ABSTRACT

Title of Dissertation: **EMERGING ADULT EAST ASIAN WOMEN WITNESSING RACISM EVENTS: TO ACT OR NOT TO ACT**

Christina Jean Thai, Doctor of Philosophy, 2020

Dissertation Directed By: Dr. Clara E. Hill, Department of Psychology

Racial discrimination acts continue to occur and impact the lives of people of color. One mechanism that may help in halting discriminatory behavior is bystander intervention. While there have been studies on bystander intervention during discriminatory events, there is little research on how other people of color intervene during these events. This present study focuses on bystander interventions by emerging adult East Asian American women. As Asian Americans, they are often perceived as "privileged" than other people of color and as women they been socialized to "keep their head down." This present qualitative study investigated how they determine whether or not to intervene when they witnessed racism events. Our results showed that participants had three response types: minimized response/did not react, nonaggressivly challenged perpetrator, and supported the target. Some of our most interesting findings were that participants voiced that they were motivated to help because of their relationship with the target and/or perpetrator, and that they were inhibited by their fear of retaliation, being unsure of how to respond, and difficulty determining if an event was racist.

EMERGING ADULT EAST ASIAN WOMEN WITNESSING RACISM EVENTS:

TO ACT OR NOT TO ACT

By

Christina Jean Thai

A Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the
University of Maryland, College Park in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Counseling Psychology, Ph.D.
2020

Committee Members:

Chair: Clara Hill, Ph.D.
Dean's Representative: Richard Shin, Ph.D.
Committee Member: Edward Lemay, Ph.D.
Committee Member: Matthew J. Miller, Ph.D.
Committee Member: Jon Mohr, Ph.D.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Given the prevalence of racism incidents and the negative impacts on people of color's health as well as the impact of bystander interventions, it is crucial to investigate how bystanders decide when and how to act when they observe racism events. Of particular interest is investigating how emerging adult East Asian American women handle witnessing discrimination since they have generally been socialized to "stay in their lane" and not react aggressively. Hence, our overall purpose of the present study was to investigate how emerging adult East Asian American women respond when they witness discrimination perpetrated against others.

We found no studies of how emerging adult east Asian Women respond when they witness racism. Hence, we build our argument for this study by first talking about racism, the racial hierarchy in the United States (U.S.), roles within the racial hierarchy, racism interventions, and bystander interventions.

Racism

Racism has been defined as acts that "draw unfair or injurious distinctions . . . based solely on ethnic or racial basis and that have effects favorable to in-groups and negative to out-groups" (Jackson et al., 1998 p. 110). Racism can manifest on the individual, cultural, and institutional levels, with the dominant/privileged White individuals and institutions devaluing and disempowering those in marginalized racial groups (Williams, 2018). Throughout the years, racism has changed from overt racism events (i.e., "old fashioned," direct, and intentional) to covert racism events, which are more ambiguous, nebulous, and thus difficult to identify (DeVos & Banaji, 2005;

Dovidio & Gaertner, 2004). These covert acts have been labeled as *modern racism* (McConahay, 1986), *aversive racism* (Dovidio, Gaertner, Kawakami, & Hodson, 2002), and *symbolic racism* (Sears, 1998).

POC also experience racial battle fatigue when they have to continuously prepare for experiences of discrimination, combat discrimination, and cope with their experience (Smith, 2009). This hypervigilance often reduces their emotional and psychological resources (Smith et al., 2011) and has an impact on their psychological (e.g., anger, frustration), physiological (e.g., high blood pressure, headaches), and behavioral stress responses (e.g., poor performance, stereotype threat; Smith, 2004). Experiences of racial discrimination are associated with increased emotional distress (Sue et al., 2008; Wang, Leu, & Shoda, 2011), poorer mental health, and physical health (Bhui et al., 2005; Brody et al., 2006; Rumbaut, 1994; Williams et al., 2003), feeling powerless, helpless, worthless, and depressed (Essed, 1991, Feagin, 1991), and having intrusive thoughts and troubling dreams (Sanders-Thompson, 1996).

Liu (2017) argued that POC learn through racism (i.e., microaggressions, overt racism) and racial trauma about their positionality within society and thus, learn how to accommodate White people's needs and emotions. Liu (2017) and Liu et al. (2019) suggested that POC may avoid confrontation to minimize White discomfort so that they can continue to thrive within the United States social system (i.e., racial hierarchy).

The Racial Hierarchy

The U.S. is a country founded by White men and built on a foundation of slavery. Historically, the U.S. maintained a bi-racial hierarchy of "White" and "Non-White" racial strata, with White Europeans on the top and Africans on the bottom (Feagin, 2000).

Magee and Galinsky (2008) defined social hierarchy as the "implicit or explicit rank order of individuals or groups with respect to a valued social dimension" (p. 354). Hierarchies are pervasive features of society that are socially constructed and maintained through social discourse (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999) such as stereotypes, ideologies, institutional behaviors and policies, and culture. Race as a social hierarchy (i.e., racial hierarchy) privileges and disadvantages people based on their racial group membership, which has serious implications for one's life (Gold, 2004) based on oppression experiences.

Over the past few decades, the racial hierarchy has shifted and expanded due to the Civil Rights Movement and immigration (Bonilla-Silva, 2004), leading to a *tri-racial stratification: Whites, Honorary Whites, and Collective Blacks* Bonilla-Silva (2004). The *Whites* stratum is composed of "traditional" or native-born White Americans, new "White" immigrants, assimilated White Latinos, and lighter-skinned multiracial individuals. The *Honorary Whites* stratum is composed of light-skinned Latinos, Japanese Americans, Korean Americans, Asian Indians, Chinese Americans, Filipino Americans, Middle Eastern Americans, and most multiracial Americans. The *Collective Black* stratum include African/African Americans, Dark-Skinned Latinos, Vietnamese Americans, Hmong Americans, Laotian Americans, New West Indian and African Immigrants, and Reservation-bound Native Americans.

The creation of the Honorary Whites stratum in the middle between White and Collective Black allows for a racial buffer, the appearance of racial movement, and a reduction of racial conflict similar to how having a large middle class avoid class conflict (Bottomore, 1968 as cited in Bonilla-Silva, 2004). Kim (1999) proposed that Asians have

been "racialized relative to and through interaction with Whites and Blacks" (p. 107), such that the privilege and marginalization that Asians face within the US is derived from the privilege of Whites and the marginalization of Blacks. Asians are often treated as "non-Black" rather than being treated as "non-White" (Akoi, 1997), although they are sometimes perceived as closer to "White" and with higher privilege (Feagin, 2010). Asian Americans may function to uphold White privilege in hopes that they may also benefit from the status quo through *proxy privilege.* This proxy privilege is not "real" and is granted through the system of oppression and thus, only exists within certain areas and contexts. Through the racial hierarchy system, Asian Americans have been granted proxy privilege such that they are perceived as "honorary White" and "a successful minority," however this perception of privilege does not protect them from systemic oppression and experiences of discrimination. To distance themselves from being "Black" and to retain their proxy privilege, some Asians may try to associate more with Whites (Banks, 1998; Prashad, 2001), which could lead to perpetuating anti-Black messages and promoting White ideas and standards (Bell et al., 2014).

Roles within the Racial Hierarchy

Within systems of oppression, such as racial discrimination, individuals have certain roles. The *perpetrator* is the individual who enacts oppression through overt or covert racist acts. The *target* is the POC who experiences the racist event and discrimination. An *ally* is an individual from a dominant social group who is willing to forego their status to help support marginalized groups in changing oppressive systems (Edward, 2006; Mizock & Page, 2016; Munin & Speight, 2010). Finally, a *bystander* is

anyone who became aware of and/or witnessed the behavior or practice (Scully & Rowe, 2009).

Scholars have proposed that individuals become allies or are motivated to take action through developing critical consciousness or the "ability to recognize and challenge oppressive and dehumanizing political, economic, and social systems" (Garcia et al., 2009, p. 20). Once individuals are able to recognize the oppressive reality (Freire, 2000) and understand how oppression is connected to one's function and opportunity in society (Christens et al., 2016; Watts & Flanagan, 2007), then action can be taken.

Both critical consciousness (Freire, 2000) and allyship literature (Edwards, 2006) highlights the process of how individuals move toward resisting systems of oppression and work toward social change. These theories center on how awareness of systems of oppression is the first and most crucial step. However, both these theories are less clear on how individuals move towards taking action when they witness oppression (i.e., racial discrimination). If change (i.e., intervention) occurs when individuals recognize the nature of oppression and how harmful it is, how is it that not every individual become agents of change? Furthermore, these theories do not account for the bystanders of racist events, who may be other people of color or individuals who have yet to become fully aware of racism. Not every individual who is aware of racism will intervene in every racist event.

Bystander Interventions

Darley and Latané (1968) coined the term *bystander effect* to describe the phenomenon of whether individuals will intervene when they observe an emergency. They described a five-step process to determine whether an individual would act in such

situations: (a) the event has to capture the attention of the individual, (b) the individual has to evaluate that the situation is an emergency, (c) the individual have to decide it is their responsibility to act, (d) the individual has to believe in their competence to act, and (e) the individual has to make a decision to help.

Latané and Darley stated that bystanders have three primary reasons for apathy when they evaluate their responsibility to act: a) *diffusion of responsibility* or feeling less responsibility when other bystanders are present (Darley & Latané, 1968; Fisher et al., 2011), b) *evaluation apprehension* or the fear of unfavorable public opinion (Scully & Rowe, 2009), and c) *pluralistic ignorance* or the belief that because no one else is helping, the situation is not an emergency. Bystanders may also hesitant to intervene because they fear the perpetrator would turn their focus on them if they intervened (Aboud & Joong, 2008).

For racist events, it may also be difficult for bystanders to intervene due to the invisibility of covert racism. Bystander intervention is important because it helps to alleviate the burden of confrontation from the target by shifting the work away from them. Bystander intervention can also divert the negative consequences of intervening (i.e., retaliation, anger) from the target (Shelton et al., 2006; Zou & Dickter, 2013). Furthermore, bystander intervention can influence public opinion and behavior by establishing norms of egalitarianism and confrontation (Czopp et al., 2006). Confrontations may also change a perpetrators' actions because they do not want to appear discriminatory in front of others (Plant & Devine, 1998).

Intervening with the Perpetrator

One common method of intervention for racism is *confrontation,* which Shelton and colleagues (2006) defined as verbally or nonverbally expressing dissatisfaction to the perpetrator about their prejudicial and discriminatory behavior. Researchers have found that confrontations are effective in reducing bias in individuals who exhibit prejudice attitudes. Czopp et al. (2006) found that when individuals were confronted about their discriminatory statements, they were more likely to have a reduction in their biased responding (i.e., make fewer stereotypic interferences and reported fewer hostile beliefs) about Black individuals. Perpetrators who were not confronted were more likely to continue to exhibit prejudicial behaviors, perhaps because they were unaware that what they did was discriminatory or because they did not realize that others were unhappy with them (Czopp & Monteith, 2003; Czopp et al., 2006).

Target Interventions during Racist Events

When people of color experience a discriminatory event, they do not always confront the perpetrator, perhaps because confronting can be psychologically costly. Marginalized individuals need to process and cope with their emotions after the event while also determining whether or not to intervene. Their decision may be based on an evaluation of their emotions, interpersonal costs, and social acceptance (Sue & Constantine, 2007; Sue et al., 2009; Wang, Leu, et al., 2011). Targets of racist events were more likely to label an event as discriminatory in private and in the presence of other target group members (Stangor et al., 2002) or when the cost of confronting the perpetrator was low (Shelton & Stewart, 2004), probably due to the fear of potential negative consequences (Shelton et al., 2006) if they were to label something as discriminatory. When targets decide not to intervene, however, it can lead to rumination

and negative self-evaluations (Shelton et al., 2006) and increase feelings of helplessness and hopelessness that result in individuals feeling that discriminatory events are normative and accepted (Williams & Williams-Morris, 2000).

When targets do confront or label incidents as prejudice or discrimination, they are often perceived negatively and may be less effective in changing perception. Participants in one study were less likely to feel guilty in response to a target's confrontation (Czopp & Monteith, 2003) and were less likely to be have a negative self-evaluation afterwards, which has been found to be necessary in order to create a change in perception (Monteith et al., 2002). Kaiser and Miller (2001; 2003) found that participants perceived an African American individual as a complainer and troublemaker when they attributed failure to discrimination rather than to a lack of effort or lack of skill. Participants also perceived targets who confronted them for discriminatory acts to be hypersensitive and overreacting (Czopp & Monteith, 2003; Gulker et al., 2013). Kaiser and Miller (2001; 2003) suggested that these findings may be why targets of discrimination publicly minimize the racist event in order to reduce further negative perception or retaliation.

Non-Target Intervention during a Racist Event

White (non-target) confronters may be more effective in reducing bias because they do not benefit from intervening, and thus are perceived as more valid (Eagly et al.,1978; Petty et al., 2001). Individuals also have greater acceptance of a confrontation message about racism when the confronter is White compared to Black (Gulker et al., 2013). In one study, White participants watched a video where the confronter (White vs Black) confronted a White speaker over a racially biased report; participants were more

persuaded in the White confronter condition, and they perceived the Black speaker as relatively rude (Rasinski & Czopp, 2010). Individuals may be more willing to accept confrontation from non-target members because people expect target members to confront and thus individuals may not may as much attention to them (Swim et al., 1998). Furthermore, people are more persuasive when it appears that they have nothing to gain from intervening (Ashburn-Nardo et al., 2008).

Limitations of Bystander Research

Researchers studying bystander intervention have conducted experiments to approximate how individuals respond in similar situations in real life, but it can be questioned how much the results generalize to real life. Another limitation is that many studies used small sample sizes (see Levine et al., 2005; Lee et al., 2012) and self-report measures.

In addition, group membership is often not included, so we do not know if the results apply across the board to different groups. In one exception, Levine and colleagues (2005) investigated how social group membership impacted helping behaviors by creating salience of the identity as a soccer fan. Participants were primed to group membership either as a Manchester United fan or a more generic soccer fan. They were then tested for their helping behavior (i.e., did not notice, noticed by did not help, and noticed and helped) towards a confederate who was either a Manchester United fan, a Liverpool fan, or a generic sports fan. Levine et al. (2005) concluded that being primed toward a common social group membership provided an advantage during an emergency but priming towards a rival group (e.g., Liverpool soccer fan) was not a disadvantage. They also concluded that when participants were primed towards a superordinate group

(i.e., generic soccer fan), they were more likely to help such that collective identity of being soccer fans outweighed the identification with a specific team. Although these findings indicate that group membership does impact helping behavior, we do not know if these results apply to other social identity groups (e.g., East Asian women).

In another study, Lee and colleagues (2012) looked at how Asian American and Black women responded to a racist comment directly and indirectly. They assessed direct confrontation by analyzing their online responses to the perpetrator; indirect actions were determined by assessing how participants distributed jellybeans (good tasting vs bad tasting) in an "unrelated" taste testing study. A limitation of this methodology is that it might not generalize to what occurs in real life. Their "direct" response occurred online, which may reduce some of the potential negative consequences that may impeded bystanders from responding (i.e., fear of retaliation or social costs). The jellybean distribution may allow for researchers to look at how participants expressed disapproval through "withholding positive outcomes" or "administration of negative outcomes" (p. 924), but it does not account for other forms of indirect responses that may occur in real life such as helping the target or other non-verbal communications. Furthermore, the results might not apply to East Asian women.

Furthermore, researchers of bystander studies have often utilized quantitative methodology to investigate behavior and or decision-making process during bystander intervention. For example, Brinkman et al. (2015) conducted a study in which 292 participants were asked to recall an event of sexism and to describe the event as either a 1) hostile or negative comment, 2) comment that women should act in a certain way, and 3) an unwanted sexual comment. Participants were then asked to describe what they

might do in the situation from several possible response options: 1) help the victim, 2) ignore the person/people, 3) leave the situation, 4) respond indirectly but in a way they hoped would end the situation, 5) use a nonverbal gesture to express offense, 6) say something to the instigator to express thoughts/feelings, 7) use a physical response to express thoughts/feelings, or 8) nothing. They were also asked if they wished they had done something else by selecting a response option (i.e., "I did everything I wanted to do," "say something to the instigator," and "no there was nothing I wanted to do). The decision making process was then assessed by using a 5-point Likert Scale (1 = "not at all;" 5 = "extremely") on the Social Norms subscale ("I reflected on how my response would make me look to others") and Cost-Effectiveness subscale ("I wondered if my response might make the situation worse"). These self-report measures may not be able to accurately assess the nuances of decision-making when they witness discriminatory event. It also reduces an individual's behavior into one response option (i.e., responded indirectly, left the situation) when individuals may have done or wanted to do several behaviors/actions.

Finally, many studies of bystander intervention during racist events focused on the target's behavior and a non-target bystanders' behavior. Researchers have examined how POC responded to witnessed racist events towards their own racial group, but not towards other racial groups. For example, Lee and colleagues (2012), investigated cultural differences between Asian Americans and Black women when they witnessed a racist comment towards an Asian American woman and Black woman, respectively. However, POC are often bystanders to witnessed racism against other POC. Additionally,

POC have experienced their own form of racial discrimination which may impact their willingness and motivation to intervene during racist events.

Purpose of the Present Study

In the present qualitative study, we hope to contribute to the understanding of how people make decisions on intervening when they observe racist events. This understanding may offer insight into how individuals may continue to perpetrate systems of oppression and how individuals can challenge the existence of racism. The first research question was how East Asian American women decide when to intervene when they witness racist events. Second, we wondered if the social location (i.e., same on the racial hierarchy ladder or lower on the racial hierarchy ladder) impacted the decision-making process. Third, we wondered how East Asian American women intervene when they witness racist events.

We focused on East Asian Americans because they occupy a unique position within society, such that they are granted proxy privilege through the racial hierarchy and are marginalized, thus providing an opportunity to investigate how this juxtaposition impacts their decision making. Anecdotally, children of Asian American immigrants have expressed that their parents tell them to "keep their heads down," "don't make waves," and do not get involved in people's business because it could "invite trouble." However, Feagin (1991) suggested that individuals who belong to stigmatized social groups and experienced discrimination may have a desire to confront prejudice because it may enhance their quality of life.

We focused on women because they have typically been socialized to respond indirectly and nonconfrontationally. Researchers have shown that Asian women may feel

pressure to conform to stereotypes of being compliant, nonthreatening, and quiet (Niemann et al., 1994; Root, 1995).

We focused on emerging adult East Asians because emerging adulthood and college/graduate school is a time of self-identity exploration and self-focus (Arnett, 2014). Thus, it may be the age where individuals experience and reflect on social justice issues. Researchers have also shown that emerging adults frequently display prosocial behaviors and also have unique opportunities to help others (Randall & Wenner, 2014). College also provides students the opportunity to socialize and interact with a diverse group of peers, faculty, and staff. They are in an environment outside of their parents' control and provided time for reflection and growth (Blimling, 2010).

Finally, we used a qualitative method because qualitative methods are valuable when exploring the subjective experiences of participants. Polkinghorne (1991) stated that the purpose of qualitative research is to provide "full and integrated descriptions of an experience of situation" (p. 164). Qualitative methods allow for participants to expand on their responses, thus providing more nuance. This methodology also lends itself to the study of complex human phenomena that may not be adequately studied using quantitative methods (Hill et al., 1997).

CHAPTER 2

EXTENDED LITERATURE REVIEW

In this is literature view, I will provide an extended literature on racial hierarchy, the Asian American experience of racial discrimination, bystander literature, and System Justification Theory.

Extended Literature on Racism and Asian American Discrimination

Racism as a System of Oppression

Oppression is a hierarchical relationship where an individual or group is disadvantaged compared to others based on social group membership (Adams, Bell, & Griffin, 2007; Bell, 1997). This hierarchical relationship is often maintained through the "dominant" group holding differential power and privilege over the "marginalized" group (Jemal, 2017; Kivel, 2002). Oppression is one of the most important sociopolitical factors in the lives of marginalized individuals and may influence much of their psychological experience (David, 2014). Oppression is correlated with depression, anxiety, and aspects of physical health such as high blood pressure (Din-Dzietham et al., 2004; Fang & Myers, 2001). Oppression may also harm members of privileged groups through the loss of authenticity and humanity (Freire, 1973, 2000). According to Prilleltensky and Laurier (1996), oppression can be conceptualized as both a state and a process. Unequal group access to power and privilege reflect the state aspects of oppression whereas the many ways in which inequality is maintained reflect the process aspect of oppression. Oppression can exist and be enacted at the interpersonal, institutional, and systemic (or cultural) level (Jones, 1997), such as through discriminatory language, laws, and practices that are considered "the norm."

