *Developmental Psychology, 54*(5), 929-937. doi:10.1037/dev0000465

Gosling, S. D., John, O. P., Craik, K. H., & Robins, R. W. (n.d.). *Do People Know How They Behave? Self-Reported Act Frequencies Compared With On-Line Codings by Observers*. 13.

Heider, F. (1958). *The psychology of interpersonal relations.* John Wiley & Sons Inc. https://doi.org/10.1037/10628-000

Hoffman, J. L., & Hoffman, J. L. S. (2006). Sculpting race: An innovative approach to teaching racial identity development. Presentation at the Western Regional Careers in Student Affairs Day, California State University, Fullerton.

Jetten, J., & Hornsey, M. J. (2014). Deviance and Dissent in Groups. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *65*(1), 461–485. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-010213-115151

Jones, E. E., & Harris, V. A. (1967). The attribution of attitudes. *Journal of experimental social psychology*, *3*(1), 1-24. https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-1031(67)90034-0

Jones, K. P., Peddie, C. I., Gilrane, V. L., King, E. B., & Gray, A. L. (2016). Not So Subtle: A Meta-Analytic Investigation of the Correlates of Subtle and Overt Discrimination. *Journal of Management*, *42*(6), 1588–1613. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206313506466

Kendi, I. X. (2019). *How to be an Antiracist*. One World/Ballantine.

Krueger, J. (1996). Personal Beliefs and Cultural Stereotypes about Racial Characteristics. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *71*(3), 536–548. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.71.3.536

Lazerus, T., Ingbretsen, Z. A., Stolier, R. M., Freeman, J. B., & Cikara, M. (2016). Positivity bias in judging ingroup members' emotional expressions. *Emotion, 16*(8), 1117–1125. https://doi.org/10.1037/emo0000227

Lee, R. M. (2005). Resilience against discrimination: Ethnic identity and other-group orientation as protective factors for korean americans. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 52*(1), 36-44. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.52.1.36

Lee, R. T., Perez, A. D., Boykin, C. M., & Mendoza-Denton, R. (2019). On the prevalence of racial discrimination in the United States. *PloS one, 14*(1), e0210698. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.021069

Lewis, T. T., Williams, D. R., Tamene, M., & Clark, C. R. (2014). Self-Reported Experiences of Discrimination and Cardiovascular Disease. *Current Cardiovascular Risk Reports*, Vol. 8, pp. 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12170-013-0365-2

Lindeman, M. (1997). Ingroup bias, self-enhancement and group identification. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 27*(3), 337–355. https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-0992(199705)27:3<337::AID-EJSP825>3.0.CO;2-S

Lopez, M. H., Gonzalez-Barrera, A., & Krogstad, J. M. (2018). Latinos' experiences with discrimination | Pew Research Center. Retrieved October 23, 2019, from https://www.pewresearch.org/hispanic/2018/10/25/latinos-and-discrimination/

Magallares, A., Benito De Valle, P., Irles, J. A., & Jauregui-Lobera, I. (2014). Overt and subtle discrimination, subjective well-being and physical health-related quality of life in an obese sample. *Spanish Journal of Psychology*, *17*(2). https://doi.org/10.1017/sjp.2014.64

Malle, B. F. (2006). The actor-observer asymmetry in attribution: A (surprising) meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 132*(6), 895–919. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.132.6.895

Marques, J. M., Yzerbyt, V. Y., & Leyens, J. -P. (1988). The "Black Sheep Effect": Extremity of judgments towards ingroup members as a function of group identification. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *18*(1), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2420180102

Mata-Greve, F. (2016). Effects of Within-Group Discrimination on Mental Health Symptoms in Latinos. *Dissertations (2009 -)*. Retrieved from https://epublications.marquette.edu/dissertations_mu/634

Matthews, D., & Dietz-Uhler, B. (1998). The Black-Sheep Effect: How Positive and Negative Advertisements Affect Voters' Perceptions of the Sponsor of the Advertisement 1. *Journal*

of Applied Social Psychology, *28*(20), 1903-1915.

McConahay, J. B. (1986). Modern racism, ambivalence, and the Modern Racism Scale. In *Prejudice, discrimination, and racism* (pp. 91–125). Academic Press.

McNeilly, M. D., Anderson, N. B., Armstead, C. A., Clark, R., Corbett, M., Robinson, E. L., ... & Lepisto, E. M. (1996). The perceived racism scale: a multidimensional assessment of the experience of white racism among African Americans. *Ethnicity & disease*.