Recently, scholars have tried to shed light on how oppression is perpetuated at systemic levels. Oppression, as previously stated, is the hierarchical relationship in which an individual or group is disadvantaged based on social group membership. *Systems of oppression*, therefore, represent the dynamic relation between social systems and oppression. Johnson (2013) succinctly put it that "people are what make a system 'happen,'" without the participation of individuals within the system, it does not exist. Similarly, I argue that in addition to people, the institutions and culture that individuals have created also make systems of oppression "happen." Thus, I have conceptualized "systems of oppression" as the cycle in which individuals, institutions, and culture maintain and perpetuate the disparate and unequal distribution of power, resources, and opportunities.

Racism as Oppression

One clear example of how oppression can impact the lives of marginalized individuals is through racism, which is a distinct form of oppression in which there is differential and marginalized treatment of others based on racial group membership. As Johnson (2013) states, society can be "racist," but "racism" cannot happen without individuals (and institutions) acting in a manner that privileges some individuals and oppresses others. In the United States systems of racial oppression have persisted throughout time.

Race has a long-standing influence in people's life during discrimination and differential treatment (Feagin, 2010; Gold, 2004) despite the fact that race is socially constructed. hooks (2004) stated that intuitions have worked to establish an ideology of "White supremacist capitalistic patriarchy" (p. ix), such that a small minority of White

men control a larger majority through legitimizing oppression through language acquisition, genocide, economic inequality, and slavery. There is a history of discriminatory practices and policies that disadvantage groups and created disparities in terms of human, social, and cultural capital (Iceland, 2017). Racial inequalities, biases, and discrimination is present within school systems (Lewis, 2003), the criminal justice system (Alexander, 2010), the housing market, and residential systems (Charles, 2003). For example, African American/Blacks are four times more likely to be targeted for police use force than their White counterparts and are arrested and convicted for drug-related criminal activities at a higher rate than their White counterparts (Goff & Kahn, 2012; Tyler & Huo, 2002).

As POC in the United States, living within a system of racial oppression involves learning how to avoid racial discourse and upsetting White people's fragility around talking about race (D'Angleo, 2011; Liu et al., 2019). Liu (2017) proposed that people of color (POC) learn how to live within a racial society through experiences of discrimination, microaggressions, and racial traumas. Individuals learn to internalize stereotypes and the racial hierarchy (Yip, 2016). These experiences inform POC of their racial positionality within White spaces and the importance of accommodating White people's needs and status (Liu, 2017; Settles et al., 2018). Thus, POC will continue to uphold White dominance so that they may continue to function within society (Liu, 2017). These individuals function as "power-governors" such that they function in the background to uphold White privilege in hopes that they may also benefit from the status quo through *proxy* privilege (Liu, 2017) or "privilege" that is granted based on proximity to a White person.

Racial Hierarchy

One way in which systems of oppression and racism continues to be present and preserved is through the racial hierarchy (Bonilla-Silva, 1997), which allows for preferential treatment and privileges/values Whiteness over other races (Bell et al., 2014). The racial hierarchy system was created and based on slavery and the assumption of moral and intellectual inferiority of Blacks compared to the assumed superiority of Whites (Feagin, 2010). The racial hierarchy is often described as stable with impermeable boundaries between boundaries (Ho et al., 2012). One's position within the hierarchy is determined by their racial group membership. Race is typically accessed by one's phenotypic features, such as skin color and facial features (Maddox, 2006) and an individual's place on the racial hierarchy is determined by how closely they resemble the "typical" norm of their race (Bashi & McDaniel, 1997).

One of the most commonly accepted racial hierarchy was proposed by Bonilla-Silva (2004), which proposed three strata, (a) White, (b) Honorary White, and (c) Collective Black. The *Whites* stratum is composed of native-born White Americans, new "White" immigrants, assimilated White Latinos, and lighter-skinned multiracial individuals. The *Honorary Whites* stratum is composed of light-skinned Latinos, Japanese Americans, Korean Americans, Asian Indians, Chinese Americans, Filipino Americans, Middle Eastern Americans, and most multiracial Americans. The *Collective Black* stratum include African/African Americans, Dark-Skinned Latinos, Vietnamese Americans, Hmong Americans, Laotian Americans, New West Indian and African Immigrants, and Reservation-bound Native Americans. Bonilla-Silva (2004) proposed that colorism impacts one's placement within the hierarchy, he termed this

pigmentocratic logic, such that such that two individuals within the "Honorary Whites" and "Collective Black" strata can be differentiated by the color of their skin such that the individual who is lighter skinned is perceived as "better" and of higher status (Song, 2004).

Bell and colleagues (2013) proposed that the hierarchy described by Bonilla-Silva (2004) does not fully account for the multi-racial aspect of the United States. They believed that rather than "honorary White," the most fitting description for that stratum is "non-White, non-Black," which includes light-skinned Latinos, visible (non-Black) multiracial individuals, Asian Americans, and Native Americans (Bell et al., 2014). This description highlights that individuals within this stratum try to associate with Whiteness and to distance themselves from the Black stratum. The racial buffer of the middle category can lead to the *triangulation* of the racial group between the "White" strata and the "Collective Black" or "Black strata" (Kim, 1999).

Members of this middle stratum, especially Asian Americans, attempt to avoid being seen as "Black" (Akoi, 1997), through distancing themselves from Blackness and positioning themselves closer to privilege (Bell et al., 2014; Feagin, 2010). Individuals may also express anti-Black sentiments and conforming to White standards (Bell et al., 2014). Racially marginalized groups have been systemically positioned against one another (Osajima, 2005) because White dominance promotes a "divide and conquer" strategy (Tawa, 2013) were racially marginalized groups attempt to jockey for privilege. Kim (2004) termed this *racial positionality* (Kim, 2004), such that there are interethnic tensions among racially marginalized groups, where groups attempt to position themselves closer to White ness (Jordan, 2006). This can lead to groups being "complicit

in maintaining the racial hierarchy" (Hernández, 2007, p. 264) because racially marginalized groups are attempting to gain access to the privilege and power associated with Whiteness.

One way in which individuals attempt to access privilege is through *simultaneous racism*, or when one racially marginalized group simultaneously subordinates another racially marginalized group in order to improve their own status (Banks, 1998). For instance, in early American society, there was a large distinction between "White Americans" and "European Immigrants" because it allowed for the financial separation between the two groups (Omi & Winant, 2015). Over time, the European Immigrants capitalized on their phenotypic similarities to White Americans to differentiate themselves from the lower strata and Black Americans (Lee & Bean, 2007; Takai, 1993). Healey (2004) indicated that the arrival of Black Americans into the Northern states helped European immigrants and their descents become accepted because they were able to marginalize Black Americans to highlight their closeness to Whiteness.

The Triangulation of Asian Americans. Kim (1999) proposed that Asian Americans are triangulated between Whites and Blacks and that their position is society is evaluated on two axes: racial valorization and civic ostracism (Kim, 2004). Racial valorization is the superiority/inferiority axis where racial groups are ranked based on their cultural/racial aspects. The second axis, or civil ostracism, looks at the insider/foreigner aspect or the extent to which a group is considered assimilable. For Asian Americans, this means that they are seen as the model minority within the United States and they are also seen as perpetual foreigners. Asian Americans have been stereotyped as a highly successful racial group that achieves economic and academic

success (Cuddy et al., 2007) while simultaneously being perceived as perpetual foreigners (Tuan, 1998; Sue et al., 2007).

Xu and Lee (2013) conducted a study to look at how Black and White Americans perceive Asian Americans. They found that in general, Asian Americans were perceived highly in terms of family commitment, work ethic, intelligence, and socioeconomic status but they were also perceived to be the least patriotic, low in desirability to live in the same community with, and low marriageability. Thus, their results support that the "non-White, non-Black" position.

One of the largest mechanisms in which the racial hierarchy is maintained is through the *model minority myth*, which Kim (1999) asserted was created by Whites to maintain their social position above Asian Americans and African Americans. The model minority myth has always worked in tandem with explicit constructions of Blacks as culturally deficient (Kim, 1999). The model minority myth suggest that Asian Americans are socially, academically, and economically successful because of their values that emphasize hard work and perseverance (Wu, 2002; Yoo et al., 2010). This myth has also been used to discount the experiences of other racially marginalized groups (Zhou, 2004), stating that if Asian Americans are able to succeed that there is no racial inequality.

Focusing on the achievements of Asian Americans allows society to perceive them as superior to African Americans, which fosters a "us vs. them" mentality and reduces the potential for a coalition to form between people of color against the White majority. Asian/Asian Americans may also perceive themselves to be "closer" to white and more socially accepted (Tuan, 1998), thus further distancing them from other POC (Dhingra, 2003). Scholars have argued that as Asian/Asian Americans socially move

upwards and become more integrated and accepted by the White dominant group, they may distance themselves from other POC to maintain their higher social position (Loewen, 1971).

The model minority myth disregards the experiences of Asian Americans because it portrays Asians as all doing well and hides the poverty rate or education and employment attainment. For instance, Pew Research Center (2012) conducted a research study that looked at the median household income for Asian Americans, which showed their median income as $66,000 (compared to $54,000 for Whites, $40,000 for Hispanics, and $33,000 for Blacks) but disregarded the fact that many Asian households are multigenerational. Thus, skewing the data to portray Asians are "doing well." Furthermore, the model minority myth conceals the racial subordinations of Asian Americans (Kim, 1999; Kim, 2007) and negates and minimizes the experiences of discrimination (Cheryan & Boderhausen, 2000) that Asian Americans continue to experience (Pew Research Center, 2012). Due to this perception, there has been little focus on the racial experiences of Asian Americans (Sue & Sue, 2003).

Asian American Experience of Discrimination

Asian Americans are one of the fastest growing ethnic groups in the United States (US Bureau of the Census, 2012) yet less attention is often paid to their experience of discrimination (Gee et al., 2009). Huynh and Fuligni (2010) stated that Asian American college students reported higher levels of perceived discrimination than their European counterparts, indicating that Asian Americans experience discrimination despite their model minority image. Furthermore, experiences of discrimination are normative for Asian Americans and other marginalized racial groups (Yip et al., 2008).

Experience of discrimination have been associated with increased alcohol (Chae et al., 2008), controlled substances, and tobacco use (Yoo, Gee, et al., 2010). Perceived discrimination was also positively associated with somatic symptoms (i.e., back pain, chest pain, tiredness; Chen et al., 2014)). Experiences of discrimination have also been correlated with negative psychological outcomes (Stein et al.,2012), such as low self-esteem. Chen and colleagues (2014) also found that higher levels of reported discrimination experience are associated with higher depressive symptoms and anxiety symptoms in Asian American/Pacific Islander college students.

A qualitative study by Sue and colleagues (2007) proposed a taxonomy of common microaggression experienced by Asian Americans. They found eight themes: (a) alien in own land, such that there is an assumption of foreignness, (b) ascription of intelligence or assumption of intelligence based on race, (c) denial of racial reality or the invalidation of experiences of discrimination, (d) exoticization of Asian American women, such that Asian women are viewed only in the context of pleasing White men, (e) invalidation of interethnic differences, which minimizes the experiences/differences that exist between ethnic groups, (f) pathologizing cultural values/communication styles such that any communication style or value other than those held by the White majority is perceived as less desirable or deficits, (g) second class citizenship or the perception that Asian Americans are less important and lesser customers, and (g) invisibility, such that Asian Americans are left out of discussions related to race.

A unique experience for Asian Americans is the model minority stereotype and its restrictiveness (Wang, Siy et al., 2011). Asian Americans may perceive a need to live up to expectations of being successful and hard-working (Cheryan & Bodenhausen, 2000;

Wong & Halgin, 2006). Furthermore, Asian Americans may feel pressure to present as "doing well" because they fear losing "face" (Oerzel et al., 2001) or being perceived poorly by others. Asian Americans who internalize the model minority myth, particularly that they do not experience barriers to success (Museus & Kiang, 2009), may perceive that they do not experience racial discrimination (Yoo, Burrolo et al., 2010) and reflect a colorblind racial ideology (Gupta et al., 2011). This colorblind perception of society may, in turn, be a coping mechanism where they believe that Asian Americans are immune to racism (Lee, 2016).

Conclusion

This literature review highlights how racial oppression is perpetuated within society through multiple mechanisms. The racial hierarchy system was created to maintain White dominance and supremacy by marginalized people as inferior and "less than." Furthermore, this review illustrates how Asian Americans have been triangulated between White and Black and how this position as the "model minority" is used to argue that racial oppression does not exist. This creates a unique position for Asian Americans, who are not fully part of the privileged White group and yet are not fully seen as marginalized people of color.

Literature Review on Bystander Literature

Bystander Effect and Bystander Apathy

Bystander research predominately emerged after the murder of Kitty Genovese in 1964 where bystanders did not intervene when she called out help. In a seminal article, Darley and Latané (1968) stated that when there is a perception that other people are also witnessing an event, the likelihood of an individual intervening decreases, which they labeled as the *bystander effect*. Bystanders are individuals who witness an event and are in a position to know what is happening and to intervene (Staub, 2005). Latané and Darley (1970) proposed that there are three different reasons for bystander apathy: (a) social influence, (b) diffusion of responsibility, and (c) pluralistic ignorance. Researchers propose that having other bystanders around limits helping behavior through social inhibition (Latané & Nida, 1981), such that when helping situations are ambiguous, individuals are more likely to look to others to determine whether or not to intervene.

There may also be a neural component to bystander apathy. Hortensius & de Gelder (2018) conducted a study that found bystander apathy may also be a result of reflective emotional reaction that is dependent on the personality of the bystander. Individuals who have a greater disposition to experience personal distress are more likely to display reflexive apathy. This aversive reaction is similar to behavioral avoidance and inhibition. Research has indicated that state and trait avoidance motivation influences bystander apathy (van den Bos, Müller, & can Bussel, 2009; Zoccola, Green, Karoutsos, Katona, & Sabini, 2011), such that when individuals are primed to act without inhibition, helping behavior is more likely to increase (van den Bos et al., 2009).

Understanding why individuals do not intervene is important because inaction can perpetuate norms for discriminatory behavior (Aboud & Joong, 2008). Staub (2011) argues that bystander passivity encourages preparators to continue their behavior because perpetrators receive a message that their behavior is accepted or approved. Staub (2019) states that passivity not only affects perpetrators but also impacts the bystanders, such that passivity reduces empathy and caring. He provides examples throughout history where bystander passivity in the face of human rights violations, such as the Nazi concentration camps and the Tutsi genocide in Rwanda, allowed these atrocities to continue longer.

The bystander effect has been replicated in experimental conditions, such as when an interview room is filled with smoke (Latané & Darly, 1968), when a fire alarm sounds (Ross & Braband, 1973), and when someone is experience health issues (Harris & Robinson, 1973; Schwartz & Clausen, 1970). A meta-analysis conducted by Latané and Nida (1981) provided support for the bystander effect. However, a reanalysis correcting for a mathematical error, found that targets were more likely to be helped when other bystanders are present, particularly when bystanders could not all see each other (Stalder, 2008).

For instance, Harari and colleagues (1986) found that men were more likely to intervene during a simulated rape situation when they were with others (85%) compared to when they were alone (65%). A meta-analysis showed that while there is empirical support for the bystander effect, there is no evidence that the bystander effect applies to aggressive or violent emergencies (Fisher et al., 2011). They described this as a *reverse bystander effect*, such that the presence of bystanders increased the likelihood of

intervention. This is perhaps because as the danger of a situation increases, the cost for not helping the target also increases, such that participants are more likely to accept the potential cost of helping compared to the cost of not intervening (Fischer et al., 2005). To determine whether individuals would be more likely to intervene in dangerous situations where bystanders are present, Philpot and colleagues (2019) systemically observed 219 CCTV footage of real-life arguments and assaults in the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, and South Africa. They found that in over 90% of the recorded footage, at least one bystander made attempts to intervene.

The Bystander Effect and Self-Categorization Theory

Although the bystander effect has been replicated in numerous studies, much of this literature has been conducted where bystanders are strangers. Dovidio and colleagues (1991) and Batson (1991) and colleagues (1989) emphasize the importance of who individuals are helping on determining bystander intervention. The *arousal cost reward model,* proposed by Dovidio et al. (1991) states that when an individual observes the distress of another person, the amount of empathic arousal they experience is related to the clarity, severity, and duration of the situation. If there is too much empathic arousal, it becomes aversive and the individual is motivated to intervene. They proposed that empathic arousal increases based on the group membership. They suggest that *we-ness* or the connectedness or categorization of someone as a member of one's own group increases helping behavior (Dovidio et al., 1991). A similar theory was created by Batson and colleagues (Batson et al., 1989; Batson & Shaw, 1991) who created the *empathy-altruism* model. This model was based on perception of *one-ness*, such that individuals are more likely to help when the self-other overlap, or when individuals see themselves in

a close other. Thus, feelings of empathetic concern and helping behavior is then dependent on perception of closeness and group identity.

Future studies on bystander intervention have shown that group membership influences helping behavior (Levine, 1999; Levine et al., 2002; Levine et al., 2005). For example, Levine and colleagues (2002) found that bystanders were more likely to intervene based on if the target was a ingroup or outgroup member. Research has also found that passive bystanders are less likely to report being friends with either the target or the perpetrator (Lodge & Frydenberg, 2005). Furthermore, when participants were asked what they would do in a hypothetical bullying scenario, a majority of the bystanders indicated they would be more likely to help a friend who was being bullied than a neutral peer (Bellmore et al., 2012; Pronk et al., 2014). Levine and Crowther (2009) also found that when participants imagined a group of bystanders as friends, the greater the group size was, the more willing participants were likely to intervene directly.

Levine and colleagues (Levine, 1999; Levine et al., 2002) further emphasized that Self-Categorization Theory (SCT, Turner et al., 1987) may influence bystander intervention, suggesting that group membership does not have to be permanent to impact intervention. Levine and Thompson (2004) primed individuals to either perceive themselves as "European" or "British" and they found that the salience of an identity, even when not closely identified with, can still influence someone to intervene in disaster situations (i.e., donating money in a hypothetical natural disaster).

Bystander Intervention, Gender, and Group Identity

There is conflicting literature on the role gender plays in bystander intervention. Some research states that there may not be a difference (Chekroun & Brauer, 2002;

Fischer et al., 2005) whereas other studies do state that there is an impact. An early study on helping behavior, found that found that men are more likely to intervene (Eagly & Crowley, 1986) than women. Recently, Hayes (2019) found that in incidences of cyber stalking, women are more likely to offer support to the victim, recommend programming, and call for resident assistants. Carlson (2008) also found that if women did intervene, they often did so indirectly. Brinkman and colleagues (2015) found some gender differences in gender prejudice bystander interventions but there were also multiple similarities. They found that women and men used confrontational responses as similar rates, however women indicated that they considered a confrontational response more than utilized one.

It is possible that there is a gender x social identity interaction that influences whether or not individuals intervene. Levine and Crowther (2009) also found that when there was no shared social group membership that situation specific norms, such as gender norms, influenced behavior. In one study, they primed participants to their gender identity, and they found that gender norms, such as heroic male or demure female, impacted behavior. Female participants were less willing to intervene in the presence of men and male participants were more likely to intervene in the presence of women. A study by Lowe and colleagues (2012) indicated that women were more likely than men to intervene in women-women fights when they occurred in front of mixed-gender bystander groups. The female bystanders stated that they intervened because they felt embarrassed watching the fight and were worried that male observes would sexualize or trivialize women in general. Carlson (2008) suggests that men may be less likely to

intervene in the presence of other men to avoid being perceived as weak and will thus maintain the status quo.

Bystander Intervention Programs

Many intervention programs have been developed based on the literature for the bystander effect. Thus, these programs focus on reducing diffusion of responsibility, pluralistic ignorance, and social inhibition. Bystander intervention programs have been implemented into elementary schools as anti-bullying campaigns that teach children how to recognize and intervene during bullying events. They have also been implemented on college campuses and community-based programs to reduce sexual assault and sexual violence.

Within schools, bystander intervention programs have been shown to decrease bullying incidents (Salmivalli et al., 2011) and when bystanders intervene, the bullying tends to stop within 10 seconds (Hawkins et al., 2001). Bystander intervention programs have also been effective in reducing anti-LGBT bullying (Espelage & Swearer Napolitano, 2008). The effectiveness of these programs is important because researchers have found that children and adolescents have a difficult time intervening because of their fear of social rejection by peers (Espelage & Swearer Napolitano, 2008). These programs may help to reduce some of the fear and provide students with skills on how to intervene.

There are several well-known sexual violence intervention programs that vary in how they frame the program. I will review four programs: These are the Green Dot program (Green Dot, 2010), Bringing in the Bystander (Banyard et al., 2007), The Intervention Initiative (Fenton & Mott, 2018; Fenton, Mott, McCartan, & Rumney,

2014), and the Mentors in Violence Program (MVP; Katz, 1995). The Green Dot program is focused on changing violence acceptance and engagement through building awareness of sexual assault and that intervention is a manageable action. Participants are tried to identity the problem, identity bystander behaviors, and to facilitate enough confidence to act. The Bringing in the Bystander program focuses on increasing bystander intervention through building a greater sense of community. The program focuses on empathy building, increasing a sense of responsibility, and changing beliefs about rape myths (Banyard, 2008). The Intervention Initiative is an eight-session program that provides participants with knowledge about bystander intervention and encourages responsibility, empathy, and knowledge. Participants are provided time to rehearse and role-play interventions. Finally, the Mentors in Violence program focuses on encouraging male college athletes to challenge masculinity stereotypes and encourages men to intervene when they witness signs of violence.

These programs have been found to be effective. Cocker and colleagues (2011) evaluated the Green Dot program and found that the training had a positive effect on rape myth reduction. Participants also self-reported that they completed more active bystander behaviors. The Bringing in the Bystander program decreases rape myth acceptance and increases self-reported willingness to intervene and acts of intervention (Banyard et al., 2007; Inman et al., 2018). The Intervention Initiative also improve willingness to help, feelings of responsibility, and self-reported efficacy. However, there was no significant change in self-reported helping behavior (Fenton & Mott, 2018). Cissner (2009) found that college students who completed the MVP program had fewer sexist attitudes and had a greater sense of self-efficacy in intervening. Another meta-analysis that included 26

studies evaluating sexual violence bystander intervention programs for college students and adolescents found that bystander programs are effective in increasing bystander intervention but not on reducing sexual assault perpetration (Kettrey & Marx, 2019). Levine and colleagues (2019) proposed that bystander intervention programs should take into account social identity and group membership and to be more sensitive to how they may be salient within bystander-target relationships.

Conclusion

Bystander effect and bystander intervention research has existed for decades and has expanded and changed over time. This literature review highlights that there are multiple factors that may influencing one's decision to intervene or not intervene other than the presence of others. However, many of the bystander intervention programs are based on the bystander effect, such that they are focused on reducing diffusion of responsibility and pluralistic ignorance. Furthermore, many of the bystander intervention programs are focused on reducing sexual violence or bullying. I believe that bystander programs may be beneficial for events such as racism and may benefit from incorporating social identity and how that may impact intervention.

Literature Review of System Justification Theory

The Development of System Justification Theory

Jost and Banaji (1994) believed that existing theories failed to fully account for the experience of marginalized individuals and groups and how they exhibit outgroup favoritism. Jost and Banaji reviewed previous social theories and divided them into ones that focused on *ego justification* and *group justification*. Ego justification states that stereotypes (and behaviors) develop in order to protect the individual whereas group justification assumes that they emerge to protect the social group as a whole (Jost & Banaji, 1994). They proposed that there is a third form of justification, which they termed *system justification* to explain how people, specifically "disadvantaged people," justify and rationalized the existence of the status quo and social arrangements even at their own personal and group expense. Jost and Banaji's critical review of the literature highlighted several gaps in ego and group justification theories that were better accounted for by system justification theory.

For instance, individuals may have negative self-stereotyping and self-stigmatization (Allport, 1954; Clark & Clark, 1947) and may therefore exhibit outgroup favoritism (Jost & Banaji, 1994). However, ego-justification theories assert that individuals will act and behave in a manner that will protect their self-image and therefore these theories are unable to account for behaviors such as outgroup favoritism (Jost & Banaji, 1994). Social Identity Theory (Tajfel, 1981; Tajfel & Turner, 1986), a prominent group justification theory, was created to account for the gaps in ego-justification theories. These theories suggested that stereotypes were used to rationalize and justify group differences, group relations, and group competition (Hogg & Abrams,

1988; Tajfel, 1981). Individuals will make judgments that will benefit their ingroup (Tajfel 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 1979) and defend their actions. Although group justification theories are able to explain how marginalized individuals will use stereotypes against each other (e.g., conflict for resources) and how consensual stereotypes emerge within groups (e.g., my group has interacted with you in the past and I now hold the same negative perception), they do not explain how wide spread consensual stereotypes develop (Jost & Banaji, 1994). For example, members of marginalized groups can also hold negative stereotypes about other marginalized groups (Wilhelm, 1980 as cited in Jost & Banaji, 1994) and groups that they have never interacted with before.

Other researchers believed that Social Identity Theory failed to address the existence of outgroup favoritism (Hinkle & Brown, 1990). Jost (1993) completed a meta-analysis of past literature and found that 85% of low status groups made positive outgroup evaluations of the higher status group whereas higher status groups did not exhibit outgroup favoritism. Jost and Banaji (1994) believe that Social Identity Theory fails to address the ideological domination or false consciousness. *False consciousness* refers to holding beliefs that are contrary to personal and group interests and is rooted in the work of Karl Marx (Jost & Banaji, 1994; Jost, Gaucher & Stern, 2015; Meyerson, 1991). It is based on the concept that ideas and systems that favor the dominant group prevail because these groups control the cultural institutions (Jost & Banaji, 1994; Jost et al., 2015). These beliefs will then contribute to the maintenance of the social hierarchies and the marginalizing of groups (Cunningham, 1987; Eagleton, 1991). Thus, when first proposing this theory, Jost and Banaji (1994) were focused on understanding how

stereotypes emerge and may be used to explain current social systems. They postulated that stereotypes also serve to justify an existing state of affairs and will operate even at the expense of individual or collective self-interest. However, Jost and Banaji (1994) stress that they do not believe that system justification theory accounts for all forms of stereotypes but that stereotypes function as a way to maintain the system such that it provides legitimacy to the system.

What Does System Justification Look like?

Ego, group, and system justification tendencies have the potential to be in conflict or contradict with one another (Jost & Banaji, 1994). Jost and Banaji (1994) proposed that individuals from disadvantage groups would only engage in social change when the ego and group motives overcome the strength of system justification motives. Both ego-justification and group-justification are seen as a psychologically adaptive mechanisms that protect the individual and/or collective ego, however system-justification does not operate in a similar protective way. Instead, according to Jost and Banaji (1994), individuals may engage in system justifying beliefs and actions in spite of the psychological and material harm they may experience as a direct result of these beliefs and actions. According to system justification theory, the drive and motivation to perceive existing social arrangements as fair and legitimate emerges because it fulfills the (a) need for personal control, and (b) rationalization of the status quo (Kay, Jimenez, & Jost, 2002; Jost & Banaji, 1994).

System justification theory has two major goals (Jost, Pelham, & Carvallo, 2002). The first is to explain how and why people support the status quo even when it may conflict with their personal or group interests (Haines & Jost, 2000). The second goal is

to analyze the social psychological consequences of supporting the system (Glick & Fiske, 2001). Individuals want to have a positive outlook and favorable outcomes about themselves but they also want to hold the same perception for the social and political systems that affect them (Jost, Banaji, & Nosek, 2004). These systems can refer to any social, economic, or political arrangements that affect individuals and groups (van der Toorn & Jost, 2014). System justifying beliefs and actions maintains the social order by reducing group-based conflict. For example, individuals who are privileged by the social order produce hierarchy-legitimizing myths whereas the individuals who are marginalized are the consumers of the myths (Jost & Banaji, 1994; Sidanius, 1993; Martorana, Galinsky, & Rao, 2005).

System justification occurs in a multitude of ways. People may actively defend and support existing social systems by denying or rationalizing injustices. For example, Jost and Hunyady (2002) suggest that members of disadvantaged groups are more likely to misremember explanations and will be more likely to falsely recall information that is neutral or illegitimate as legitimate (Kappen & Branscome, 2001). Individuals may also believe in the negative stereotypes about themselves (Haines & Jost, 2000; Jost & Kay, 2005; Kay & Jost, 2003), may deny or rationalize inequality (Kay, Gaucher, Peach, Laurin, Friesen, Zanna, & Spencer, 2009; Napier & Jost, 2008), and may endorse political and religious belief systems (Jost, Glaser, Kruglanski, & Wulloway, 2003; Jost, Hwakins, Nosek, Hennes, Stern, Goslin, & Graham, 2014).

Stereotypes

One common way in which people will justify and defend the system is through the use of stereotypes. Stereotypes serve to justify the exploitation of certain groups and

helps to perpetuate the assumption that the inequality that exists is natural and legitimate (Jackman & Sentr, 1983; Jost & Banaji, 1994). Theorists stress that the stereotypes about those who are marginalized by the system do not have to be negative nor do the stereotypes about the privileged groups need to be positive. These stereotypes only have to function as a way to maintain the system (Jost & Banaji, 1994). For example, Jost and Banaji (1994) highlight that men may be seen as aggressive and controlling but these negative stereotypes reinforce their position as the "higher status" in society. System justification theory assumes that stereotypes are predicted on objective, material factors. Such that stereotypes will provide behavioral confirmation and individuals will act in a way that will reinforce the stereotypes. Stereotypes evolved as a way to justify the social system and they may not be related to any "real characterization" and are based more on the ideological justification rather than specific traits (Jost & Banaji, 1994).

Complementary stereotypes are another method in which existing systems are legitimized and stabilized (Kay & Jost, 2003) and may be perceived as "less aversive and more socially desirable than straightforward victim derogation" (Kay & Jost, 2003, p. 825). These stereotypes help to maintain the perception of "balance" and "justness." For example, perception that power is balanced between genders (i.e., men have more power at work whereas women hold the power at home), limits women's influence outside the home and reduces women's interest in attaining power outside of the home (Williams & Chen, 2014). Another common complementary stereotype is the ascription of happiness and morality to individuals who are underprivileged and loneliness and unhappiness to individuals who are rich (Kay & Jost, 2003). According to researchers, these complementary stereotypes, "poor but happy" and "rich but miserable" allows for the

maintenance of the "no one has it all" belief. This system legitimizing belief allows individuals to "feel better about their own position in society and increases the perceived legitimacy of the social system" (Kay & Jost, 2003, p.824). They found that exposure to "poor but happy" and "rich but miserable" stereotypes lead people to score higher on an explicit system justification measure compared to individuals who were exposed to non-complementary stereotypes. These individuals were able to maintain their perception that the system is just. Researchers also found that exposure to non-complementary stereotypes implicitly activated "justice concerns" (Hafer, 2000). These individuals had faster reaction times for justice related words compared to those who were exposed to complementary words (Kay & Jost, 2003). Although not explicitly started by the authors, it appears that exposure to non-complementary stereotypes threatens the legitimizing myth, which in turns, induces more behavior or thought that justifies the system (i.e., "the system needs to be just").

Critique of System Justification

I believe that there are several gaps in the systems justification literature that need to be addressed. These issues are broadly broken down to (a) articulation of theory, (b) underdeveloped rationalization of theory, and (c) methodological concerns.

Articulation of Theory.

In my review of the literature, one of the most salient issues is that there is no consensus by what researchers consider "system justification." According to the founders of this theory, system justification is defined as the "process by which existing social arrangements are legitimized, even at the expense of personal and group interest" (Jost & Banaji, 1994, p. 2). When Jost and Banaji (1994) first conceptualized this theory, it was

focused on stereotypes and false consciousness, thus system justification referred to outgroup favoritism and internalized stereotypes. These researchers believed that there was a gap in understanding of why disadvantaged individuals would "legitimize" a system that perpetuated their continued marginalization. However, over the past 20 years, system justification has expanded outward and researchers have applied this to contexts such as the American political system (Jost, 2017) and the perpetuation of ignorance (Shepherd & Kay, 2012). With such a broad understanding of system justification, almost every aspect of human nature can be considered and interpreted as "system justifying."

The very definition of system justification is broad; it states that this is the "process" that "legitimizes" existing social arrangements, leaving it to the researcher to explicate and operationalize the process. Without a firm conceptualization of how what system justification looks like, it appears that the process of system justification can include everything. For example, system justification has been described as operating outside of conscious awareness (Ashburn-Nardo, Knowles, & Monteith, 2003; Jost, Pelham, & Carvallo, 2002) as well as being "non-conscious" (Jost et al., 2002). It can also occur implicitly (Jost & Burgess, 2000; Jost et al., 2002; Kay & Jost, 2003) and explicitly (Jost et al., 2002; Nosek, Banaji, & Greenwald, 2002; Rudman, Feinberg, & Fairchild, 2002). The process could be an individual holding stereotypes that favor the higher status outgroup or it could be maintaining beliefs that the world is just and fair. For example, in the study cited earlier by Kay and Jost (2003), the authors utilized two different operationalization of "system justification." They stated that participants who were exposed to complementary stereotypes (i.e., poor but happy) explicitly exhibited system justification by the higher scores on the General System Justification Measure

compared to participants who were exposed to non-complementary stereotypes. Thus, system justification was shown in the following way: when shown evidence that supports the legitimizing belief, belief that the system is just will be stronger than when shown evidence that contradicts the belief. Within the same study, Kay and Jost (2003) stated that participants' faster response time in a lexical decision task following exposure to non-complementary stereotypes (i.e., poor and unhappy) supported the theory of system justification. In this instance, system justification was depicted through the need for justice after being shown something that contradicted their belief that the system is just. Although, both these things may fall under the umbrella of system justification, it reiterates the importance of a strong definition of the "process."

Jost and Banaji (1994) stated that System Justification Theory was proposed because social theories overlook the experience of disadvantaged individuals, specifically how disadvantaged individuals exhibit outgroup favoritism. They presented research findings, such as Sniderman and Piazza's (1993) finding that African Americans "accepted" stereotypes of their group as "lazy", "irresponsible" and "violent" and that they endorsed these stereotypes more strongly than European Americans as evidence for system justification. Although it is true that Social Identity Theory and other social theories may not be able to fully explain why marginalized individuals hold harmful stereotypes of themselves, it is important to note that System Justification theorists have never distinguished this theory from the concept of internalized oppression. As David and Derthick (2014) stress "the omission of oppression and internalized oppression when conceptualizing people's experiences…is not a new or unique occurrence. (p. 2)"

The role of internalized oppression is often minimized (Pyke, 2010); it is a process that can begin at a very young age (Clark & Clark, 1947) and is unconscious and involuntary (Batts, 1983; David & Okazaki, 2010). When looking at the "evidence" of system justification through the lens of internalized oppression, it is difficult to tease apart the two concepts. Internalized oppression can appear as internalized negative stereotypes (Amaro & Raj, 2000; Brown, 1986; Pheterson, 1986) and expectations (Brown, 1986). Jost and Banaji (1994) present held negative beliefs about themselves as evidence of system justification Furthermore, the description of internalized oppression put forth by Lipsky (1987) is very similar to that of System Justification; internalized oppression is the "turning upon ourselves, upon our families, and upon our own people the distress patterns that result from the oppression of the society" (p. 6). This description of internalized oppression and the definition of System Justification both stress that the "patterns" or "process that legitimize"' are things individuals will due despite the harm it causes them. I strongly believe that it is a poor conceptualization that has led to a theory that is difficult to distinguish from other existing concepts.

The broadness in the applicability of the system justification can also be seen in the following study conducted by Mallett, Huntsinger, and Swim (2011) on how system justification may explain an individuals' perception of hate crime legislation. They found that participants who are motivated to maintain the current system perceived that there was less harm from hate crimes when they targeted low status groups and therefore were more likely to oppose policies that addressed hate crimes. However, when hate crimes targeted high status groups, individuals who are more motivated to maintain the system were more likely to perceive more harm. Researchers interpreted perceived harm to high

status groups as a threat to the system, however another potential way to look at this interaction is perception of "in-group" and "out-group" or that participants inherently saw themselves as members of the higher status group and saw it as a potential hate-crime to themselves.

One troubling instance of this is when Jost and colleagues presented the following as evidence of the utility of system justification (Jost et al., 2004). They indicated that people may be more likely justify the system through the use of stereotypes in response to a threat than when there is no threat. They cited Pyszczynski, Solomon, and Greenberg's (2003) psychology of terror research that indicated after the 9/11 terrorist attacks, there was a greater perception of a threat to the system. This then induced the psychological need to justify the system, leading to increased stereotyping of Arab Americans (Goodwin & Devos, 2002). However, this leads to the question of what "system" is being threatened in this scenario. Jost and colleagues (2004) state that systems refer to any social, economic, or political arrangements that impact an individual's life; in this instance it is not clear what "system" is being threatened. Is the system the "American way of life?" Or is it possible that what was activated in this situation was "in-group" and "out-group" or prejudice/discrimination of the unknown rather than system justification. Jost et al (2004) presented research that stated that individuals showed an increase in support for the Iraq war after President George W. Bush's announcement of way plans (Saad, 2003). However, Rubin and Hewstone(2004) argued this may be due to ingroup and outgroup differences rather than believing in the inevitability of the system. The declaration of war created a large distinction between "us" and "them," even if individuals were "justifying the system" by supporting the war

once it is hard to disregard the competing hypothesis that the war was supported because of an ingroup/outgroup effect.

Jost and colleagues (2004) stated that the "neglect of system-justifying processes is ironic, given that the historical record reveals far more acquiescence than identity-based competition or revolt (p. 886)." They argued that other social theories are unable to fully describe the experiences of ingroup and outgroup members by citing Jackman (1994) who stated that from a system maintenance perspective it is in "the dominant groups'" best interest to "foster a cooperative and affectionate relationship with their subordinates." Furthermore, Jost and colleagues (2004) argue that historically "dominant and subordinates" are "highly averse to conflict and antagonism and generally develop collaborative relationships." Even, they state, in instances of slavery. Thus, they argue that system justification is a process that is inevitable and is build into our society. I believe that in centering their theory on the continued maintenance of oppression and the proposed collaborative relationships, Jost and Banaji (1994) disregard the lived experiences of the very people they were attempting to describe. This dismisses the oppressed experiences of the marginalized individuals and how individuals may negotiate within themselves so they may continue to exist in a society that oppresses them.

When presented with the contradictory results for why some complementary stereotypes induce system-justifying belief whereas others do not. Kay, Jost, and Young (2005) propose that it may be related to the causal relation between the existing stereotype and the outcome. When a causal perception exists between a trait (i.e., intelligence) and an outcome (e.g., wealth), individuals are more likely to score higher on system justification after being exposed to non-complementary stereotype. However, if

there is no causal connection (i.e., happiness and wealth), then individuals are more likely to exhibit more system justification after being exposed to a complementary stereotype. Thus, both (a) victim-derogating judgments and stereotypes maintain the belief in a just world and (b) victim-enhancing representations increase system-justification tendencies. Although Kay and colleagues (2005) provide a potential explanation for why some contradictory results exist, the questions remain about what motivates individuals to explicitly justify when they are presented with legitimizing beliefs and implicitly justify the system when presented with threatening information.

Overall, within system justification literature there is an inconsistency as to how "system justification" is conceptualized and how it is measured. This lack of clarity and consistency creates confusion and hinder the advancement of theory and research. Furthermore, this theory was created to explain the experiences of marginalized individuals however the theory does not center on their lived experiences and dismisses the possibility that individuals may have internalized oppression, and thus "justify" the system.

Under-Developed Rationalization of the Psychological Need to Justify

In the literature for System Justification Theory, it is not apparent what motivation underlies justifying the existing system. Jost and colleagues (2004) state that individuals "want to hold favorable attitudes about social and political systems that affect them" (p. 887). What purpose does holding favorable attitudes about the existing systems have? Some researchers have suggested that system justification occurs because it may reduce anxiety, guilt, discomfort, and uncertainty and thus may be a coping mechanism (Jost & Hunyady, 2002; 2005). Jost and Hunyady (2002; 2005) found that marginalized

individuals justify the system because it alleviates emotional distress and increases subjective well-being. Jost and Banaji (1994) stated that individuals may obtain relief by believing that their experience is unavoidable (Wood, 1988). Others state that is reduces dissonant feelings, members of disadvantaged and marginalized groups will attempt to resolve their cognitive dissonance through justifying and maintaining a positive image the existing status quo and system (Jost et al., 2012). Other researchers, such as Rubin and Hewstone (2004), question where system justification has a palliative effect that is greater or different than the functions of cognitive dissonance and other social identity theories (e.g., Blanz, Mummendey, Mielke, & Klink, 1998; Tajfel & Turner, 1979).