Mekawi, Y., & Todd, N. R. (2018). Okay to say?: Initial validation of the Acceptability of Racial Microaggressions Scale. *Cultural diversity and ethnic minority psychology*, *24*(3), 346.

Messick, D. M., & Mackie, D. M. (1989). Intergroup relations. *Annual review of psychology*, *40*(1), 45-81.

Mills, C. W. (2003). White supremacy as sociopolitical system: A philosophical perspective. *White out: The continuing significance of racism*, 35-48.

National Association of School Psychologists. (2019). Position statement: prejudice, discrimination, and racism. Retrieved from https://www.nasponline.org/x26830.xml

Neblett, E. W., & Roberts, S. O. (2013). Racial identity and autonomic responses to racial discrimination. *Psychophysiology*, *50*(10), 943–953. https://doi.org/10.1111/psyp.12087

Newman, L. S., & Uleman, J. S. (1989). Spontaneous trait inference. *New York: Guilford*, 155-88.

Nisbett, R. E., Caputo, C., Legant, P., & Marecek, J. (1973). Behavior as seen by the actor and as seen by the observer. *Journal of personality and Social Psychology*, *27*(2), 154. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0034779

Noh, S., Kaspar, V., & Wickrama, K. A. S. (2007). Overt and subtle racial discrimination and mental health: Preliminary findings for Korean immigrants. *American Journal of Public Health*, *97*(7), 1269–1274. https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2005.085316

O'Brien, L. T., Major, B., & Simon, S. (2012). Why did you choose that person over me? ingroup rejection and attributions to discrimination. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *48*(6), 1225-1233. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2012.04.007

Pascoe, E. A., & Richman, L. S. (2009). Perceived Discrimination and Health: A Meta-Analytic Review. *Psychological Bulletin*, *135*(4), 531–554. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0016059

Pennington, D. C. (2012). *Social cognition*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203136089

Pérez, D. J., Fortuna, L., & Alegria, M. (2008). Prevalence and correlates of everyday discrimination among US Latinos. *Journal of community psychology*, *36*(4), 421-433.

Pettigrew, T. F. (1979). The ultimate attribution error: Extending Allport's cognitive analysis of prejudice. *Personality and social psychology bulletin*, *5*(4), 461-476.

Phinney, J. S. (1989). Stages of ethnic identity development in minority group adolescents. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, *9*(1-2), 34-49.

Phinney, J. S., & Ong, A. D. (2007). Conceptualization and Measurement of Ethnic Identity: Current Status and Future Directions. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *54*(3), 271–281. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.54.3.271

Pinto, I. R., Marques, J. M., Levine, J. M., & Abrams, D. (2010). Membership Status and Subjective Group Dynamics: Who Triggers the Black Sheep Effect? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 99, pp. 107–119. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018187

Reid, L. D., & Birchard, K. E. (2010). The people doth protest too much: Explaining away subtle racism. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, *29*(4), 478-490.

Romero, A. J., & Roberts, R. E. (2003). The impact of multiple dimensions of ethnic identity on discrimination and adolescents' Self-Estees. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *33*(11), 2288-2305. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2003.tb01885.x

Ross, L. D., Amabile, T. M., & Steinmetz, J. L. (1977). Social roles, social control, and biases in social-perception processes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 35*(7), 485–494. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.35.7.485

Smith, R. E., & Wout, D. A. (2019). Blacks' perception of a biracial's ingroup membership shapes attributions to discrimination following social rejection. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology, 25*(4), 483.

Sue, D. W., & Sue, D. (1999). *Counseling the culturally different: Theory and practice* (3rd ed.). New York: Wiley.

Sue, D. W., Sue, D., Neville, H. A., & Smith, L. (2019). *Counseling the culturally diverse: Theory and practice*. John Wiley & Sons.

Tajfel, H. (1982). Social psychology of intergroup relations. *Annual review of psychology*, *33*(1), 1-39.

Tao, K. W., Owen, J., & Drinane, J. M. (2017). Was that Racist? An Experimental Study of Microaggression Ambiguity and Emotional Reactions for Racial–Ethnic Minority and White Individuals. *Race and Social Problems*, *9*(4), 262–271. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12552-017-9210-4

Taylor, S. E., & Koivumaki, J. H. (1976). The perception of self and others: Acquaintanceship, affect, and actor-observer differences. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 33*(4),

403-408. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.33.4.403

Torres, L., & Ong, A. D. (2010). A daily diary investigation of Latino ethnic identity, discrimination, and depression. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, *16*(4), 561.