It is important to note that the use of the term cognitive dissonance within System Justification Theory literature differs from the original articulation of the concept put forth by Festinger (1962). Festinger (1962) stated that there is an intrinsic motivation to ensure that one's beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors are aligned. If a conflict does exist, individuals will change their beliefs and behaviors to become more consistent. Cognitive dissonance theory states that individuals are more likely to experience a cognitive dilemma when things (beliefs, behaviors, attitudes) are dissonant. However, in the systems justification literature, Jost and colleagues (2004) stressed that the "that members of disadvantaged groups would be even more likely…to support the status quo… when personal and group interests are low in salience" (p. 909). Thus, cognitive dissonance, according to SJT, will be higher among marginalized members when their personal and group interest in low because personal and group interests may prevent and overpower the system justification motive (Jost et al., 2004). However, this assertion goes counter to Festinger's cognitive dissonance theory, which postulates that individuals who have

stronger attitudinal preference or attachment will experience greater cognitive dilemma. Therefore, if these marginalized individuals do not have a preference for or identify with their personal or group identity, it is unclear what would be motivating them to justify the system without sufficient cognitive conflict (Owuamalam, Rubin, Spears, 2016). Kay et al. (2009) stated that these individuals may be motivated because they are dependent on the system. However, Owuamalam and colleagues (2016) raise the question that if individuals were dependent on a social system, why would they not also have strong personal and group interest. There is a lack of conceptual and theoretical clarity around how these cognitive dilemmas arise.

According to Owuamalam and colleagues (2016), individuals who have strong attitudinal preferences toward their group identities would be more likely to experience a cognitive conflict with the social reality than those who do not have strong group identities. Thus, they proposed that individuals who have stronger preference group identities would be more likely to justify the system. Research has confirmed this hypothesis. Owuamalam, Rubin, Spears, & Weerabangsa (2017) found that when people with a sense of being lower social class justified the system more than those with a sense of being upper class. When these results were investigated further, it is apparent that system justification was more likely to occur under strong group interest whether than weak. Owuamalam et al. (2016) suggest that system justification may operate concordantly with ego motivation and group motivation and that personal and group interests drive system justification even if this comes at a cost to group and personal interests. Strangely enough, researchers also state that individuals are motivated to imbue the system with legitimacy and fairness even if beliefs actually create dissonance,

conflict, and ambivalence (Jost & Burgess, 2000). For example, Kay and colleagues

(2002) found that immediately before the 2000 US presidential election, both Democrats

and Republicans judged potential Bush and Gore presidencies to be more desirable as

their perceived likelihood increased and less desirable as their perceived likelihood

decreased. According to theorists and researchers, this indicated that they rationalized the

status quo even before it became the status quo. They postulated that people will

rationalize the anticipated status quo by judging likely events to be more desirable than

unlikely events, (a) even in the absence of personal responsibility, (b) whether those

events are initially defined as attractive or unattractive, and (c) especially when

motivational involvement is high rather than low (Jost et al., 2004). Little attention,

however, was given to the psychological motivation behind justifying an anticipated

system. Another example of system justification that is cited is that individuals from low-

income groups are not more likely than high-income groups to support policies that may

benefit them (Fong, 2001; Gilens, 1999; Pelham, Sheldon, & Sullivan, 2003). However,

Jost and colleagues (2004) do not speak to what motivates this decision. Is it because

there is a dissonant thought that individuals are attempting to reduce by not supporting

policies? Or are there additional motivations that have not yet been explored in the

literature?

Theorists stress that individuals will not always justify the systemic inequalities

and that there are moderating factors (Jost et al., 2001) such as belief in a just world,

political conservatism, fear of equality (Lane, 1962), perception of control (Kluegel &

Smith, 1986) and social dominance orientation, which may amplify how individuals feel

about other groups (i.e., ingroup ambivalence, outgroup favoritism, depressed

entitlement; Jost & Burgess, 2000; Kay & Jost, 2003). There may also be cognitive

factors such as cognitive conservatism (Greenwald, 1980), and the need for cognitive

closure (Jost, Kruglanski, & Simon, 1999). Theorists reject the idea that there is a

universal need to have a belief in a just world (Jost & Hunyady, 2002). They state

individuals are taught to rationalize the way society exists through social learning (Bern,

1970; Jost & Hunyady, 2002). There may be dispositional, situation, and cultural causes

for justifying the system. Furthermore, theorists indicate that system justification is

activated under different circumstances (van der Toorn & Jost, 2014) and that not all

"disadvantage" individuals will continuously justify the system.

Justification is a motivated process (Jost, Liviatan, van der Toorn, Ledgerwood,

Mandisodza, & Nosek, 2010) is activated or strengthened based on the context and there

may also be personality characteristics. Personality characteristics may also impact

whether an individual will justify the system or not justify the system. Overbeck, Jost,

Mosso, & Flizik (2004) found that members from low-status group who had high social

dominance scores were more likely to adopt system justifying "acquiesce" rather than

group-justifying resistance. People hold beliefs in meritocracy and the protestant work

ethic to justify their opposition to policies that reduce social inequalities (Jost et al., 2004;

Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). Individuals who score low on dispositional measures must

satisfy their system justification needs. These differences may explain in-group

ambivalence and outgroup favoritism (Jost & Burgess, 2000; Kay & Jost, 2003).

Theorists state these motives are dependent on five contexts: (a) low personal control, (b)

system threat, (c) system dependence, (d) system inescapability, and (e) legitimacy (Kay

& Friesen, 2011; Jost, Kiveyz, Rubini, Guermandi, & Mosso, 2005; Laurin, Shepherd, & Kay, 2010a; Ellemers, Wilke, & van Knippenberg, 1993; Jost, 2001).

Low personal control is when individuals perceive that they are not able to control their life experiences. Individuals who have low personal control are more likely to defend social systems because they perceive that they are unable to do anything to change the system (Kay & Friesen, 2011). *System threats* are events that may call into question the system's legitimacy (Kay & Friesen, 2011). When individuals perceive a threat to their system, they may defend the system in subtle (e.g., endorse stereotypes) or blatant ways (e.g., punishing those who threaten the system; Jost et al., 2005; Kay et al., 2005; Kay et al., 2009). *System dependence* is the perception of how much control the system has on an individual's life. If individuals perceive a high dependence on the system, then they are more likely to defend the legitimacy of the system (van der Toorn, Tyler, & Jost, 2011). *System inescapability* is the perception that one is unable to leave the social system or institution. Individuals who perceive the system as inescapable are more likely to engage in a process that allows them to adapt to their situation such that they rationalize their decisions and situation (Kay, Jimenez, & Jost, 2002). Laurin, Shepherd, and Kay (2010a) found that when individuals were told that emigration from their country is becoming harder and thus would be unable to leave, individuals were more likely to state they supported the status quo than those who did not find the system inescapable (e.g., were not told that emigration is harder). Finally, perceiving the system as legitimate also greatly impacts whether one will justify the system. For example, researchers have found that legitimacy increases ingroup favoritism among high status

group members but deceases ingroup favoritism among low status group members
(Ellemers et al.,1993; Jost, 2001).

Within the system justification literature, there is underdeveloped rational for why
individuals justify the system. Although SJT theorists have pointed to cognitive
dissonance as the causal mechanism for system justification, there are conceptual
concerns about how individuals experience sufficient cognitive dilemmas that will induce
system justifying beliefs and actions. Other theorists have highlighted that different
contexts may explain this justification. However, there are methodological issues within
the research on contexts that call into question the validity of the results.

Methodological Concerns

Based on the extant research, it is evident that there are situations when system-
justifying beliefs and actions occur and are strengthened and other times when they are
less likely to occur. However, it is important to note that many studies in the area were
conducted within a laboratory setting and some researchers (see Laurin, Shepherd, &
Kay, 2010b) selectively excluded privileged perspectives (i.e., certain genders) because
they believed it was related to the dependent measures (i.e. perception of sexism). By
selectively excluding privileged or marginalized identities or not measuring or accounting
for these identities, researchers cannot be sure how and why individuals justify the
system. This leaves a significant gap in the literature about *why* system-justifying beliefs
occur and the motivations behind these beliefs. Furthermore, many of these studies
primed and manipulated their participants by having them read vignettes or imagine
various scenarios to evoke one of these contexts (e.g., system threat, system legitimacy
etc.). Given that system justification literature strongly relies on experimental evidence, it

is essential that these studies were conducted in a valid and reliable manner. However, there are a lot of different methodological concerns surrounding the execution and outcome of these studies, which brings into the question the meaningfulness of the results.

Jost and Banaji (1994) stated individuals will actively legitimize and support a current system even when it did not benefit them. However, in much of the research, there is only evidence of individuals who reflect and show awareness of the status system. When one looks at the evidence for system justification theory, it becomes apparent that much of the research seems to be experiments that utilize the "minimal group paradigm." This method involves dividing participants into two arbitrary groups in order to investigate perception, attitudes, and behaviors towards "ingroup" and "outgroup" members (Tajel, Billig, Bundy, & Flament, 1971). This method is useful because it allows researchers to prime individuals to perceive themselves and others as members of the system. However, this method of research is not without its limitations. System justification researchers do not have a consistent operationalization of ingroups and outgroups, thus it is possible that the results of the studies do not accurately showcase system justification. Kay and Jost (2003) highlighted in their literature review that many studies have inferred system justification through outgroup favoritism, which is concerning because this theory is relying on another construct as evidence of their construct. As Rubin and Hewstone (2004) suggested, there needs to be further research that indicate that individuals will actively "perceive, understand, reiterate, and explain the processes and outcomes" (p. 834) of existing in a system where injustices occur. Rubin

and Hewstone (2004) indicate that there needs to be research that indicates that individuals are biased towards protecting the system.

System Justification Theory, as stated, has been primarily studied through experiments, with participants being primed to perceive a fabricated scenario. Many of these experiments utilize manipulations/primes and a between group design. For example, in Kay and Jost (2003) study on the relationship between complementary stereotypes and system justification, they used the following vignette to manipulate perception of "rich + happy," "rich + unhappy," "poor + happy," "poor + unhappy:"

> "Mark is from a large Northeast city. He is married and has two children, has brown hair and is 5 feet 11 inches. Mark was an athletic child and still closely follows all his local sports teams. Mark enjoys almost all aspects of his life [is not particularly happy with most aspects of his life] and [but] because of his low [high] salary, he has [has no] trouble getting the bills paid and keeping food on the table. In June, Mark will be turning 41"

The manipulation check for this study was to determine the participants' ratings of Mark's happiness/unhappiness ($M = 5.35$ vs 3.83), likeability ($M = 6.04$ vs. 4.83), and if he is funny ($M = 5.65$ vs 4.75), and unfulfilled ($M = 4.04$ vs 5.54) on a 9-pt Likert-type scale. All of the t-tests were significant ($p < .03$). Ultimately, this study highlights that much of the experimental system justification literature relies on a manipulation being strong enough to impact participant perception. It is possible that what is impactful about this manipulation may not be "happiness" but other personality characteristics that may not have been measured or accounted for in the manipulation check.

In another experimental study, manipulation checks were conducted using the following two items: "The decisions and actions of the federal government affect me personally" and "Individual Canadians' success depends on the government making good decisions" which were assessed on a 9-point Likert-type scale (1 = *very easy*; 9 = *very*

difficult; Kay et al., 2009). However, when looking at these questions, one notices that it is not possible to fully separate ego (individual) and group (Canada) justification from system justification. Thus, the question remains whether researchers are fully able to interpret if participants are acting on their ego, group, or system justification motivation.

Kay and colleagues (2009) conducted a study to demonstrate the role of the system dependence on "injunctification" public policy. They hypothesized that people would state that the extant public policy to be the most desirable, fair, and reasonable only when the system justification motive was heightened (i.e., system dependent). Kay and colleagues (2009) used two different primes to induce system dependence. In the "university control condition," the passage emphasized that the university students attended controlled important outcomes in their lives (i.e., "recent surveys of university alumni report even at age 40 that their choice of university was one of the most impactful decisions of their life" (p. 425)). In the "country dependency condition" participants read a paragraph emphasizing that the country they chose to live in impacted important outcomes (i.e., "recent surveys report that even at age 40, people still consider that their choice to live where they do was one of the most impactful decisions of their life" (p. 425). After reading the two different paragraphs (i.e., university or country), participants were divided into two context groups (i.e., university policy and country policy). Participants were told that the system (i.e., university or country) distributed funds unequally. "Injustification" was then studied in the following way, participants were asked to place an x on one of eight lines to represent how they felt funding to the department/provinces should be distributed (leftmost line = *every department/province should receive exactly the same funding;*" rightmost line = *some departments/provinces*

should get more funding than others). They then completed a four-item questionnaire on

a 7-point Likert-type scale (1 = *not at all* 7 = *definitely*): (1) How fair is this distribution

of funding that you read about? (2) Do you think it is reasonable to allot

departments/provinces equal funding (reverse coded)? (3) Do you think it is reasonable to

allot some more funding than others? And (4) How desirable is the current distribution of

funding to academic departments/provinces?

According to Kay and colleagues (2009), they induced the "system justification

motive" by "manipulating the extent to which one of two systems (i.e., either the

participants' university or federal government) was described as controlling the

participants…and crossed this with a manipulation that varied the context, in which a

policy had been instituted (i.e., either the participants' university or federal government)"

(p. 425). It appears that the researchers assumed that the system dependence would be

greater on the federal government level. However, researchers utilized a sample of

college students. This study illustrates the problem with the much of the system

justification research. They heavily rely on manipulation and assume that participants

will interpret the primes and manipulation in the direction that the researchers wished for

them to. College students are the demographic that is the most dependent on the

collegiate system and they will most likely be immersed in the social and financial world

of their university compared to the greater Canadian government. Furthermore, no

demographics were collected and thus included in the analysis of the results.

Kay and colleagues (2009) conducted a 2 (system dependence: university vs.

federal) x 2 (context of policy: university funding policy vs. federal government)

ANOVA using a sample of 55 undergraduate students. It should be noted that Kay and

colleagues also did not complete a power analysis prior to running their analysis, however it possible that 55 participants would not powerful enough to detect a small to medium effect at the 0.05 alpha level. The researchers found that when participants had been reminded of how dependent they were on their country, they were more likely to injuctify the funding policy of their federal government ($M = 0.12$, $SD = 0.55$) than their university ($M = -0.58$, $SD = 1.05$); $F(1, 51) = 5.86$, $p < 0.02$. They stated that when participants had just been reminded of how dependent they were on their university, they were more likely to injunctify the funding policy of their university ($M = 0.41$, $SD = 0.58$) than their country ($M = -0.07$, $SD = 0.71$); $F(1, 51) = 3.03$, $p < 0.09$. They presented these results as "marginally significant" (p. 426). These results, especially the interpretation of a significant result with a p-value over 0.05, need to be interpreted with caution given their small sample size. This poor methodological standard is not just specific to this one study and can be found throughout the literature on system justification. Similarly, many of the experimental studies in this field utilize 2x2 between group designs but will often times have insufficient sample sizes (see Kay & Jost, 2003; Kay et al., 2009; Kay et al., 2005; Laurin, Fitzsimons, & Kay, 2011; Laurin et al., 2010a).

The methodological limitations within Kay and colleagues (2009) represent the broader concerns within the system justification literature. This study was part of a larger research study that examined the "contexts" in which system justification is more likely to occur (e.g., system threat, low personal control etc.; Kay et al., 2009). Throughout the SJT empirical literature, the same methodological concerns can be found. Researchers often do not account for the demographics of participants and how participants may be inherently impacted by the "system" (e.g., using a sample of college students when

examining dependence on college systems and the federal government). The validity of inferences made from potentially non-representative samples significantly diminishes the meaningfulness of study findings. Furthermore, much of the literature has been based on experiments that make the theoretical leap from perception of "reasonable-ness" and "fairness" as evidence of "system justification." Kay and colleagues' (2009) study is one of the key findings of system justification literature because it provides further evidence for the motivation behind system justification beliefs and actions. Yet, the prevalent methodological limitations call to question the accuracy of this study and thus, the rest of the system justification literature.

Studies range in how they measure system justification. Some studies utilize the General System Justification Scale (Kay & Jost, 2003) whereas other studies use items created to measure their specific system or context (see Kay et al., 2009). The General System Justification Scale was created to assess people's perception of fairness, legitimacy, and justifiability of the social system. The measure was developed based on Belief in a Just World (Lerner, 1980) and the Protestant Work Ethic (Katz & Hass, 1988). Kay and Jost (2003) stated that this measure addressed "situational" aspects of system justification, which differs from the dispositional effects of Belief in a Just World and Protestant Work Ethic. This is an eight item, 9-point Likert-type scale (1 = *Strongly Agree*; 9 = *Strongly Disagree*). Some of the items on this measure are "In general, you find society to be fair," "Most policies serve the greater good," "Society is set up so that people usually get what they deserve." Reading the items, it seems that these items are assessing "belief in a just world" rather than "system justification." In Kay and Jost (2003) study on complementary stereotypes, this measure was used to highlight that

when individuals are presented with complementary stereotypes that collaborate with their legitimizing belief, they are more likely to "justify the system" or, in actuality, "maintain their belief that the system is fair." The creation and use of this measure raise conceptual questions about what is considered "system justification." Is system justification maintaining a belief in the "justness" of the existing society or does it go beyond a passive belief?

Conclusion

In the past 20 years of system justification, researchers have presented evidence that individuals are motivated to "legitimize" existing social systems. They state that this is perhaps why systems of oppression continue to persist. However, this literature contains several conceptualization and methodological concerns that need to be addressed. This theory has been broadly conceptualized and operationalized in such a way that researchers are able to present any result as evidence of "system justification." There is also inconsistency and insufficient exploration of the motivation individuals have for either justifying or not justifying the system. Finally, there are methodological concerns that range from biases in the sample, statistical leniency to inconsistent operationalization of system justification. Taken together, I believe that more caution should be taken when reading and interpreting the system justification literature. Furthermore, more research is needed to clarify and address these concerns.

CHAPTER 3

Method

Participants

Interviewees

Interviewees were 11 female East Asians (8 Chinese, 3 Korean), ranging in age from 21 to 30 years old ($M = 27.63$; $SD = 3.11$). Two had immigrated to the U.S. before the age of 4 and were naturalized American citizens: 9 were born in the U.S. and were citizens.

Interviewer and Judges

I (the first author, a 30-year-old, Chinese American female, doctoral student in counseling psychology) conducted all the interviews. In addition to the first author who served on both teams, there were 7 other team members, all of whom expressed interest in the topic, doing qualitative research, and participating in a team research project. Team A had 1 graduate student (26-year-old Asian Indian American woman), 1 post-baccalaureate student (23-year-old Asian American woman), and 2 undergraduate students (22-year-old Iranian American woman; 25-year-old White American woman). Team B had 1 graduate student (29-year-old Chinese woman), 1 post- baccalaureate student (31-year-old Vietnamese American, non-binary), and 1 undergraduate student (21-year-old White American woman). A 71-year-old female European American counseling psychology professor with extensive experience in qualitative research served as the external auditor and oversaw the coding process.

Measures

Screening Questionnaire

A screening questionnaire was used to determine individual's eligibility (i.e., East Asian American women between 20-30 years old) and their willingness to discuss their Asian American identity and experience/perception of racism (see Appendix A).

Semi-Structured Interview

A semi-structured 60 to 90-minute interview (see Appendix B) was used to explore the experiences of Asian American woman intervening during witnessed racism events. The questions were created to be broad and general enough so that participants were not influenced into answering in a certain way. The questions were developed by the first author in collaboration with her advisors and then piloted with 3 Asian American women (not interviewees). Based on the feedback from the pilot interviewees, we modified the interview protocol. The final protocol included 13 open-ended questions, with room for follow-up questions to probe for additional information or clarification. The questions had a Flesch-Kincaid Grade level of 4.9, which indicates a 4th grade U.S. reading level, and a Flesch Reading Ease of 75.6, where scores between 70 to 80 out of 100 indicate being fairly easy to read.

According to Hill (2014), a CQR protocol should balance rapport building and data gathering. The current protocol is consistent in this regard; the interview began with less intrusive questions about racial identity, upbringing, and experiences and understanding of racism. The next question focused on perceptions of a racial hierarchy with probes about what influenced their understanding. Four questions focused on their experience perceiving and acting when racism is targeted towards in-group and out-group

members. Finally, four questions focused on understandings about their behaviors and their experience of the interview.

Questionnaires

Following the interview, participants were asked to complete their Demographic Form and Social Justice Interest Scale to help provide greater context to participants (see Appendix C).

Demographic Form. The demographic form asked for age, race/ethnicity, gender, religion, citizenship, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, geographic location and education level. Participants were asked to give their name, phone number, and e-mail address so researcher could contact them to schedule the interview.

Social Justice Interest Subscale. The Social Justice Interest Subscale (Miller et al., 2009) was created to assess college students' interest in social justice. It refers to an individual's pattern of likes, dislikes, and indifference towards different activities (Lent & Brown, 2006). This subscale is comprised of nine items and is on a 10-point Likert-type scale (0 = *Very Low Interest*, 9 = *Very High Interest*). Sample questions include "Enrolling a course on social issues" and "watching television programs that cover a social issue (e.g., history of marginalized group)." Miller and colleagues stated that the more one holds color-blind racial attitudes, the less one would be interested in social justice (Miller et al., 2007). Miller and colleagues (2007) found a negative correlation (r = - 0.60, $p < .01$) between SJI scores and the Color-Blind Racial Attitudes Scale (CoBRAS; Neville et al., 2000). Higher scores are indicative of a higher degree of interest in social justice activities and advocacy. Possible scores range from 1 to 9.

Studies have reported an internal consistency between .81 to .90 (Miller et al., 2007; Miller et al., 2009). The internal consistency for this present study was .89.

Procedures

Recruitment

Participants were recruited using purposeful sampling, which is a form of convenience sampling such that a sample is selected based on the objectives and desired characteristics of the population (Marshall, 1996; Patton, 1990). Asian American women were recruited via Asian American organizations (Asian American Psychological Association Listserv), and psychology listservs (American Psychological Association Division 35 – Society for the Psychology of Women listserv), and Student Doctor Network Forum, a nonprofit service for current and future healthcare students and professionals. From the recruiting, 50 individuals completed the screening questionnaire; 22 who fit the criteria were contacted, and 18 individuals agreed to participate in the interview. Participants consented to the study verbally prior to the interview or through an email exchange and were provided with a list of interview questions to review. Four interviews were dropped from the study because the tapes were inaudible; 3 were dropped because the examples and experiences described were not specific to the United States. Hence, our final sample was 11 participants.

Interview

The approximately 60 to 90-minute audio-recorded interview was conducted over the telephone or via video. Hill and colleagues (2005) stated that interviewers can use their clinical skills to build rapport, even without being in person and using telephone and vide allowed us to recruit a national sample. Participants were reminded at the beginning

of the study of the potential risks to anonymity and that they could skip any questions or terminate the interview at any time.

Transcriptions

The interviews were transcribed by me and a team of research assistants, who were trained in transcription. All identifying information was removed and a code number was assigned. Minimal encouragers and non-verbal utterances (e.g., um, ah etc.) were excluded from the transcripts. Interviews that were transcribed by the research team were reviewed by the first author, who also conducted the interviews, for accuracy.

Selecting and Training Judges

Although some of the judges had experience with qualitative research prior to this study, all members participated in a training process to ensure a competent knowledge of CQR. The training included readings on how to conduct CQR (i.e., Hill, 2014), reading and discussing the methodology of a recently published CQR article, and participating in practiced coding (for domain coding and core idea coding).

Following recommendations by Hill (2014), prior to the coding process, judges completed a questionnaire (see Appendix D) about their biases and expectations for the research, such as their own experiences of racism and how individuals would intervene during racism events. The team members then met to discuss their biases to help them become aware of biases that might impact the data analysis. Team members were also encouraged to share any biases or reactions during the coding process. Rapport and mutual respect were also established within the coding team to facilitate team members feeling comfortable openly share their thoughts. Power was also shared within the team by allowing every team member to be involved in the coding process.

CQR Process

Analyses followed the recommended CQR procedure (Hill, 2014). CQR provides a method of analyzing data that allows researchers to retain the integrity of participants' experiences, such that all conclusions are derived from the data. CQR is a consensus process, such that research team members examine the data independently and then meet as a team to discuss until one interpretation emerges that is agreed upon. This team consensus approach reduces individual research bias by allowing for different perspectives. Finally, an assumption of CQR is that data cannot be understood without awareness of the context (Hill et al., 1997), and so contextual data such as setting, antecedents, and characteristics of interviewees were noted.

Domain Coding. The first step of CQR is to develop and code domains, which are the content or topic areas. All judges met four times to code an interview to ensure that they understood the domain coding process. They were then divided into two teams. Each team member then independently read the transcripts and assigned data (i.e., portions of the transcript) into domains. The teams met weekly to discuss the coding until reaching consensus. Domains were modified (e.g., deleted, combined, or added) as additional interviews were coded, with initial transcripts recoded when the domain list changed. Data that did not fit into established domains were coded as "other" and reexamined later. The auditor reviewed all the codes; if she disagreed with the codes, the team reviewed her comments and consensually resolve the codes.

Core Ideas. Following domain coding, the teams together created core ideas for the cases they were assigned. Core ideas summarize the content of each domain in a brief statement that reflects the interviewee's meaning (Hill, 2014). Team members took turns

creating the core idea, with the rest of the team offering suggestions until consensus was reached. The auditor reviewed each consensus version (core ideas for each domain with associated raw data) to determine if the core ideas adequately captured the raw data for each domain. The teams then reviewed the suggestions, revising the consensus version accordingly.

Cross Analysis. The master table was created of the core ideas for each domain across cases. Judges independently reviewed this document for themes in each domain. They then came together and consensually constructed a list of categories and subcategories that fit these themes. Once a stable list was developed, the core ideas were examined and placed into categories and subcategories; core ideas could be separated and placed within multiple domains. Finally, the auditor reviewed the cross analysis and provided suggestions on the categories (i.e., merge them, separate them), which the team reviewed. This process continued until all were satisfied that the cross analysis adequately reflected the data.

Once we finished the cross analysis, we noted some concerns with the data. Some participants provided more than one example of a given type of event. To be consistent across the data, we selected only one example per type of event, choosing the example was provided in response to the interview prompt for that type (i.e., were not experiences that the participant provided earlier on in the interview) or that had the most detail if both were presented in response to the interview question. Some participants responses were also deemed inappropriate because it did not fit the criteria of a racism event. In total, six participants provided an example of when they intervened for someone on the same rung of the ladder, nine participants provided an example of when they did not intervene for

someone on the same rung of the ladder, 9 participants were able to recall a time when they intervened for someone lower on the ladder, and 8 participants were able to recall a time they did not intervene for someone lower on the ladder (see Table F1).

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Quantitative Data

Scores on the Social Justice Interest scale in this study ranged from 2.89 to 8.22

($M = 6.49$; $SD = 1.50$), with higher scores indicative of a higher degree of interest (see

Appendix E). In a sample of 274 college students (191 were women), the mean score was

5.94 ($SD = 1.77$; Miller et al., 2009). There was a small effect size ($d = 0.34$, $r = 0.17$)

between these two samples. Miller and Sendrowitz (2011) found a mean score of 7.89

($SD = 1.29$) in a sample of 229 individuals enrolled in Doctor of Philosophy, Doctor of

Psychology, and Doctor of Education counseling psychology programs. There was a

large effect size between these two samples, ($d = - 1.00$, $r = -0.45$). Thus, our sample

falls slightly above the college sample and below the students in the doctoral programs.

Qualitative Data

We dropped the data from two sections of the protocol. In these sections, the

questions were used to help establish and build rapport with the participant (i.e.,

"Growing up, what are some messages your parents taught you about race?") or were

beyond the scope of the present study (i.e., "Growing up, what are some messages your

parents taught you about what to do when you see racism directed towards someone

else?"). We used a code number for each participant, determined by the order in which

their interviews were conducted (e.g., the first to be interviewed was P1, the 7th was P7).

When providing quotes, we indicate where words have been deleted through ellipses (. .

.).

We followed the CQR guidelines for labeling category frequencies (Hill, 2014).

General refers to findings that emerged in all or all but one case (10 or 11 cases), *typical*

to more than half of the cases up to the cut off for general (6 to 9 cases), and variant to at least two cases up to the cut off for typical (2 to 5 cases). Findings that emerged in only one case were not discussed.

Appendix F shows the results for the qualitative analysis, with the frequency designations and actual number of participants for each domain, category, and subcategory.

Domain 1: Perceptions of Racial Hierarchy and Socialization about Race

Participants described where they placed different races on the ladder of racial hierarchy, their difficulties in doing the task of creating the ladder, and experiences in terms of racial socialization that may have led to their perceptions.

Places on the Ladder

Participants generally placed White Americans at the top of the racial hierarchy in the United States. For example, P7 said, "I just, White people I feel like have always been on top. They hold the most power . . . they have just so much privilege." When explaining why she placed White Americans at the top of her racial hierarchy ladder, P16 stated, "I mean White people are the dominant race. You know European Americans they hold the most power in this country, so that was very easy." P5 referenced messages that she received from her grandparents about wanting, "to be more White . . . I guess in Asian culture, back when the people were paler were the ones who were richer and the people who were tanner were considered poor."

Generally, Asian Americans were placed anywhere from the top to bottom of the ladder. At one extreme, P3 placed Asian Americans above Whites on the racial hierarchy ladder. She thought that the stereotypes for Asian Americans were positive (e.g., "studious, well behaved"), whereas the stereotypes for White Americans were negative

(e.g., "bland," "no specific culture," "waspy," or "privileged"). Others described Asian

Americans as having both privilege and discrimination. They, however, characterized the

privileges Asian Americans experience as conditional and never as great as the privilege

that White Americans experience. Furthermore, participants highlighted experiences of

discrimination Asian Americans face but differentiated their discrimination experiences

from those of other POC. P12 agreed that Asian Americans have privilege, but confined

that to East Asians who have

> the most positive stereotyping. I also think that we're pretty privileged, like we
>
> tend to have lighter skin . . . I feel like I get the benefit of the doubt. And, I mean,
>
> there is also some negative stereotypes, but I think that for the most part, it is not.

P1's parents warned her to

> "Keep [her] head low," particularly when it came to getting involved with
>
> speaking up about racism because she has to "understand where you are . . .
>
> because we're Chinese, we're going to have to work harder just to get the same,
>
> to get the same kind of results that a White person would get. My mom did sit us
>
> down and tell me about that, that no matter how American I am, people will also
>
> look at me and never think that I'm, they'll look at me and say I'm Chinese. They
>
> will always ask, "Where are you from?"

> POC (Black Americans, Latino/Hispanic Americans, Native Americans) were

generally placed lowest on the ladder. Some of the stereotypes that influenced their

placement was Black Americans and Latino/Hispanic Americans being perceived as

"criminals" or POC being perceived as "lazy." Other participants were influenced by

thinking of the "inherent racism" that is "built into America" such as police brutality. P15

placed African Americans and Midden Eastern Americans lower on her racial hierarchy because of stereotypes such as, "Black Americans . . . They're aggressive and they're impulsive and so-on and so-on. I put Middle Eastern at the bottom because of how afraid or how fearful Americans are of terrorists."

Racial Hierarchy was Difficult to Rank

Generally, participants had difficulty creating the racial ladder because of the complexity of the construct of race and feeling that the ladder did not allow them to express the nuances of race in America. They felt "weird" or "uncomfortable" because they created their ladders based on "assumptions" and "generalizations." Participants wished they could include moderators such as colorism, socioeconomic status, immigration, and geographic location. P10 stated,

> [My ladder was] based on my assumptions about society's assumptions, I know that there are exceptions to these orderings of racial backgrounds. Just having to order them in general is strange . . . I feel like I'm aware of exceptions to these stereotypes . . . but the question is about advantages and disadvantages, so I guess it is according to what the examples I know have had happened and have led me to come up with this order.

Participants were Not Exposed to Diversity Growing Up

Typically, participants were not exposed to other POC during childhood. P12 did not recall receiving any explicit messages about race when she was growing up, "Nobody really talked about race growing up. There wasn't enough diversity." There were not a lot of students who looked like P15 who attended Catholic schools, '"I didn't have many

Black friends growing up and I still don't have- well I still don't have that many friends of color."

Domain 2: Witnessed Racism Experiences

In this section, we present the range of possibilities collapsed across the 4 types of events. Following this section, we provide more specifics about the 4 types of events.

Type of Racism

Comments about Racial Features. Participants typically witnessed stereotypical comments about a POC's features (e.g., facial features, skin tones). P15 recalled a moment in elementary school when

A White teacher would kind of make comments to a Black student, one of my peers, and it was racist . . . we were doing self-portraits and [teacher] was, was saying how, [student] had a very Black nose and how it should be more round and this isn't the ideal, you are not drawing ideal self-portraits but true self-portraits.

P3 recalled being at a wedding where a brother-in law "was calling an Asian guy and an Indian guy Harold and Kumar. And it was kind of joking but also kind of a derogatory sense."

Generalizations/Assumptions about POC. Typically, participants spoke about racist events that involved someone making stereotypical generalizations or assumptions about POC (e.g., about criminality, complaining, violence). P5 said that whenever she and her African American boyfriend were in a store, they think he's stealing something." P3 said, "My mom saying that I should, I should not tell people at my office that I speak Spanish because Spanish-speaking patients have the most problems and the most issues,

and they complain the most." P12 remembered her father saying that she "had to be careful because Muslim men are often violent towards their partners."

POC were Treated as Second Class Customers. Another typical event was witnessing others being treated as second class citizens in restaurants, clothing stores, and places of employment. People ignored and did not serve POC, dismissed them as not being able to afford the services, or treated them differently. P10 witnessed a front desk worker treating her Black friend differently than other non-POC. P15 witnessed a worker who "slowed down her speech, started talking louder, and started kind of saying, started talking down to [my mom]."

Comments about Language/Culture. A variant event was racist comments about someone's language or culture. P1 recalled hearing people saying "ching chong or konnichiwa to you and they think it's hilarious." P18 recounted a situation where

> There was an Asian woman on the bus I was riding, and this White woman was
> harassing her saying she touched her leg and she needs to speak English because
> this is America even though she [Asian woman] wasn't even saying anything.

Personal Reactions about Event

Upset/Uncomfortable with Witnessing the Racist Event. Participants typically felt upset or uncomfortable about the racist event. P4 witnessed how poorly Hispanic workers were treated at a restaurant, "I was just kind of like, "Oh, that's not how we treat people" and feeling uncomfortable at the mistreatment. P7 said she felt "I was just ashamed of being Asian and just like being around my brother too [who was being bullied]. Just really embarrassed, not wanting to be Asian, not, wishing we were different."

Shock/Frozen by the Extent of the Racist Event. Another typical reaction was feeling shock, surprise, or frozen by what they had seen. P15 stated, "At the time I was just kind of shell shocked because my mom always told me that over here people talk down to her on the phone, but actually being there was kind of bizarre."

Anger and Frustration at the Racist Event. A variant reaction was anger, rage, and frustration at the racism event. P18 recalled an incident in high school, "I'm still frustrated about it now thinking about all those girls giggling at him calling them chick and calling me a chink."

Feeling Helpless/Powerless at the Racist Event. Participants variantly felt helpless and powerless when they witnessed the racism event because they did not know what to do. P1 described it as, "helpless and stuck. It didn't matter."

Concern about Own Well-Being. A variant response was concern over their own social and physical well-being if they spoke up or if they were associated with the target. P7 shared how after witnessing her older brother being bullied in elementary school for bringing Korean food to lunch, she said, "I was like, 'there is no way that I'm bringing any type of Korean food to the lunchroom" because she did not want to experience the things her brother had. After speaking up for her Middle Eastern friend, P17 had thoughts like "Oh, my god. Are they gonna, are they gonna, are they gonna do something?''

Confusion about Whether Event was Racist. Participants variantly felt confused about whether the event could be classified as racist. P16 texted an Asian friend about a possible racist comment because "I was thinking I don't want to overreact, am I being too sensitive, stuff like that." P18 shared a time when she wasn't not sure what was happening,

I saw these two guys detaining a Black guy on the street and people were like "Somebody call the police," and there were a ton of people around, and I didn't really do anything in that situation because I don't know what the situation really was, like pushing his head into the ground, which was really scary.

Response to Witnessed Racist Event

Minimized/Dismissed or Did Not React to the Racist Event. A general response was to minimize/dismiss the racist event as not as serious or provide an explanation (excuse) for the behavior. They laughed off the event or stated that it was okay. P16 recounted a time she dismissed hearing someone make stereotypical comments about Asian Americans,

I remember being and feeling uncomfortable, but I didn't do anything, I didn't say anything to anybody else . . . If I perceive them to be intoxicated or under the influence I will not engage because I view that as pointless.

P10 shared a situation where her supervisor made a racist comment at work,

When he apologized, or at first, I didn't really know what he was referring to, he was vague about it. He was like, "I made a comment yesterday and I didn't mean for it to be offensive in any way, but I'm sorry if it did come off as being offensive," or something like that. It took me a minute to recognize what he was referring to. Once I connected the dots I was like, "Oh, thanks."

Nonaggressively Challenged the Perpetrator of the Racist Event. A typical response was for participants who witnessed a racist event to directly but nonaggressively talk to or challenge the perpetrator about the event. We defined challenging responses as anything that informed the perpetrator of their disapproval or disagreement with the

statement or action. Some took the route of stopping and educating the perpetrator or making snide comments back. P17 recounted an incident in high school where her Middle Eastern friend was being bullied for wearing a hijab, "I said 'Wait, why'd you do, that's terrible . . . Stop that, that's not cool."

Provided Support and Validation to the Target of the Racist Event. Participants variantly provided advice, encouraged the target to advocate for themselves, or validated the target. P3 shared an experience during her medical school rotation were an Indian cohort mate was asked to make a resident doctor a coffee that matched the color of his [Indian] skin,

> We all kind of just laughed about it and none of us did anything about it . . . I did say, maybe "You should think about doing a complaint against her because that's inappropriate. I mean she wasn't even just asking you to get her coffee, she was like, make it the color of your skin" . . . There wasn't much at risk for me, I was just kind of advising him.

Personal Reflections about Event

Wish had Directly Challenged Racist Event. Typically, participants wished they had taken more direct action. They wished they had been more courageous in how they responded or reacted more quickly when the racist event occurred. P7 wished that she had more courage and "been angry or just said something, anything, just to protect him [her brother]."

Satisfaction with Decision. Typically, after reflecting their actions, participants were satisfied with their action, felt confident to intervene in the future, or did not wish they had done anything different. After reflecting about her decision to tell one of her

White friends that he was being racist, P7 stated, "I'm actually really glad I stood my ground . . . I don't need a friend like that, and I don't want a friend like that in my life."

Regret for Inaction. Participants variantly felt guilty or frustrated for not speaking up or felt that they could have done more when they did speak up. Reflecting on her inaction when she observed a young African American boy being stereotyped, P5 said, "I should have left a note in an envelope for the parents, because that would have helped, I just didn't take the extra effort to go and speak to the parents. Yeah, I do regret that."

Wish had Supported Target. Variantly**,** participants wished they had been more supportive of the target during or after the racist event. P18 "would have liked to just have gone over to that woman and just talk to her. Like 'Hey are you okay? Is this woman bothering you?"

Wish for Support from Others. A variant reflection was a wish to have taken additional action or to have had additional support from bystanders. They did not want to be the only ones helping the target of the racist incident. P4 shared she wished she knew other staff at the hospital because she was often the one who was escorting Hispanic visitors or giving the additional directions when they appeared lost. P7 wished that other bystanders, such as her teacher or her classmates, had spoken up when one of her classmates made a comment about nappy hair.

Forces that Facilitated Action During Decision-Making

Felt Responsibility to Act Because Familiar with Target. Typically, participants felt responsible for speaking up when they knew the target of the racist event. They wanted to protect the target because they perceived it as "a more personal attack"

and because they were comfortable speaking up for someone they knew. Some participants who had partners of color also did not like thinking about them experiencing racism. P15 intervened to ensure that her mom was "spoken for" and to inform the perpetrator that they were insulting P's mom.

Participants also felt more comfortable speaking up for fellow Asians than other people because they understood the experience. P18 explained,

> If I see someone who looks like me, another Asian person struggling, I'm probably going to jump up a lot quicker than I would for another group. And that's not necessarily because I don't believe in other groups' rights, but like, I don't know, there's just some sort of pull, you just understand them so fully that you just, you can put yourself in their shoes so much easier. There would be some sort of understanding and an easier way to figure out how to deal with it because you share a culture.

Wanted to Help the Target. Variantly, participants were motivated to help so that the target of the racism would not experience discrimination. When her Muslim friend was being bullied for wearing a Hijab, P17 "felt terrible" and intervened to tell the bullies to stop it.

Wanted to Educate the Perpetrator that Racism is Bad. A variant factor was wanting to educate the perpetrator that what they were saying was racist and that racism is bad and wrong. P15 said, "When I did act, it seemed like I was doing it in an act of educating them and making sure that they knew what, that they were aware." P18 stated that a benefit for taking action is "just educating people . . . because I don't think they even know that they are doing it. So, someone needs to say something, so I just say it."