Turner, J. C. (1975). Social comparison and social identity: Some prospects for intergroup behaviour. *European journal of social psychology*, *5*(1), 1-34.

Turner, J. C. (2010). *Social categorization and the self-concept: A social cognitive theory of group behavior.* In T. Postmes & N. R. Branscombe (Eds.), *Key readings in social psychology. Rediscovering social identity* (p. 243–272). Psychology Press

Tynes, B. M., Umaña-Taylor, A. J., Rose, C. A., Lin, J., & Anderson, C. J. (2012). Online racial discrimination and the protective function of ethnic identity and self-esteem for African American adolescents. *Developmental Psychology, 48*(2), 343–355. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0027032

Uleman, J. S., Blader, S. L., & Todorov, A. (2005). Implicit impressions. *The new unconscious*, 362-392.

Vorauer, J. D., Main, K. J., & O'Connell, G. B. (1998). How do individuals expect to be viewed by members of lower status groups? Content and implications of meta-stereotypes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *75*(4), 917–937. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.75.4.917

Wang, J., Leu, J., & Shoda, Y. (2011). When the Seemingly Innocuous "Stings": Racial Microaggressions and Their Emotional Consequences. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *37*(12), 1666–1678. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167211416130

Wijeyesinghe, C. L., Griffin, P., & Love, B. (1997). Racism curriculum design. *Teaching for diversity and social justice: A sourcebook*, 82-109.

Williams, D. R., Lawrence, J. A., & Davis, B. A. (2019). Racism and Health: Evidence and Needed Research. *Annual Review of Public Health*, *40*(1), 105–125. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-publhealth-040218-043750

Wilson, D. W., & Bennett, V. Y. (1994). Determinants of the attribution of racism. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, *9*(3), 489.

Wilson, S. R., Levine, K. J., Cruz, M. G., & Rao, N. (1997). Attribution complexity and actor-observer bias. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, *12*(3), 709-726.

Yoon, E. (2011). Measuring ethnic identity in the Ethnic Identity Scale and the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure-Revised. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 17*(2), 144–155. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0023361

Tables

Table 1

Common Themes in Racial/Ethnic Identity Development Models

Stages of Racial/Ethnic Identity Development	Common Themes
• Conformity (Sue & Sue, 1999) • Pre-encounter (Cross, 1971) • Assimilation (Berry, 1997) • Diffusion/Foreclosure (Phinney, 1989)	• Minimal emphasis on one's own racial/ethnic membership. • Overemphasis and focus on whiteness. Believes in white supremacy.
• Dissonance (Sue & Sue, 1999) • Encounter (Cross, 1971)	• Growing awareness of racism. • Starting to question the views of White people toward their own racial/ethnic group. • Beginning to question White stereotypes of their racial/ethnic group.
• Resistance and Immersion (Sue & Sue, 1999) • Immersion/Emersion (Cross, 1971) • Separation (Berry, 1997) • Moratorium (Phinney, 1989)	• Begins to reject White values. • Endorses views of their racial/ethnic group. • Actively seeking out opportunities to learn about one's own history and culture.
• Introspection (Sue & Sue, 1999) • Internalization (Cross, 1971) • Moratorium (Phinney, 1989)	• Willing to establish meaningful relationships with White people. • Starting to learn that there are views from White people and from their own culture that they may agree and/or disagree with.
• Integrative Awareness (Sue & Sue, 1999) • Internalization – Commitment (Cross, 1971) • Integration (Berry, 1997) • Ethnic identity achieved (Phinney, 1989)	• Valuing and integrating one's culture as well as the majority culture. • Inner sense of security with their racial/ethnic identity.

Table 2

Participant Demographics

Demographics	Total *n* (%)
Race/ethnicity	
Black	12 (31%)
Latinx	11 (28%)
Asian	13 (33%)
Biracial/Multiracial	2 (5%)
Native American	1 (3%)
Gender identity	
Woman	21 (54%)
Man	18 (46%)
Sexual orientation	
Bisexual	2 (4%)
Heterosexual	27 (69%)
Gay	3 (8%)
Lesbian	1 (3%)
Queer	5 (13%)
Prefer not to disclose	1 (3%)
Marital status	
Married	5 (12%)
Single	33 (85%)
Domestic partnership	1 (3%)
Employment status	
Unemployed	1 (3%)
Full-time	11 (28%)
Part-time	2 (4%)
Student	24 (62%)
Self-employed	1 (3%)
Educational achievement	
High school or equivalent	7 (18%)
Associates (2-year degree)	1 (3%)
Bachelors (4-year degree)	18 (46%)
Masters degree	10 (26%)
Doctorate (e.g., Ph. D, E.D.)	2 (4%)
Professional (e.g., Law, Medical)	1 (3%)
Average yearly income	
Below $10K	4 (10%)
$10K - $50K	19 (49%)
$51K - $100K	8 (21%)
$101K – $150K	4 (10%)
Over $150K	4 (10%)