Experienced Strong Negative Emotional Reaction. Experiencing strong negative emotions, particularly anger or frustration, variantly influenced decisions to intervene. For P7, "Probably just my emotions [influenced me]. I think, because when he started talking, I just got so much anger and frustration. I'm like, I have to say something."

The Witnessed Racist Event was Too Egregious to Ignore. Variantly, when the event was just too blatant to ignore, participants acted. For P7, it "gets to the point where it's outlandish, you're literally, this is direct racism" or it if was "hard to ignore." P5 intervened in events that were egregious because one of her friends helped her "understand, she's like, if something is really, really bad, then definitely advocate and talk about it."

Felt Responsibility to Act Because Familiar with Perpetrator. Participants variantly felt responsibility to speak up when the perpetrator was a parent or close friend. P3 explained, "You want them to understand that it's not right to say things like that and it's somebody that you're gonna always be around, so you don't want to hear those type of negative things." P16 said,

> In situations where I have more of a relationship built in trust, like a friendship, or a close coworker or something like that I do feel like I, that contributes to, "Okay, I can say something because I think it will be received better because they care about my feelings" . . . For me it would be harder with a stranger to say something because I don't know their temperament or how they're going to react.

Forces that Inhibited Action During Decision-Making

Feared Retaliation. Participants typically feared retaliation if they acted, worrying that the perpetrator would make them a target, they would get into an argument with the perpetrator, or they would get reprimanded for acting. P7 did not defend her brother when he was bullied for being Asian because she feared being labeled as "other" and experiencing the racism herself. P10 did not intervene when her supervisor made a racist comment because she was worried about potential retaliation at work.

Social Costs were Too High. Typically, participants feared that if they acted, relationships could be damaged. P7 had difficulty intervening around White people because she thought,

> I want to please them, and then I get frustrated, but then if I do say something then it makes them feel uncomfortable, and then I'm sad because it made them feel uncomfortable, then if I don't say something, so it's a lose-lose situation.

When P15 considered intervening at school, she worried about receiving a "negative incident report" and it how it "would affect my parents' reputation . . . It would make me feel like I wasn't being the perfect daughter that she wanted me to be."

Did Not Feel Invested Enough. Participants typically did not act because they were not feeling invested in the situation or did not feel responsible. P1 speculated about whether it was "worth . . . spending any kind of emotional energy" and noted how it is "draining . . . feeling like you always have to say something." Others were more focused on "getting through rotations" (P3) than intervening in the racist event. Some participants thought that the event was trivial, so "small…that you can let go of some pretty easy (P10)."

Unsure of How to Respond. Participants typically were inhibited from responding because they were unsure about how to respond or did not have enough confidence to respond. For instance, P5 shared that she "didn't know how to be assertive or advocate," and P17 stated it "took a lot for [her] to learn how to kind of stand up for [herself]."

Thought It Wouldn't Make a Difference. Typically, participants were inhibited from responding because they believe it would not matter if they said anything (e.g., "How can I actually help," P18). P4 stated, "You have to have a lot of respect in order to actually make your point proven. I'm just like one little voice."

Unsure If Event was Racism. A variant inhibiting factor was being unsure if the event was actually racism. P7 said, "I kind of realized that it was racism, but kind of I was like, maybe it wasn't." For P16, "I generally have a difficult time recognizing what microaggressions towards other people or towards me."

Four Types of Racism Events

To illustrate the process of the different types of events when participants witnessed a racism experience, we describe the incident for one participant per event type. We italicize the category or subcategory or list it in parentheses after the description.

Same Rung on Ladder and Intervened. P15, a 21-year-old Korean American, grew up in a suburban neighborhood with minimal exposure to racial diversity. During the event, P15 initiated a three-way call with a utility company to set up services for her mother, a Korean immigrant mother who spoke English with a thick accent. The agent spoke in a loud, slow, and condescending manner to her mother and then gave up even

trying to talk to P15's mother halfway through the call (*racist comments about language/culture*). After her mom hung up, P15 sarcastically told the agent, "Thank you for understanding, she doesn't speak English well, and we appreciate your kindness" to signal that it was not okay to talk down to people (i.e., *nonaggressively challenged the perpetrator*). P15 was angry (i.e., *felt anger/frustration*) because the agent could have taken a different approach, such as asking questions or just speaking in a normal tone. In that moment, P15 wanted to speak up for her mother (i.e., *wanted to help the target; felt responsibility because close relationship with target*) and also inform the perpetrator that the behavior was insulting (i.e., *wanted to educate the perpetrator that racism is bad*). One of the inhibiting factors was P15's *fear of retaliation*, in that she needed the agent's help setting up services for her mom. P15 *wished she had been more direct* because the perpetrator could have misinterpreted P15's sarcastic responses as positive feedback.

Same Rung on Ladder and Did Not Intervene. P18, a 27-year-old Chinese American woman, grew up in a suburban neighborhood and had been exposed to an intermediate amount of diversity. While she was riding a bus, P18 observed a White woman harassing an older Asian woman, accusing her of touching her leg and repeatedly telling her to speak English because this was America (i.e., *racist comments about language/culture*). The older Asian lady did not respond in any way. P18 and the other passengers on the bus looked at each other in shock (i.e., *shock/frozen by the extent of racist event*) because they did not know what to do. P18 remembered thinking, "We should do something, should we take out our phones, should we get the bus driver?" (i.e., *unsure how to respond*). In the moment, P didn't do anything because it happened fast, she was stuck in the middle seat, and the Asian lady moved seats and eventually got off

the bus. P thought about this incident a lot, wondering whether she should have said something (i.e., *wish for direct action*). She wished that she had gone over to the older Asian woman and asked whether she was okay, provided strength, and diffused the situation (i.e., *wish supported the target*), but she worried that the White woman would have started yelling and P18 would not have known what to do (i.e., *fear retaliation*).

  Lower Rung on Ladder and Intervened. P1, a 29-year-old Chinese American woman, grew up in a suburban neighborhood with minimal exposure to diversity. In the incident, she and her Hispanic husband were in a high-end department store shopping for business clothes for him. When P1's husband needed help, he was ignored by all the sales associates who instead asked an older White couple if they needed assistance (i.e., *second class customer*). When P1's husband finally got someone's attention, the associate "blew him off . . . implying that he couldn't afford it." P1's husband called the associate out and then told the manager that they had to teach their staff to respect customers regardless of what they looked like. When P1 saw that her husband was getting upset, and so she *nonaggresively challenged* by saying, "We're leaving, we're not shopping here, it's not worth it." Reflecting on the incident, P *felt helpless* because despite their careers, they were still judged based on their race. Although P1 felt that racism is uncontrollable, she also felt that she could attempt to control the extent to which it upset her and her husband. She removed her husband from the situation because she was worried that people would call the police, especially because her husband's darker complexion made him look Black (i.e., *fear of retaliation*). P wished that she had "raged with him" and trusted her husband to manage his anger so the situation did not escalate (i.e., *wish supported the target*).

Lower Rung on Ladder and Did Not Intervene. P10, a 23-year-old Chinese American woman, grew up in a suburban neighborhood with intermittent exposure to diversity. She described an incident that occurred when she was a resident assistant in a freshman dorm. Although there was a rule that visitors had to show identification to check in with desk attendants, P10 had brought many friends of different races to her dorm and the attendants waved them through without requiring the identification check-in. However, on this occasion when P brought an African American male friend, the desk attendants asked him to show his identification, which he did (i.e., *second class customer*). P10 did not intervene in the moment because she was unclear whether it was a racist incident or whether the desk attendant was just trying to enforce the rules (albeit selectively). Although P10 did not want to accuse the desk attendant of committing a microaggression when it only took a moment for her friend to show his identification, she felt uncomfortable with what she witnessed. She worried that she was the only one who would have perceived it as racism given that her friend had never visited her before (i.e., *minimized the event*). Her friend brushed off the incident as "whatever." P10 was unsure whether she should have done anything differently, but she did have some regret. She also worried about the police being called if she had raised the issue (i.e., *feared retaliation*).

Comparisons Between the Four Types

For comparisons of the event types in Domain 2, we first calculated percentages of occurrence (number of incidents divided by the total number of events of that type). Then, to determine if there were meaningful differences between types, we used the 30% difference suggested by Hill (2014) for qualitative data. The results for Domain 2 are

separated by 4 event types: same rung on the ladder and did intervene (SD), same rung on

the ladder and did not intervene (SN), lower rung on the ladder and did intervene (LD),

and lower rung on the ladder and did not intervene (LN). Participants reported between 2

to 4 examples ($M = 3.00$; $SD = 0.77$). There were no meaningful differences in the

number of events of each type reported by participants (9, 82% LD; 9, 82% SN; 8, 72%

LN; 6, 55% SD). None of the pairs differed by 30%, and a chi-square analysis showed no

difference among the 4 groups ($\chi^2 = 3.82$, p $= 0.28$). Hence, participants reported about

an equal number of events across the four types.

Differences Based Whether Intervened or Not. Table F2 shows that there were

17 differences in whether the participant intervened or not (9 of 31 comparisons between

SD vs. SN; 7 of 31 comparisons between LD vs. LN). To showcase these differences

better, we collapsed across the rungs on the ladder (See Table F3). This yielded 15

meaningful differences out of 31 comparisons between whether participants did (N = 10)

or not intervene (N = 11).

In terms of racism type, more participants reported intervening when they

witnessed racist generalizations or assumptions about POC ($N = 7$, 70%) compared to

those who did not intervene ($N = 4$, 36%). In terms of reactions to racism, more

participants who reported feeling angry or frustrated by the witnessed racist event

intervened ($N = 5$, 50%) than did not intervene ($N = 2$, 18%). In terms of responses to the

witnessed racist event, more participants who responded through minimizing or

dismissing the event did not intervene ($N = 11$, 100%) than those who intervened ($N = 1$,

10%). In terms of personal reflections, more participants who did not intervene ($N = 7$,

67%) wished that they had directly challenged the racist event than those who did

intervene (N = 3, 30%). Participants who intervened (N = 5, 50%) were more satisfied with their decision than were those who did not intervene (N = 1, 9%). In terms of decision making for action, all the categories in this section differed from when participants did not intervene (N = 0, 0%): (a) felt responsibility to act because familiar with target (N = 6, 60%), (b) wanted to educate the perpetrator that racism is bad (N = 5, 50%), (c) experienced strong negative emotional response (N = 4, 40%), (d) wanted to help the target (N = 4, 40%), and (e) the witnessed racist event was too egregious to ignore (N = 3, 30%). In terms of inhibiting forces (which were discussed both when participants did and did not intervene), more participants considered potential retaliation when did not intervene (N = 9, 82%) than when they did intervene (N = 4, 40%), felt inhibited by not knowing how to respond when they did not intervene (N =5, 45%) than did intervene (N = 0), and felt more unsure about whether the event was racist when they did not intervene (N = 4, 36%) than when they did intervene (N = 0).

Differences Based on Position on the Ladder. Collapsing across position on the ladder (See Table F4) yielded 9 meaningful differences out of 31 comparisons between events directed towards someone on the same rung (N = 10) and someone on the lower rung of the ladder (N = 10).

In terms of types of racism, more participants recalled racist events about racial features directed towards someone on the same level (SL; N = 6, 60%) than towards someone on the lower level (LL; N = 3, 30%). In addition, more participants recalled events that made generalizations about POC directed towards LL (N = 6, 60%) than they did for SL (N = 2, 20%). Finally, more participants recalled language/culture racist events directed towards SL (N = 5, 50%) than directed towards LL (N = 0).

In terms of reactions to the event, more participants felt uncomfortable or upset witnessing racist events directed towards LL ($N = 7$, 70%) than towards someone on the same level ($N = 3$, 30%). In terms of responses, more participants nonaggressively challenged the perpetrator when the events were directed towards someone on lower level ($N = 8$, 80%) than at the same level ($N = 4$, 40%). Participants provided support more often, however, when the racist event was directed to a SL ($N = 4$, 40%) than they did when it was to an LL ($N = 1$, 10%).

In terms of decision-making factors, more participants wanted to help the target when the racist event was towards someone lower on the ladder ($N = 4$, 40%) than when it was towards someone on the same level ($N = 1$, 10%).

Domain 3: Reactions to Interview

Gained Insight/Awareness

Participants generally indicated that they gained insight or awareness about racism during the interview. They talked about recognizing their racial attitudes and perceptions and needing to be aware of racism moving forward. Some also wished that they were "stronger" and "more aware" of racism. P4 said that the interview was "eye-opening" to the different stages of her life and how she has handled racism. She came to recognize that, "It's just something that I've lived through, but don't really talk about it. I'm like, well it's just here, it just happens." If she could go back in time, P4 wished she "could be a lot more vocal." P7 stated,

> I feel like I'm going to cry. Even just talking about sticking up for myself and for the Asian American community, and it kind of makes me realize, huh, "I wish I

would have been stronger growing up." I wish I could tell my younger self to have more courage and to be more confident.

Aspects of the Interview Were Difficult

Participants typically had difficulty recalling racism events and whether they had intervened or not. P16 stated that her hesitance in answering was due to being unsure if it was "racism in action, like nowadays there's so many instances of overt oppression and racism [she] cannot recall . . . seeing anything that egregious."

Interview was Meaningful/Important

Participants variantly thought that the interview was meaningful and provided them with an opportunity to reflect about racism. P18 thought that creating the racial hierarchy was a good way to start conversations about race, "This was a really interesting way to think about it too, in the different scenarios . . . I just accepted this is how life is, and I just react to things. And I try my best to mitigate that kind of stuff and help people and help people feel more confident.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

We interviewed 11 emerging adult East Asian American women about their experiences witnessing at least two different racist events. They recalled events related to comments about racial features, generalizations about people of color, treatment as second-class customers, and racist comments about language/culture. Participants described feeling upset/uncomfortable, shock/frozen, anger/frustrated, helpless/powerless, concern for their own well-being, and confusion about whether the event was racist. In response to witnessing racist events, they minimized, dismissed, or did not respond; nonaggressively challenged the racist event, and supported the target. They wished they had more directly addressed the racist events and regretted their inaction. We expected to find that participants' actions would be influenced by whether they perceived the perpetrator and target to be above or below them on the racial hierarchy ladder, but it appeared that their decisions about whether to intervene were more complex. We discuss these results below.

To fully understand the results and implications of this study, it is important to contextualize our sample. Our participants were individuals currently in college or graduate school or whom had recently obtained professional degrees. They appeared to fall within an average range of social just interest. They identified as being either 1.5 generation (arriving to the United States prior to the age of 4 years old) or second generation (born in the U.S. to immigrant parents). Thus, our results may not generalize to other subgroups of Asian American women given the vast intragroup differences in

terms of cultural norms, discrimination and socialization experiences, and acculturation experiences (Choi, et al., 2018; Edlagan & Vaghul, 2016; Museus & Truong, 2009).

We also want to first highlight the historical context of this study. Although the participants for this study were interviewed in the summer of 2019 and the data analyses were completed by February 2020, this discussion was written in June 2020 following the coronavirus pandemic (COVID-19) and the multiple incidents of police brutality against African Americans, such as the death of Breonna Taylor and George Floyd. Following these deaths, there have been a large number of protests and discussions about systemic racism, allyship, and social justice change. Clearly, many people have been challenged by witnessing racist events and have been energized to do something about such events. Part of the discussion about social justice change and the Black Lives Matter Movement was the call for Asian Americans to stand with the African American/Black community. This has led to discussions within the Asian American community of how to discuss our complicity in anti-Blackness and how to move towards solidarity. However, there has also been challenges and pushbacks from the Asian American community.

Perceptions of the Racial Hierarchy

Almost all of the participants perceived White Americans to be at the top of the racial hierarchy ladder because of their privilege, and POC to be lower on the ladder because of their experiences of discrimination. Interestingly, most participants voiced that Asian Americans occupy a unique position of "yes, but" where they experience both "privilege" and discrimination. These results align with other scholars who state that Asian American are triangulated within the racial hierarchy of the United States (Kim, 1999; Bonilla-Silva, 2001). Zou and Cheryan (2017) suggested that based the two-

dimension racial hierarchy of perceived inferiority and perceived cultural foreignness, Asian Americans, while perceived as foreign, are seen as relatively superior compared to Latino and African Americans.

Although our participants discussed the privilege experienced by Asian Americans, we highlight that this "privilege" has been granted through the system of oppression and can easily be taken away. The proxy privilege that Asian Americans experience also does not protect them from experiences of discrimination and oppression. For instance, during COVID-19, there was an influx of hate speech and hate crimes targeted against the Asian American community. Furthermore, the status of being "honorary White" and occupying the triangulated stratum is arbitrary, such that White Americans/privilege institutions could have chosen any racial group to hold up as the "model minority."

We also caution against using the results of this study and other research on the racial hierarchy as evidence that Asian Americans do not experience racial oppression. One byproduct of the racial hierarchy system and marginalized groups jockeying for position is the idea of "oppression Olympics" or marginalized groups competing against each other to gain the most oppressed status (Hancock, 2011) and dismissing others' experiences of discrimination as "not being as bad." All forms of oppression are detrimental and negatively impact one's physical and psychological health. Our hope is that this study highlights the existence of a racial hierarchy within the United States and depicts that one's station within the hierarchy impacts one's perceived privilege and discrimination experiences.

Position on the ladder only sometimes (9 out of 31 comparisons) emerged as a factor when deciding about whether to speak up when witnessing racism acts. We speculate that this minimal impact was because participants had a difficult time constructing the hierarchy and may not have completely believed in it. These results may also be because some of our participants may have a colorblind racial ideology, such as they do not "see" race. Scholars have suggested that individuals may utilize a colorblind approach to research because it allows them to feel protected from and adapt to social norms (Lewis, 2003). One study of Korean American students in a predominately White school found that Korean students had to be "symbolically White" in order to be successful (Marinari, 2005, p. 376).

Reactions to the Racist Events

Participants reported several different reactions to the racist event, with the most typically being that they felt uncomfortable/upset and felt shock/frozen. Participants were more uncomfortable/upset when they witnessed a racist event directed towards someone who was lower on the ladder than they did when it was directed to someone on the same level. Many Americans wish to believe that racism is no longer an issue and that the civil rights movement has eliminated racism (Thompson & Neville, 1999) and have adopted a colorblind perception (Apfelbaum et al., 2012) as a way to promote equality. This may be particularly true for Asian Americans who occupy the "yes, but" position within society where they are perceived to experience both privilege and discrimination. This position may allow Asian Americans to be blissfully ignorant to racism because they may be perceived as honorary White (Bonilla-Silva, 2004) as well as experience "positive" stereotypes such as being perceived as the model minority.

Although participants only variantly felt angry and frustrated after witnessing racism events, more participants who reported feeling angry or frustrated intervened than did not intervene. Other studies have found that feelings of anger typically serve as motivating factor (Gill & Matheson, 2006, Mackie et al., 2000) and it is often one of the predominant emotions expressed after witnessing discrimination (Mackie et al., 2000; Swim et al., 2003). However, despite reporting that they had negative emotional reactions to witnessing the racist event, this only variantly emerged as a facilitating factor during their decision-making process, perhaps because East Asians value regulating their emotions (Mauss et al., 2010), and marginalized racial groups often feel pressured to suppress anger (Brody, 2000; Keltner et al., 2003). Swim and Thomas (2006) proposed that when marginalized individuals are angered by discriminatory events, they utilize other coping mechanisms to manage their emotional and behavioral responses rather than expressing their anger.

Responses to Racist Events

Minimal Responses/Did Not React

Participants generally minimized or dismissed the event or did not react to it, often because they were unsure about how to respond. They seemed taken aback by the event and frozen, as if they just did not have more assertive responses in their repertoire. Similarly, in a qualitative study, Chiang et al. (2013) found that Asian immigrant women often responded with passive responses, nonconfrontation, isolating behavior, avoiding perpetrators, or conforming to mainstream norms. It is possible that our participants were also uncomfortable with potentially labeling an event as racist and thus, dismissed or minimized it stating they were most likely "overthinking."

One explanation for this minimal response is that Asian cultures are primarily collectivist, such that they value harmony, group cohesion and relationships (Oyserman et al., 2002; Rothbaum & Rusk, 2011; Triandis, 1990). Although there is not as much research on Asian American bystanders to racism events, there have been research studies on how culture and values impact conflict management. For example, during conflict situations, individuals who adhered to collectivist values were more likely to focus on enhancing and maintaining relationships whereas individualistic individuals were more likely to focus on obtaining justice (Ohbuchi et al., 1999). Furthermore, Asian Americans may deal with conflict by avoiding the situation and person or by accommodating another person's interest (Ting-Toomey, 2005; Ting-Toomey et al., 2000). Researchers have found that for Asian Americans, forbearance coping or passively accepting the experience and not reacting, may be protective and allow them to avoid hostility (Kuo, 1995; Noh et al., 1999). Thus, one strategy that Asian Americans may employ is avoidance because it provides individuals time to cool off and it prevents escalation to conflict. It is also important to note that researchers have found that Asians, in comparison with Whites or Blacks, endorse more self-silencing beliefs (Gratch et al., 1995) or the tendency to suppress thoughts, feelings or actions that do not conform to the expectations in a relationship (Jack & Dill, 1992).

In addition, our participants identified as Asian American women, and may have perceived pressure to conform to both cultural and gender stereotypes of being quiet, nonthreatening and compliant (Niemann et al., 1994; Root, 1995). This awareness of their gender and racial identity may have impeded their intervention. Our participants may

have been cautious in challenging perpetrators so that they were not dismissed as being angry or too sensitive.

Nonaggressive Challenging Responses

Although there was a range of ways in which they challenged, most of the challenges were nonaggressive rather than openly hostile and forceful. These fell into first two of Sue et al.'s (2019) framework of microinterventions (making the invisible visible, disarming the microaggression, educating the perpetrator, and seeking external support). Our participants helped to "make the invisible visible" by pointing out the discriminatory nature of the statement or situation, and they disarmed the microaggressions by deflecting the comment through expressing disagreement or challenging the event (i.e., asking perpetrators why they said something, being sarcastic/making a joke back).

One potential explanation for this finding is participants did not feel a need to directly state that the event was racist because they believed their intentions were clear. Perhaps our participants felt that it was not their responsibility and it was "too much of a burden" to explicitly confront the perpetrator because it may put them in harm's way.

Participants may have also responded less directly because they were focused on maintaining their relationships to the perpetrator. Asian Americans may be more indirect because more confrontational methods may impede their ability to maintain group harmony (Friedman et al., 2006; Ohbuchi & Atsumi, 2010). Lee and colleagues (2012) found that Asian American women were less likely to directly reply to racist comments, compared to Black American women, because they were focused on maintaining positive interpersonal relationships for future interactions with the perpetrator.

Supporting Targets of the Racist Event

Participants provided validation and support to the target or encouraged them to advocate for themselves, which may have allowed them to help the target while also limiting their exposure to potential retaliation. Furthermore, participants provided support more often when the racist event was directed to someone on the same rather than a lower level of the perceived ladder. Participants may have provided more support because they were able to imagine how the target felt, and they may have felt a need to soothe the target.

What Participants Wished They Had Done Differently

Our results indicate that participants who did not intervene wished they had directly intervened more often. Similarly, Hyer (2007) found that women who responded nonassertively to racist events expressed a desire to respond differently (54% compared to 29% of those who responded assertively) because otherwise they "carry it with [them]." In addition, Swim et al. (2010) found that targets of gender discrimination wished they had said something or more than they did and suggested that women's gender roles provide a context that encourages them to self-silence. Within the decision-making research, researchers have suggested that regret is due to a comparative evaluation of the outcome (i.e., good outcome vs poor outcome) and self-blame for making a poor decision (Connolly & Zeelenberg, 2002). Decision-making researchers also indicate that when individuals are asked to reflect on real-life regrets, they tended to focus on incidents when they did not do something (i.e., paths not taken; Gilovich & Medvec, 1995). Perhaps our participants expressed regret and wished for more direct action because they had engaged in self-silencing behavior when observing the racist

event. As members of marginalized target groups, it is possible that participants were able to empathize with the potential pain and suffering that the witnessed targets experienced and imagine the potential positive impacts of their intervention (i.e., good vs poor outcome), which led to their feeling of regret.

Facilitating Factors

Relationship to Target

Many of our participants seemed to be motivated to intervene because of their relationship to the target. One explanation if because of *ingroup/outgroup bias*, which refers to the tendency to evaluate one's own group more favorably (Tajfel, 1982). This favorable outlook towards one's own group may also extend to treating ingroup members more favorably and being more likely to help them. Dovidio and colleagues (1991) described a concept of "we-ness" or the sense of connectedness with another person categorized as a member of one's own group. This feeling of we-ness may increase feelings of responsibility for the wellbeing of other members and decrease the feeling of cost to helping. Levine and colleagues (2005) found evidence that when individuals perceive commonality in a stranger, they were more likely to intervene during distress than when they did not perceive common group membership. Similarly, bystanders who categorize themselves as members of the same group as the target may feel more responsibility to intervene, perhaps because they believe that the same experience could happen to them (Levine et al., 2002; Nicksa, 2014).

Similarly, more participants intervened when they witnessed a racist event towards someone on the same rather than lower level of the ladder because they were able to imagine themselves in that situation. Batson and colleagues (1996) found that

when similar experiences were treated like a dichotomous variable, women who had experienced a similar experience reported more greater empathy than those who did not. Nickerson (1999) suggested that when individuals perceive an event, they often imagine how they would react, thus if individuals had previously experienced a similar situation, they may have greater empathy. The participants in this current study are marginalized individuals who statistically experienced racial discrimination, thus they may have had greater empathy for individuals who experienced similar experiences of racism. Fourie et al. (2019) found that when Black South Africans had experienced adversity, such as racial discrimination, they responded with self-reported compassion and neural changes (i.e., heightened activation of the thalamus and dorsal anterior cingulate cortex (dACC)) when they viewed videos of individuals experiencing discrimination. Another study on White and Asian American participants found that the neural circuit for pain was more active when viewing same-race faces being pricked with a needled compared to other-race faces (Xu et al., 2009). Our participants may have been motivated to act because they viewed other Asian Americans as members of their in-group and thus anticipated and displayed empathy for their experiences of emotional distress.

Relationship to Perpetrator

Participants also occasionally felt motivated to intervene when they had a close relationship with the perpetrator. Perhaps these participants were motivated to intervene to ensure that they could feel comfortable within their environment. Similarly, the bystander literature on sexual assault/intimate partner violence suggests that knowing the perpetrator is associated with more direct interventions (Palmer et al., 2018), perhaps because individuals are more comfortable confronting friends (Casey & Ohler, 2012)

because there is more trust in the relationship and they felt their intervention would have an impact.

Furthermore, participants may have been particularly motivated to confront known perpetrators because they wanted to ensure that others would not view the perpetrator as "racist." In particular, participants may have been embarrassed that their parents' actions would be potential reflections of their own beliefs and behaviors. Within Asian culture, the concept of *face* is highly valued, such that Asian individuals consider how others will perceive them in social interactions. "Face" can apply to an individual, to others, and to the relationship (Oerzel et al., 2001). Within bystander research, Burn (2009) found that friends of perpetrators were more likely to intervene to reduce negative impact on their in-group's reputation (i.e., Black sheep effect; Burn, 2009).

Inhibiting Factors

Fear of Retaliation

When participants feared potential retaliation, they often did not intervene is racist situations. Similarly, other researchers have found that bystanders may be hesitant because they fear that the perpetrator's focus will be re-directed towards them (Aboud & Joong, 2008) or that their intervention will cause the perpetrator to escalate their discriminatory behavior (Coles, 1986; Kowalski, 1996).

The fear of retaliation expressed by our participants is not unfounded. Researchers have found that when target group members intervened during racist events, they received similar negative consequences as had the original target (Czopp & Monteith, 2003; Gulker et al., 2013; Rasinski & Czopp, 2010). Research on bystander intervention for sexual assault/violence has also indicated that women may be more cautious in

intervening, especially during high-risk situations (Weitzman et al., 2017) due to their consideration of safety and well-being. Women do not want to put themselves in a position where they may experience physical or emotional harm (Cohen & Swim, 1995).

Social Cost Were Too High

Our participants often thought that the social costs of their intervening were too high and that they needed to preserve their relationship with the perpetrator. Similarly, researchers have found that individuals might not confront perpetrators because they do not want to be disliked (Czopp, Monteith, & Mark, 2006; Mallett & Wagner, 2011) or negatively impact their relationships. Given our participants' Asian identities, they may have been socialized to consider the importance of relational harmony.

Participants may have also been worried about the potential loss of their proxy privilege or social standing if they were to intervene in racist events. One participant voiced that she was taught to consider her own self-preservation and that if she were to speak out, she may engender her own privilege. It is possible that, although not explicitly voiced by other participants, there may have been consideration of how their action may impact them within the racial hierarchy.

Unsure How to Respond

Some participants were unsure about how to respond to the racist event and thus did not intervene. Some of the participants who expressed that they felt unsure stated that they did not know how to handle racism displayed by an authority figure. This deference may be related to the Asian culture norm of respecting elders and preserving their face. In relationships where there are greater power dynamics, researchers have found that how

individuals respond to conflict depends on their status. Subordinates are more likely to adopt nonconfrontational styles (Lee, 2002; Rahim, 1986) or may not respond.

Participants' hesitance in how to respond may also be because they did not how to address the racism or did not feel confident enough to say anything. Similarly, Goodman (2011) suggested that individuals may experience a "freeze effect" where they are unsure of how to respond to racism, which can lead to experience of anxiety and self-disappointment.

Confusion about Whether an Event was Racist

When participants felt unsure whether the event was racist, they often did not intervene. Many researchers have described that racism has evolved to be more ambiguous and subtle in nature (Sue, 2005; Pettigrew & Meertens, 1995). Thus, racism is difficult to identify, and individuals may question whether the action was racist or if it occurred for other reasons (Crandall & Eshlerman, 2003; Dovidio et al., 2002; Reid & Foels, 2010).

Limitations

We had a small sample of educated emerging adult East Asian American women, so results may not generalize to other samples. In the construction of our study, we did not limit the participants in the type of discrimination event that they shared (i.e., who the target was, who the perpetrator was, and the type of racism event), which led to a broad range of responses that may have made it difficult to obtain consistency across the sample. In addition, we did not include a comparison sample, so we cannot make conclusions about whether our sample differed from other potential samples (e.g., African American women of the same age).

In addition, asking participants about their memories related to racist events requires retrospective self-report. Therefore, the quality of the data was dependent on participants' ability to recall their experiences, feelings, and thought processes for the events where they witnessed a racist event. Furthermore, the depth of participants' responses may have also been compounded by the fact that Asian Americans have a tendency to avoid conflict, thus they may have a greater difficulty of recalling and reflecting on interpersonally distressing situations (Tsai & Lau, 2013), such as witnessing racism or their experiencing of intervening.

Similarly, some participants noted the responses of the target during the racist event whereas other individuals could not or did not recall them. We did not have enough data to draw conclusions, but we note that the emotional or behavioral response of the target may have impacted participants' decision to intervene. More specifically, when the target minimized the event, participants seemed less likely to intervene. Future research is needed to further investigate whether target responses influenced decision making.

Participants may also be motivated to respond in a socially desirable way given that they were interviewed by a Chinese American woman. They may have been hesitant about disclosing because of not wanting to appear racist. Finally, this study asked interviewers to recall events that occurred to targets on different levels of the racial hierarchy, but we did not ask about the social location of the perpetrator. Thus, we are unable to conclusively state whether or not social location impacts bystander intervention.

Implications

These results provide insight into how individuals navigate delicate situations that often reflect systems of oppression. Thus, they have implications for talking about social justice advocacy and action within the Asian American/Pacific Islander (AAPI) population, particularly in regard to the Black Lives Matter Movement.

One of the mechanisms that may allow individuals to be complicit within a system of oppression is the difficulty in acknowledging that they exist within one. Asian American women can challenge themselves to recognize that they exist within a racist society that has provided them proxy privilege and "positive stereotypes" of being a model minority. This position in society has encouraged a colorblind racial ideology and internalized racism (Osajima, 1993), where individuals believe the stereotypes of White supremacy and are complicit in the system of racial oppression. Scholars have found that individuals who have internalized racism may exhibit more victim blaming for situations of social injustice and anti-egalitarian beliefs to justify social inequalities (Neville et al., 2005). For instance, one message that Asian Americans may perpetrate is that their success comes from hard work whereas the struggles of the African American/Black community is due to the "laziness" or lack of ambition and drive for social movement. We suggest that Asian American women thus need to develop critical consciousness into the existence and power of racial oppression on the lives of people of color. For enduring social change to occur, we must begin to see the impact the system has on our lives.

For individuals who are interested in becoming more of a social justice advocate and wish to be able to intervene more readily when they witness racism events, we stress the importance of recognizing how their action may be impacted by a variety of factors.

Particularly, it appears that fear of retaliation and social costs kept individuals from intervening and relationship with the target and wanting to support the target motivated individuals towards action. We recommend that individuals try to overcome their inhibition through focusing on the impact of their intervention. Research has shown that individuals are less likely to focus on the consequences of their action if they perceive themselves to be in the same ingroup as the target (Banyard, 2008; Casey & Ohler, 2012). Thus, we encourage individuals to foster a sense of community with other people of color through recognizing their commonality and appreciating their differences. Individuals who feel a greater sense of community and understanding of experiences may feel more motivated to act when they witnessed racist events. Scholars have found that common experiences foster a sense of coalition among marginalized groups (Cortland et al., 2015).

We also encourage a sense of solidarity among racial/ethnic minority groups. One way to develop this sense of closeness and understanding is through facilitating a superordinate identity as "people of color." In the Common Ingroup Identity Model, Gaertner et al. (1993) stated that when individuals perceive a superordinate identity (e.g., people of color), they exhibited more positive attitudes towards others compared to when they see themselves as members of distant groups. Furthermore, Craig and Richeson (2016) proposed making explicit connections between stigmatized groups to discourage intergroup discrimination across social identity.

Another implication is to develop programs to help educate Asian American women about how to intervene in response to racist events, given our findings that some participants were unsure of how to respond. One helpful resource is Sue et al.'s (2019) framework of microinterventions of individual and system level approaches for

challenging racism. Interventions in the face of racism do not have to be large, hostile, or aggressive confrontations to be effective. Actions such as asking perpetrators to explain the joke, modeling behavior, informing perpetrators of the racist nature of the statement, or removing the target from the situation can be impactful.

Yet another implication is to educate Asian American women about how to recognize racism, given that some participants expressed confusion about whether an event was racism. We might encourage Asian American women to trust themselves in recognizing racism. We could also teach them that the most important factor in labeling something as racist is the impact of the action and *not* the intention of the person. Regardless of whether the perpetrator intended for an action to be discriminatory, if someone perceives an event as discriminatory, individuals can treat it as such. Staub (2019) suggested that individual action can create norms of what is acceptable in society. If individuals are afraid of labeling incidents as racist because they do not want to go through the burden of educating people about racism, it may continue to perpetrate systems of oppression.

This study has several theoretical implications. To our knowledge this was one of the first studies to investigate bystander intervention and the role of social group membership for social identities within the context of a social hierarchy. The results of this study suggest that bystander intervention is more complex than social group membership and the presence of other bystanders. Our study suggests that individuals' decision to intervene or not intervene may be impacted by the social location of the target, the perception that they belong to the same ingroup, and the potential costs to themselves (i.e., safety, proxy privilege).

In terms of future research, we need to know more about the factors that influence the decision-making process. We particularly need to know more about the social location of the perpetrator. Additional research is also needed to investigate whether the perpetrator's perceived power (i.e., membership to a dominant social group) influences bystanders' willingness to intervene. Future researchers might consider using Sue and colleagues' framework (2019) to guide research questions on bystander intervention. Additional research is also needed on how an individual's personal experiences, such as romantic relations, personal experiences of racism, and environment, influence their decision-making process.

Future researchers could utilize a diary method to allow participants to share their experiences in more detail. Participants could keep a diary of whenever they witness racist events. As soon as they witness one, the investigator could interview about their experiences. Being interviewed immediately after the event would correct for the retrospective nature of the present study and allow participants to recall nuanced details that may have impacted their decision-making process.

APPENDIX A: Screening Questionnaire

1. How old are you?
2. What year were you born?
3. Would you consider yourself –
    a. East Asian (Chinese, Korean, Japanese)
    b. South East Asian (Vietnamese, Thai, Cambodian, Filipino, etc.)
    c. South Asian (Indian, Pakistani, Nepalese, etc.)
    d. Pacific Islander (Guamanian, Samoan, Hawaiian, Polynesians, etc.)
4. What is your generational status?
    a. 1st generation (I moved to the US after I was 15 years old)
    b. 1.5 generation (I moved to the US after I was born and before I was 15 years old)
    c. 2nd generation (I was born in the US)
    d. 3rd generation (My parent(s) was born in the US)
    e. 4th generation and over (My grandparent(s) were born in the US)
5. What is your gender identity?
    a. Female
    b. Male
    c. Genderqueer/Nonbinary
    d. Other (please specify)_____
6. This study asks questions about your identity as an Asian American. Would you be willing in discussing these topics with the interviewer?
    a. Yes
    b. No
7. This study asks questions about your experiences and perception of race and racism. Would you be willing in discussing these topics with the interviewer?
    a. Yes
    b. No
8. Please provide the best way to contact you
    a. Phone Number _____
    b. Email address _____

Appendix B: Semi-Structured Interview

1. Growing up, what are some messages your parents taught you about race?
    a. If there are other areas in your life that taught you about race, what were they? What did they teach you?
2. Growing up, what are some messages your parents taught you about what to do when you see racism directed towards someone else?
    a. If there are other areas that taught you what to do, what were they? What did they teach you?
3. In the United States, people from different racial backgrounds differ in advantages and disadvantages, if you were to place these racial groups on a ladder from the most advantages to the least, what would it look like?
    a. What experiences influenced you in your thinking?
        i. What advantages?
        ii. What disadvantages?
    b. What was it like to do this exercise?
4. Give me an example of a time when you have experienced racism?
    a. Where did this take place and who was there?
    b. Tell me specifically what occurred?
    c. What were the consequences?
    d. What were you feeling?
5. Give me an example of a time when you observed racism directed toward someone who and you acted in some way to help the situation
    a. Where did this take place and who was there?
    b. Tell me specifically what occurred?
    c. What were the consequences for the target?
    d. What were you feeling?
    e. What costs and benefits were you considering in these situations?
6. Give me an example of a time when you observed racism directed toward someone who is lower than you on the ladder, in terms of cultural stereotypes and race, and you acted in some way to help the situation
    a. Where did this take place and who was there?
    b. Tell me specifically what occurred?
    c. What were the consequences for the target?
    d. What were you feeling?
    e. What costs and benefits were you considering in these situations?
7. What are your thoughts about the differences/similarities between your behavior in these situations
8. Give me an example of a time when you observed racism directed toward someone who and you did not act in some way to help the situation
    a. Where did this take place and who was there?
    b. Tell me specifically what occurred?
    c. What were the consequences for the target?
    d. What were you feeling?

9. Give me an example of a time when you observed racism directed toward someone who is lower than you on the ladder, in terms of cultural stereotypes and race, and you did not act in some way to help the situation
   a. Where did this take place and who was there?
   b. Tell me specifically what occurred?
   c. What were the consequences for the target?
   d. What were you feeling?
   e. What costs and benefits were you considering in these situations?
10. What are your thoughts about the differences/similarities between your behavior in these situations?
11. After these incidents occurred, what do you now believe about what you should do when you see racism?
12. What was your experience of participating in this interview?
13. Is there anything that I didn't ask that you want to share?