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics for Scales About Ethnic Identity, Discrimination Experiences, and Acceptability of Racial/Ethnic Microaggressions

Name of Scale	Mean	Standard Deviation	Median
MEIM-R	4.31	0.31	4.33
BPEDQ-CV	2.31	0.48	2.31
ARMS (White)	1.90	1.16	1.5
ARMS (same race)	2.05	1.0	1.56

Note. *n* = 39. MEIM-R: Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure – Revised (Phinney & Ong, 2007); BPEDQ-CV: Brief Perceived Ethnic Discrimination Questionnaire – Community Version (Brondolo et al., 2005); ARMS: Acceptability of Racial Microaggressions Scale (Mekawi & Todd, 2018)

Table 4

Themes and Brief Descriptions by Aim

Aim	Theme	Brief Description
Aim 1	(1) Racism: Power and systemic or interpersonal	Participants had definitions of racism that included ideas of power and systemic issues but also definitions that focused solely on interpersonal interactions based on skin color or other phenotypical features
	(2) Discrimination: Bias and negative action	Definitions for discrimination were similar across participants. There is an understanding that discrimination is based on any identity and includes an action such as unfair treatment of a specific group.
	(3) Historical origins and intersectionality	Participants called on historical origins such as sociopolitical issues to discuss why people of color may engage in racist discrimination. Additionally, they addressed intersecting identities as another reason for racist discrimination within communities of color.
	(4) “All skinfolk ain’t kinfolk”	While not all participants agreed that people of color can be racist due to differences of opinion on the definition of racism, there was unanimous agreement that people of color can endorse racist ideas and often enact racism through discrimination and prejudice.
Aim 2	(5) Overt is clearly discriminatory	Overt behaviors such as using slurs, engaging in harmful stereotypes, or violently targeting someone because of their racial and/or ethnic background where instances that were often touted as discriminatory regardless of the racial/ethnic background of the perpetrator.
	(6) Subtle: It’s different from people of color	Comments usually labeled as covert or subtle forms of racism when White people are perpetrators provide more opportunity for situational attributions when people of color are engaging in them.

Table 4 Cont.

Themes and Brief Descriptions by Aim Cont.

Aim	Theme	Brief Description
Aim 3	(7) "They should know better": Shocked, betrayed, and hurt	Participants often noted that more overt forms of discrimination perpetuated by people from within their racial/ethnic group, led to feelings of betrayal and hurt. This seemed to be the case because they felt that people from marginalized groups "should know better" since they are often the recipients of similar forms of discrimination.
	(8) More empathy for ingroup members	While participants reported feeling shocked, hurt, and betrayed when people of color were perpetrators of overt actions of discrimination, they also reported feeling bad for them. Participants often identified that they had more empathy towards people of color engaging in discrimination towards other people of color.
	(9) Racism from White people: Expected but angering and problematic	Participants overwhelming agreed that racism that came from White people was expected. They reported getting angrier, ignoring the people who engaged in it, and finding it to be more problematic than if a person of color engaged in the same behavior.

Appendix A
Advertisement for Study in the Community

Appendix B

Demographic Measure

What is your age?

What is your gender?

- Male
- Female
- Non-Binary/Third Gender
- Prefer to self-describe

Do you identify as transgender?

- Yes
- No
- Prefer not to say

What is your race/ethnicity? (choose all that apply)

- Black/African American
- Hispanic/Latinx
- Asian/Pacific Islander
- American Indian/Native American/Alaskan Native
- White/Caucasian/European American
- Biracial / multiracial

What one racial/ethnic group do you most strongly identify with?

- Black/African American
- Hispanic/Latinx
- Asian/Pacific Islander
- American Indian/Native American/Alaskan Native
- White/Caucasian/European American
- Biracial / multiracial

What best describes your sexual orientation? (choose all that apply)

- Asexual
- Bisexual
- Gay
- Straight (heterosexual)
- Lesbian
- Pansexual
- Queer
- Questioning or unsure
- Same-gender loving
- An identity not listed (please specify)
- Prefer not to disclose

What is your marital status?

- Single (never married)
- Married

- Domestic Partnership
- Divorced
- Widowed

What is your current employment status?

- Unemployed
- Employed full-time
- Employed part-time
- Student
- Retired
- Self-employed

(if Student) What year are you in?

- Freshman/First year
- Sophomore/Second year
- Junior/Third year
- Senior/Fourth year
- Fifth year
- Graduate student

What is your highest level of education completed?

- Less than a high school diploma
- High school degree or equivalent
- Technical School

- Associates Degree (2-year degree)
- Bachelor's degree (4-year degree)
- Master's Degree
- Doctorate (e.g., PhD, EdD)
- Professional School (e.g., Medical, Law)
- Other (please specify)

What is your average annual household income?

- Below $10k
- $10k - $50k
- $51k - $100k
- $101k - $150k
- Over $150k

Appendix C

Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure – Revised (MEIM-R; Phinney & Ong, 2007)

In this country, people come from a lot of different cultures and there are many different words to describe the different backgrounds or ethnic groups that people come from. Some examples of the names of ethnic groups are Mexican-American, Hispanic, Black, Asian-American, American Indian, Anglo-American, and White. Every person is born into an ethnic group, or sometimes two groups, but people differ on how important their ethnicity is to them, how they feel about it, and how much their behaviors is affected by it. These questions are about your ethnicity group and how you feel about it or react to it.

Please fill in:

In terms of ethnic group(s), I consider myself to be

_____

_____

_____

Response scale:

(1) Strong disagree (2) Disagree (3) Neutral (4) Agree (5) Strongly Agree

1- I have spent time trying to find out more about my ethnic group, such as its history, traditions, and customs.
2- I have a strong sense of belonging to my own ethnic group.
3- I understand pretty well what my ethnic group membership means to me.

4- I have often done things that will help me understand my ethnic background better.

5- I have often talked to other people in order to learn more about my ethnic group.

6- I feel a strong attachment towards my own ethnic group.

My ethnicity is:

(1) Asian/Asian American

(2) Black or African American

(3) Hispanic or Latino

(4) White, Caucasian, European, not Hispanic

(5) American Indian

(6) Mixed: parents are from two different groups

(7) Other (write in): _____

My father's ethnicity is (use numbers above): _____

My mother's ethnicity is (use numbers above): _____

Appendix D

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN AN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY

TITLE: Attributions of Racism

RESEARCHERS:
Christin Mujica, B.S
Ana J. Bridges, Ph.D.
University of Arkansas
Department of Psychological Science
Fayetteville, AR 72701

COMPLIANCE CONTACT PERSON:
Ro Windwalker, IRB Coordinator
Office of Research Compliance
109 MLKG
1424 W. Martin Luther King, Jr.
Fayetteville, AR 72701
(479)575-2208
irb@uark.edu

RESTRICTIONS: You must be at least 18 years old to participate in this experiment. You must also reside in the United States.

PURPOSE: The purpose of this study is to understand during what context and situations are negative behaviors attributed to racism. In particular, we are interested in understanding if and when negative behavior by people of color from your same racial/ethnic group can be perceived as discriminatory or racist.

DURATION: This study should take between 60 to 90 minutes.

DESCRIPTION: In this study, you will participate in a semi-structured interview where you will be asked questions related to racist experiences you may or may not have had. The interviewer will have a question guide but may ask you to elaborate more on experiences you describe.

RISKS AND BENEFITS: There are no anticipated risks of participating in this study; however, talking about and recalling racist experiences may be uncomfortable for you. The benefits of participating in the study is a $30 compensation for an hour-long interview and your contribution to research regarding racism and racist experiences.

VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION: Your participation in this research is completely voluntary. You are not obligated to participate, and you may refuse to answer any of the questions or stop participating in the study at any time.

CONFIDENTIALITY: Your name will be kept separate from any materials, if we decide to quote something you say a pseudonym will be used; all of your responses will be recorded confidentially and, once data collection is complete, your name will be removed from all of your data to render the data anonymous. All information you provide will be kept confidential to the extent allowed by law and University policy.

VIDEO RECORDING: Your interview will be recorded in order to properly transcribe your data. We will keep your name separate from your video. Additionally, once data is transcribed, your video will be deleted.

RIGHT TO DISCONTINUE: You are free to refuse to participate in the research and/or to discontinue this study at any time. If at any time you wish to discontinue your participation, just inform the experimenter and you will be excused. Your decision to discontinue will bring no negative consequences—no penalty to you. If you choose to discontinue at any point during the experiment you will be paid according to the amount of time spent in the interview.

INFORMED CONSENT: I have read the description, including the purpose of the study, the procedures to be used, the potential risks and benefits, the confidentiality, as well as the option to discontinue participation at any time. I believe I understand what is involved in this study. By signing below, I am indicating that I freely agree to participate in this study.

Signature: Date:

Appendix E

Brief PEDQ- Community Version

Think about your **ethnicity/race**. What **group** do you belong to? **Do you think of yourself as**: Asian? Black? Latino? White? Native American? American? Caribbean? Irish? Italian? Korean? Another group?

YOUR ETHNICITY/RACE: _____

How often have any of the things listed below happened to you**, because of your ethnicity**?

BECAUSE OF YOUR ETHNICITY/RACE …

A. **How often…**	**Never**		**Sometimes**		**Very Often**
1. Have you been treated unfairly by teachers, principals, or other staff at school?	1	2	3	4	5
2. Have others thought you couldn't do things or handle a job?	1	2	3	4	5
3. Have others **threatened** to hurt you (ex: said they would hit you)?	1	2	3	4	5
4. Have others **actually** hurt you or tried to hurt you (ex: kicked or hit you)?	1	2	3	4	5
5. Have policemen or security officers been unfair to you?	1	2	3	4	5
6. Have others **threatened** to damage your property?	1	2	3	4	5
7. Have others **actually** damaged your property?	1	2	3	4	5
8. Have others made you feel like an outsider who doesn't fit in because of your dress, speech, or other characteristics related to your ethnicity?	1	2	3	4	5
9. Have you been treated unfairly by co-workers or classmates?	1	2	3	4	5

BECAUSE OF YOUR ETHNICITY/RACE …

How often…	**Never**		**Sometimes**		**Very Often**
10. Have others hinted that you are dishonest or can't be trusted?	1	2	3	4	5
11. Have people been nice to you to your face, but said bad things about you behind your back?	1	2	3	4	5
12. Have people who speak a different language made you feel like an outsider?	1	2	3	4	5
13. Have others ignored you or not paid attention to you?	1	2	3	4	5
14. Has your boss or supervisor been unfair to you?	1	2	3	4	5
15. Have others hinted that you must not be clean?	1	2	3	4	5
16. Have people not trusted you?	1	2	3	4	5
17. Has it been hinted that you must be lazy?	1	2	3	4	5

Appendix F

Acceptability of Racial Microaggressions Scale (Mekawi & Todd, 2018)

Instructions: Imagine that you are talking with a racially diverse group of peers about various topics, including race and ethnicity. Rate how ACCEPTABLE you think it would be for a White group member to say the following to a racial/ethnic minority group member:

1 (*totally unacceptable*) ------- 6 (*perfectly acceptable*)

1. Lots of people worked their way out of poverty, why can't Blacks and Latinos do the same?
2. African Americans would get more jobs if they dressed more professionally.
3. If African Americans spoke less slang, they'd be more likely to get jobs.
4. There won't be racial progress until racial minorities stop relying on handouts from the government.
5. Black people should stop using slavery as an excuse for their problems.
6. Minorities are just too sensitive about racism.
7. Latinos receive lots of unearned benefits just for being minorities.
8. People from your racial group get hired easily because companies need to meet racial quotas.
9. If Latinos spoke more English, they'd be more likely to get jobs.
10. I don't see your race, I see you as a person.
11. I don't care if you're Black, Brown, Purple, Yellow, Green…I see all people as the same.
12. There is only one race, the human race.
13. People shouldn't see race anymore.
14. Even if we look different, we are basically the same.
15. I don't notice race.
16. We are all the same.
17. People are just people, their race doesn't matter.
18. Everyone is treated the same by the legal system.
19. Everyone has the same chance to succeed regardless of their race.
20. Everyone gets a fair legal trial regardless of their race.
21. Everyone has access to the same resources such as schools and hospitals.
22. Race doesn't play a role in who gets pulled over by the police.
23. Race doesn't matter for who gets sent to prison.
24. Everyone has access to the same educational opportunities, regardless of race or ethnicity.
25. When people get shot by the police, it is more about what they were doing rather than their race
26. Everyone in life goes through the same kinds of obstacles, regardless of their race.
27. Latinos are just so sexy.
28. Native Americans are so fierce.
29. I just love Black women's butts.
30. Latino men are such passionate lovers.
31. You are so exotic.
32. You're so beautiful, you're like a geisha.
33. You're so beautiful, you look like Pocahontas.
34. Your skin color is so exotic.

Appendix G

Interview Guide

Throughout this interview we're going to discuss some situations that may or may not have happened to you. Some of these situations can be uncomfortable and elicit some emotions. If at any point you need to take a break or would like to stop the interview, please let me know.

1. First, in your own words, what is racism?

2. What about discrimination?

3. What do you think are the differences between subtle and overt discrimination/racism?

For the purposes of this study, lets define these terms:

Racism: Racism refers to prejudice or discrimination against individuals or groups based on beliefs about one's own racial superiority or the belief that race reflects inherent differences in attributes and capabilities. Racism is the basis for social stratification and differential treatment that advantage the dominant group.

Discrimination: Discrimination refers to inappropriate treatment of people because of their actual or perceived group membership and may include both overt and covert behaviors, including microaggressions, or indirect or subtle behaviors (e.g., comments) that reflect negative attitudes or beliefs about a nonmajority group.

Subtle racism/discrimination: Subtle racism or discrimination is often ambiguous in nature and can occur in any situation. While someone can potentially attribute the behavior to racism, someone else can see the same situation and attribute the behavior to other factors. You usually have to look at the context of the situation to further arrive to the conclusion that the behavior was racist.

Overt/Blatant racism/discrimination: In contrast to the subtle version of racism and discrimination, this behavior is clearly racist and related to the race of the person who is targeted.

4. What kinds of experiences have you had with racism/discrimination?

5. Tell me about a time where you experienced that was
    a. Clearly racism/discrimination

    b. How did you feel when (whatever event) happened?

    c. What do you think caused this person to do this?

    d. Would you think it was racism regardless of who says it? What if your mom, friend, colleague?

6. Tell me about a time where you experienced something where you were

    a. Uncomfortable in the situation and unsure but thought it was probably racist?

    b. How did you feel when (whatever event) happened?

    c. What do you think caused this person to do this?

    d. Would you think it was racism regardless of who says it? What if your mom, friend, colleague?

7. Tell me about a time where you experienced something where you were

    a. Uncomfortable in the situation and unsure but thought it was probably NOT racist?

    b. How did you feel when (whatever event) happened?

    c. What do you think caused this person to do this?

    d. Would you think it was NOT racist regardless of who says it? What if your mom, friend, colleague? What if it was a white person?

We know that racism exists and that people who are in the majority group (Whites) can perpetuate racism by providing messages of the inferiority of people of color. Because of the presence of these messages across society people of color can internalize racism. Therefore, even people of color can believe in the inferiority of their race and the supremacy of whiteness. We know this is a developmental process and people can be at any stage of their ethnic identity development at any given time. Given this, it's possible that people of color can be racist however there is no agreement about whether this exists. This is why we are trying to understand if it shows up in interpersonal interactions.

8. Do you believe people of color be racist?

9. Have you ever been accused of being racist? What were your reactions to that statement? If not, why do you think they have not said that?

10. Reflecting back, do you believe you have ever been racist?

IF THEY HAVE NOT MENTIONED ANY IN GROUP DISCRIMINATION:

11. Tell me about a time, if any, where someone from your own racial/ethnic group (could be family members, friends, or strangers) said something that you believed was racist towards your own racial/ethnic group?

a. How did you feel when that happened?

b. What do you think caused this person to do/say this?

c. Would it be better/worse if it came from a person who was White or not of the same racial/ethnic group?

In the online survey we asked you to complete, we provided you with some statements and asked how acceptable these statements were when people who were White or of your same racial group said them. I would like to ask you about what your thought process was when you answered some of these questions the way you did.

Final question:
What are some differences in how you perceive racism depending on the race (for example White vs someone of your racial background) of the person who does it?

Appendix H

Debriefing Form

As we mentioned in the beginning, this study is focused on describing during what situations people are more likely to label a negative experience as racism. In particular, we were interested in understanding the potential differences that might exist in your thought process when you experience racism from a person of your same race versus someone who is White or of a different racial/ethnic group. Through your participation in this study, we hope to gain a better understanding of these different experiences.

Thank you for participating in the study. Your information will be anonymous and will not be tied to you in any way. If we use a quote from your transcript in the final write-up, we will assign you a pseudonym to protect your privacy. If you have any questions or concerns following your participation in this study, please contact Christin Mujica at camujica@uark.edu.

Additionally, we understand that experiencing subtle and overt racism can cause stress in the daily lives of people of color. Constant stress related to racism can lead to racial trauma. Therefore, at the end of this document we will list resources that may help you cope with these experiences.

_____ _____

Name Date

Furthermore, given your contribution to this study, we would like to provide you with a write up of the results if you are interested. If you are interested, please include your email below:

Email

Additional resources

Organizations:

Black Emotional and Mental Health Collective (BEAM) is a training, movement building, and grant making organization dedicated to the healing, wellness, and liberation of Black and marginalized communities.

Black Mental Health Alliance develops, promotes, and sponsors trusted, culturally-relevant educational forums, trainings, and referral services that support the health and wellbeing of Black people and other vulnerable communities.

Eustress raises awareness on the importance of mental health in underserved communities, allowing individuals to identify and overcome challenges to achieve a healthier and productive lifestyle.

Inclusive Therapists aims to make the process of seeking therapy simpler and safer for all people, especially marginalized populations.

Melanin and Mental Health connects individuals with culturally competent clinicians committed to serving the mental health needs of Black & Latinx/Hispanic communities

Books:

The Unapologetic Guide to Black Mental Health: Navigate an Unequal System, Learn Tools for Emotional Wellness, and Get the Help You Deserve by Dr. Rheeda Walker

My Grandmother's Hands: Racialized Trauma and the Pathway to Mending Our Hearts and Bodies by Resmaa Menakem, MSW, LICSW, SEP

The Racial Healing Handbook by Anneliese A. Singh offers practical tools to help you navigate daily and past experiences of racism, challenge internalized negative messages and privileges, and handle feelings of stress and shame. You'll also learn to develop a profound racial consciousness and conscientiousness, and heal from grief and trauma. Most importantly, you'll discover the building blocks to creating a community of healing in a world still filled with racial microaggressions and discrimination.

Online Resources:

Decolonizing Therapy Instagram and Twitter: Resources on healing ancestral trauma compiled by Dr. Jennifer Mullan, clinical psychologist and community organizer.

Depressed While Black: An online community, blog, and video hub for Black mental health.

Grief is a Direct Impact of Racism: Eight Ways to Support Yourself: An article by global health professor Roberta K. Timothy.

Healing in Action: A Toolkit for Black Lives Matter Healing Justice & Direct Action: A guide by Black Lives Matter Healing Justice Working Group on preparing for action, self-care during an action, and restoration and resilience after an action.

Melanated Social Work Instagram and podcast: Mental health resources, information, and discussions created and curated by four men of color in the social work field.

Mental Health Tips for African Americans to Heal after Collectively Witnessing an Injustice: A self-care video by Brandon J. Johnson, M.H.S.

Racial Trauma and Self-Care in Tragedy: A resource list by University of North Texas.

Racism and Violence: How to Help Kids Handle the News: A conversation between Kenya Hameed, PsyD and Jamie Howard, PhD of Child Mind Institute.

The Safe Place: A minority mental health app geared specifically towards the black community.

Appendix I
Institutional Review Board Approval

UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS

To:	Christin A Mujica BELL 4188
From:	Douglas J Adams, Chair IRB Expedited Review
Date:	08/17/2020
Action:	**Expedited Approval**
Action Date:	08/11/2020
Protocol #:	2007274157
Study Title:	Attributions of Race-Based Discrimination When an Ingroup Member is the Perpetrator
Expiration Date:	08/10/2021
Last Approval Date:	

The above-referenced protocol has been approved following expedited review by the IRB Committee that oversees research with human subjects.

If the research involves collaboration with another institution then the research cannot commence until the Committee receives written notification of approval from the collaborating institution's IRB.

It is the Principal Investigator's responsibility to obtain review and continued approval before the expiration date.

Protocols are approved for a maximum period of one year. You may not continue any research activity beyond the expiration date without Committee approval. Please submit continuation requests early enough to allow sufficient time for review. Failure to receive approval for continuation before the expiration date will result in the automatic suspension of the approval of this protocol. Information collected following suspension is unapproved research and cannot be reported or published as research data. If you do not wish continued approval, please notify the Committee of the study closure.

Adverse Events: Any serious or unexpected adverse event must be reported to the IRB Committee within 48 hours. All other adverse events should be reported within 10 working days.

Amendments: If you wish to change any aspect of this study, such as the procedures, the consent forms, study personnel, or number of participants, please submit an amendment to the IRB. All changes must be approved by the IRB Committee before they can be initiated.

You must maintain a research file for at least 3 years after completion of the study. This file should include all correspondence with the IRB Committee, original signed consent forms, and study data.

cc: Ana J Bridges, Investigator