Appendix C: After Interview Questionnaires

Demographic Questionnaire

1. How old are you?
2. What year were you born?
3. What is your race/ethnicity?
    a. Chinese
    b. Korean
    c. Japanese
    d. Other
4. What are your parents' race?
    a. Parent 1_____
    b. Parent 2 _____
5. What is your generational status?
    a. 1st generation (I moved to the US after I was 15 years old)
    b. 1.5 generation (I moved to the US after I was born and before I was 15 years old)
    c. 2nd generation (I was born in the US)
    d. 3rd generation (My parent(s) was born in the US)
    e. 4th generation and over (My grandparent(s) were born in the US)
6. What is your citizenship status?
    a. US citizen - born in the United State
    b. US citizen – naturalized
    c. Permanent resident
    d. International (F-1, J-1,)
    e. Other:
7. What is your gender identity?
    a. Female
    b. Male
    c. Genderqueer/Nonbinary
    d. Other (please specify)_____
8. Do you consider yourself transgender
    a. Yes
    b. No
9. What is your sexual orientation?
    a. Lesbian/gay
    b. Bisexual
    c. Heterosexual
    d. Asexual
    e. Other (please specify)_____
10. Please select the option below that best describes your political orientation or identity
    a. Very Conservative
    b. Conservative
    c. Moderately Conservative
    d. Moderate

    e.   Moderately Liberal

    f.   Liberal

    g.   Very Liberal

    h.   Other (please specify)_____

11. Please select the option that best describe your current religion beliefs
    a.   Atheist (do not believe in God)
    b.   Agnostic (not sure if there is a God)
    c.   Protestant (Baptist, Methodist, Non-Denominational, Lutheran, Pentecostal, Episcopal, etc.)
    d.   Roman Catholic (Catholic)
    e.   Mormon (Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints/LDS)
    f.   Orthodox Christian (Greek, Russian, or another orthodox church)
    g.   Jehovah's Witness
    h.   Unitarian/Universalist
    i.   Jewish
    j.   Muslim
    k.   Buddhist
    l.   Hindu
    m. Spiritual
    n.   Other (please specify)_____

12. What socioeconomic class have you spent the majority of your life in?
    a.   Lower class
    b.   Working class
    c.   Middle class
    d.   Upper middle class
    e.   Upper class
    f.   Other (please specify)_____

13. Think of the ladder below as representing where people stand in the United States. At the top of the ladder are the people who are best off, those who have the most money, most education, and best jobs. At the bottom are the people who are the worst off, those who have the least money, least education, and worst jobs or no job.
    a.   Where would you place yourself on this ladder on a scale of 1-10

14. What is your highest level of education?
    a.   Grade school or equivalent
    b.   Middle school or equivalent
    c.   High school or equivalent
    d.   Two year college or technical school
    e.   4 year college/university
    f.   Graduate school or Professional School

15. Please indicate your current status
    a.   Full time college/university student
    b.   Working part time
    c.   Working full time
    d.   Seeking employment
    e.   Not currently employed and not seeking employment

      f. Self-employed

      g. Retired

      h. Other (Please specify):

16. Do you or members of your household currently receive public assistance (e.g., food stamps, welfare)

      a. Yes

      b. No

17. Do you have a disability (Select All)?

      a. None

      b. Visual

      c. Hearing

      d. Learning

      e. Mobility

      f. Speech

      g. Medical

      h. Psychological

      i. Other (please specify):

18. How would you describe the region in which you live?

      a. Rural

      b. Urban

      c. Suburban

19. What is the zip code of your childhood neighborhood?

   Note: The answer to this question will only be used to determine the population make up of your neighborhood

Social Justice Interest Subscale

Instructions: Please indicate your degree of interest in doing each of the following activities. Use the 0-9 scale to show how much interest you have in each activity.

Very Low Interest	Low Interest	Medium Interest	High Interest	Very High Interest
0 1	2 3	4 5	6 7	8 9

How much interest do you have in:

1. Volunteering your time at a community agency (such as Big Brother/Big Sister; volunteering at a homeless shelter)
2. Reading about social issues (e.g., racism, oppression, inequality)
3. Going on a week long service or work project
4. Enrolling in a course on social issues
5. Watching television programs that cover a social issue (e.g., history of marginalized group)
6. Supporting a political candidate based on her or his stance on social issues
7. Donating money to an organization committed to social issues
8. Talking to others about social issues
9. Selecting a career or job that deals with social issues

Appendix D: Judges' Biases Questionnaire & Responses

Judge Biases Questionnaire

1.Please explain any personal issues (e.g., related to cultural background, experiences, values, and/or beliefs) that might make it difficult for you to respond objectively to the data

2. What are your overall expectations regarding the results of this study? (i.e., how will the data answer our research question of how Asian American woman perceive racism and how/if they act or do not act)

3. What types of racism events do you anticipate participants sharing?

4. How do you anticipate participants would respond to the racism events they shared?

5. What factors do you anticipate would impact whether someone acts when they see racism?

6. What do you anticipate participants will share about messages they've received about race and racism?

7. Please elaborate on any other biases and/or expectations that you have regarding this study

Table D1

Team Members Responses to Biases Questionnaire

Judge ID	Question 1	Question 2	Question 3	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6
1	My cultural background is being Middle Eastern-American, and I hold liberal values. I may be more hyper vigilant in terms of detecting racism due to own personal experiences of perceived racism. I do not think that these would greatly effect my ability to respond to data objectively.	I expect that the women will perceive outright racism more clearly and act more directly against these scenarios. However, I expect that subtle racism or racially charged situations will be more confusing to perceive and that people will not act as often in these situations.	I anticipate the racism events being both recent and in the past and likely from White or European people directed at the Asian American participant. Subtle racism or racist commentary is what I expect to me most common. I anticipate participants sharing experiences in public places with strangers, such as in restaurants.	I would expect that in acts of direct or very clear racism they might act more, but not acting might be more common. I think that comforting the target would be more common as well. Overall, I think many participants will wish they had acted more in retrospect because acting while in the moment can be overwhelming.	If the person feels unsafe I expect that the participants would not act. If the perpetrator of racism is a man of a higher age or there is a large group outnumbering the participant I suspect that they would not act. In terms of location, if the 2 people in the situation are alone I would expect the participant not to act. If the location is in a public setting with	I expect them to believe that racism is morally wrong and that those who are racist are inherently bad people, ignorant, or misguided. I expect that they would classify themselves as not racist.

					other witnesses the participant might be more likely to stand up for themselves or act.	
2	As an Asian woman with an international background, it may be difficult for me to fully relate to the Asian American experience of growing up in a multiracial society. I am more sensitive to the racial experiences of model minority, social isolation, and perpetual foreigner. I may be less sensitive to the intersecting experience of gender and race, because my gender identity and racial	I expect that individuals vary greatly in terms of how salient issues of race and racism are in their lives. For those who feel racism does not significantly impact their personal life, they may not recall much experience of not acting because they do not register those experiences as a racial incident. They may report isolated incidents of gender discrimination	Workplace discrimination (e.g., lack of leadership opportunities, assumed submissiveness), everyday interaction (e.g., interaction with strangers, conversation with friends), online interactions (e.g., reading posts and news). I expect that racism directed towards participants will mainly be interpersonal. Racism directed towards other racial groups will	I expect many participants not acting rather than confronting the target. Racial minority individuals often remember and ruminate on racism experiences, wishing that they had acted differently, so I imagine these experiences would be the most salient to report.	I think safety and power differential would impact whether someone acts or not.	Asians are not racial minorities and do not face racism; As an Asian, you need to work extra hard to get ahead; Assimilate into the White culture; Certain racial groups (e.g., black people) are dangerous

	identity developed separately in two different cultural contexts.	and racial discrimination. For those who regularly think about issues of race and racism, they may be able to recall incidents of both racial privilege and racial oppression as a Asian American woman.	include media and cultural racism.			
3	Because I have not experienced much (if any) racism directed towards me, as a white female, it may be difficult for me to recognize all of the forms in which racism exists. For example, I may not quickly recognize experiences of systematic racism or discrimination, as I have not directly experienced bias towards me.	Overall, I expect Asian American women to perceive racism as hurtful, either to them directly or to their community as a whole. I recently took a course where we spent a lot of time discussing bystander intervention, so based on that, I am expecting that most will not act. However, this	I anticipate participants sharing many examples of downplayed racism they've experienced in a casual setting, possibly including jokes or conversations that reflect a hurtful stereotype. I anticipate that many of the events would have occurred in the past, and that participants will	Based on what I have learned about bystander intervention, as previously described, I would predict that the majority did not act. However, this largely depends on factors such as the setting or who the racism is coming from.	Location or setting seems like it could be a large factor in whether or not someone acts. For example, if the perpetrator is in a position of authority or higher ranking within a work place, how well they know the perpetrator or if they feel safe in calling	I anticipate that participants will try to encourage others to intervene when they witness racism. They may also share how the racism they've experienced has impacted them over time, maybe it has made them feel more self-conscious or unsafe in certain places. .

	When I reflect on the racist comments or examples of systematic discrimination that I have heard about or seen, I feel that most of these actions have come from white men. But, because I've experienced such little racism compared others, the minimal experiences I've had could contribute to bias in thinking that it mostly comes from white men. Similarly, most of the racism I've seen or heard about is directed towards members of the black community. This could lead to biased thinking in that I could	could vary greatly depending on who the perpetrator was, if they were alone or with friends when they experienced the racism, or how capable they felt they were in stopping or correcting the racism.	reflect on an accumulation of past events. I do expect participants to also share examples of more recent racism, given the current political climate.		out the racism, as well as gender- maybe women will be more hesitant to call out acts of racism from men, but less hesitant to confront other women who commit racist acts. .	

	assume, based on my limited experience, that Asian American women are subject to less racism than those in other cultural groups.				
4	I grew up in a culturally-diverse neighborhood with predominantly white or Asian community members. I did not experience harsh racism besides relational aggression and microaggressions from my peers. Therefore, I may perceive harsh and explicit racism as an exaggeration. I would like to know if microaggressions will be coded as a form of racism. In addition, since this is a CQR	I think the data will most definitely answer how/if Asian American women act or do not act towards racism. However, I am trying to conceptualize what it means to "perceive" racism: Does it have to be directed towards the participant or can it be towards another person? Is it racism in general or racism towards Asian Americans? What does it mean to "experience"	Microaggressions, relational aggression from peers, in the past (especially UMD is quite the liberal campus and values diversity and inclusion), if it is directed towards them perhaps it wasn't direct (i.e., someone making comments not directly to their face but can be heard).	I anticipate the participants to not act but rather, internalize the event during their own time.	1) Gender: Especially for women, it can be a safety issue to confront someone who may be larger than you or is an aggressive man. In terms of Asian American women, since they are stereotyped as being submissive, perhaps that may make them choose not to act. 2) Safety: See above. 3) How often	I perceive racism as forms of misconceptions and stereotypes. Therefore, I personally disregard racism as ignorance of the perpetrator. I anticipate participants will think the same.

| study, that means that the data is based off of the participant's lived experiences. I wonder if the events described by the participant were actually intentionally racist or if they are perceived as racist. | racism (i.e., does observing a racist encounter towards another person also count as 'experiencing' racism?).

Nonetheless, the stories and lived experiences of the participant will let US know how THEY define the perception of racism. In other words, having open ended questions will allow for the participant to tell us what our questions mean to them. | | | they are experiencing the racism: For example, if the perpetrator is constantly 'picking' on the participant, perhaps it will trigger the participant to act.
4) Location: Perhaps if they are in a safer environment such as in school instead of out on the streets
5) Relationship w/ perpetrator: May act if participant has a relationship with the perpetrator (family member, friends, peers, classmates, | |

					teacher, etc.) rather than a stranger.	
5	I know I have internalized racism due to my upbringing in a relatively conservative Indian-American household, and have been working against this bias for a very long time. I also grew up in a predominantly White, rural, Midwestern neighborhood with a lack of exposure to people of diverse backgrounds.	I am not really sure what to expect at this moment because this is the first qualitative study I am part of as a researcher.	I anticipate that participants will share experiences of racism where they are the recipient, related to the perpetual foreigner stereotype ("where are you really from?") and the model minority myth ("is everyone in your family a doctor?") I also anticipate that participants may have a difficult time sharing experiences of racism where they are the perpetrators.	I anticipate that participants will respond that they did not act or that they comforted the target after the intensity of the event was over.	I think all of these factors could impact whether someone acts when they see racism. I wonder if maybe people are more likely to act when the target shares a number of identities with them (i.e., same gender, same race).	I anticipate that participants will share that racism was not a topic where they received much guidance/messages.
6	My cultural background is Southeast Asian, and I grew up	I expect that the data will answer by first providing descriptions of	I expect that the data will answer by first providing descriptions of	I anticipate that participants comforted the	I anticipate that the safety of the situation and location	I anticipate that participants will have received messages about

listening to my family and diaspora community talk about their experiences related to discrimination and prejudice. Although my parents had described instances where they were ignored, treated as lesser than other Americans, or harassed, they never saw it as "oppression" per se but a given for immigrants. Thus, as they put it, acting on those acts of oppression never occurred to them because racism was a fact of life. As a result, I may mis-perceive acts of oppression described by participants as less serious than they actually are. On	what the participants perceive as racism and then second providing descriptions of what actions the participants took as a result of acts of oppression. I expect there to be more instances of covert racism than overt racism, and I expect there to be mostly no action taken as a result of these incidents because it's "not that big of a problem" or similarly minimizing reasons.	what the participants perceive as racism and then second providing descriptions of what actions the participants took as a result of acts of oppression. I expect there to be more instances of covert racism than overt racism, and I expect there to be mostly no action taken as a result of these incidents because it's "not that big of a problem" or similarly minimizing reasons.	target but otherwise did not react to the actor.	would have the greatest impact on whether or not someone acts.	letting incidents of racism go in the interest of harmony and "not making waves", as well as messages about racism being less of an issue than other aspects of life, like a career.

	the other hand, I may identify too much with the participants, especially if they come from a similar background of having refugee parents who escaped war.					
7	I am White, so my personal experiences with race have obviously been a lot different than those of the participants in this study. I would also say that because of my psychology classes and prior research experiences, I have some preconceptions about the topic. By that I mean I've been taught about things like the minority stress model, stereotype threat, and racial	I'm not expecting anything in particular, but I have a few ideas about what kind of things might come up. For example, it's plausible that the decision to act or not to act depends on whether the act of racism is addressed towards oneself of someone else, or the level of power one has over the situation. I also think it's likely that people will	I presume that a lot of it will be general statements about things that happened frequently to them during their childhoods, or microaggressions that still happen frequently in everyday life. They could also share more serious incidents that happened to either themselves, families, or friends in the past. They might also share broader events, such as	For events that occurred while growing up, I would be surprised if many people said they acted. In the present, I suppose I would anticipate that the participants would take action, but not often in a way that involves direct confrontation with the aggressor.	All of those listed are very plausible. Personal safety is a big factor, as well as conflict avoidance. Participants might also be more likely to act in defense of another victim of a racist act if that person is of their own race or gender. At some point, even if someone's natural instinct is to act, I can	As a result of social learning, I could easily see participants receiving subtle (or not-so-subtle) messages about White superiority or the undesirability of their own race. From their families, I would predict that they were taught about the reality of racism towards their own race and what they would be facing in society. I'm not entirely sure what messages they would receive

	identity as it's conceptualized by traditional measures like the MIBI, etc.	discuss how culturally ingrained racial stigma can become internalized, even if the women recognize that it is racist. I think there will likely also be some sort of internal conflict Asian American women face as a result of clashing cultural ideologies towards racism.	political events that affect entire racial groups.		imagine it would be tiring to constantly explain and correct minor transgressions.	about other non-White races.
8	The personal issues that may make it difficult to respond to the data revolves around my experience of not ethnically identifying as Asian. I am a black woman so I will mostly understand from the perspective of being a minority,	My expectations are that there will be a lot of women talking about how people may sexualize Asian women because they are considered "exotic". Some women will possibly talk about their experience with	Participants may talk about past and present events, possibly events that may not have been directed towards them. Participants may talk about events that may have happened to friends, family, and acquaintances.	Some of the people in this study probably brushed off the experience. Others may have talked with the person who caused the events in a calm manor..	Gender identifying Non-gender-identifying Attractiveness of the person who is being bothered Race of target Tone of targets skin Location Amount of people in the	Some of the participants may express that people need to learn how to be knowledgeable that the world is not just black versus white. That people should not undermine the experience of other ethnicities and races simply

	but fully understand the experience of racial profiling, racial discrimination, nor any other experience that may be solely based on race or gender-identification of an Asian female.	their love lives and possible discrimination if they are in an interracial relationship. Some women may even talk about how they may have had experiences with stereotypes regarding their race and presumed gender-identification.	Participants may even talk about racial profiling by their friends.		area (Bystander effect) Size and/or shape of the person being bothered Size and/or shape of the person that is harassing Popularity of person being bothered or harassing How approachable the situation is	because the most relevant argument is racial disagreement of the white versus black experience.

Note.   Responses were not edited

Appendix E: Participant Responses

Table E1

Participant demographics and questionnaire responses

Participant #	Age	Ethnicity	Immigration Status	Generational Status	Exposure to Diversity (Minimal; Intermediate; Extensive)	Region	Education Level	Social Justice Interest
1	29	Chinese	Citizen – Born in the US	Second Generation	Intermediate	Suburban	Obtained a Pham.D	8.22
3	30	Chinese	Citizen – Born in the US	Second Generation	Minimal	Urban	Obtained a M.D.	5
4	30	Chinese	Citizen – naturalized	1.5 Generation	Extensive	Suburban	Obtained a M.S in Public Health	6.44
5	29	Chinese	Citizen – Born in the US	Second Generation	Intermediate	Suburban	Obtained a M.S. in Education	6.89
7	26	Korean	Citizen – naturalized	1.5 Generation	Minimal	Urban	Currently in graduate school; Counseling Psychology PhD program	6.67
10	23	Chinese	Citizen – Born in the US	Second Generation	Intermediate	Suburban	Obtained a B.S. in psychology	7.78
12	30	Chinese	Citizen – Born in the US	Second Generation	Minimal	Urban	Currently in graduate school	7.44

15	21	Korean	Citizen – Born in the US	Second Generation	Minimal	Suburban	Currently in college	7.11
16	29	Chinese	Citizen – Born in the US	Second Generation	Minimal	Urban	Currently in graduate school; Counseling psychology PhD	7.22
17	30	Korean	Citizen – Born in the US	Second Generation	Minimal	Suburban	Obtained a Pham.D.	2.89
18	27	Chinese	Citizen – Born in the US		Intermediate	Suburban	Obtained a B.S.	5.78

Table E2

Participants' Racial Hierarchy and Racial Socialization Experience

Participant #	Racial Hierarchy	Racial Socialization Experience
1	White (or White passing), East Asians, Indians, Middle Eastern, Hispanic, Latinos, Black, and Native Americans	Growing up, P felt that the best race to be was White, in terms of looks and fitting in. P was the only Asian Person in her school until she moved in Eighth grade. P does not recall specific instances where her parents discussed racism directed toward others but recalls that they had a "keep your head low" attitude to avoid being bothered by others (better not to say or do anything). Her parents told her to understand that if she spoke up, she could lose her privilege and be treated more harshly, particularly by superiors, because she is a minority.
3	Asians, White, Hispanic, Black Americans/Middle Eastern	P grew up in a relatively homogenous Jewish community. P grew up believing that racism was negative. Although people in her family and direct community may have assumptions or stereotypes of others based on race, she does not believe that they would ever outwardly discriminate against another.
4	White, African American/Black, Asian American, Hispanic American/Native American	P grew up in a neighborhood that had a lower socioeconomic status. Her parents had experienced racism and taught her to be cautious around African Americans because of their association with crime. P went to a diverse school and did not really notice anything growing up. When P was in elementary and middle school, P neither noticed nor was bothered by color.
5	White, Asian American, Native American, Hispanic American, and African American	P lived in a well-off area growing up. Growing up as American Chinese, P was ashamed of and did not feel much pride in her Chinese culture. P wanted to assimilate into American culture.
7	White, Asian, Hispanic Americans, and Black Americans	P tried to be distant from Korean culture and wanted to be White because P grew up in a predominantly White neighborhood. A part of P thought P was White. P feels that growing up in a predominantly White neighborhood impacted her ability to identify racism and her confidence to speak up about racism. P did not receive a

		lot of messages about race growing up. P's dad talked to P about the importance of the Civil Rights Movement and how that relates to other races, like Asians, in the US. P's dad told P not to be racist. P doesn't feel that P's parents prepared P and P's brother for racism. And P's mom would tell P and P's brother to ignore racism and to not let those experiences get to them. P's mom also said to be the bigger person and brush it off.
10	White, Asian, Latinx, Native Americans, and Black Americans	Growing up, P received messages that racism is bad. Most of the messages she received were about overt racism, like slavery. It was not until high school, when social media became more prominent, that microaggressions were acknowledged. P feels like she was never taught how to respond to racism. Rather, she was taught to love everyone and treat everyone equally, but she perceived these messages as cliché. P thinks that the lack of messages about how to intervene and call out racism is a big barrier in discussions about race today.
12	White, East Asians, Brown (South East Asians, Middle Eastern, Hispanic Americans), and Black people (African Americans)	P grew up in a town that was 98% White, where race was not talked about much. Growing up, P did not really identify with being Chinese. In the predominantly White area in which she lived, no one looked like her and her sisters, so racism wasn't talked about among her friends
15	White, East Asian, South and Southeast Asians, Black/Latino/Hispanics, and Middle Eastern	P went to a predominantly White and Catholic school and college. Growing up, P went to Catholic schools where there were not a lot of students who looked like P, to the point where P wanted to be White. She was often one of very few Asian students in her classes, and therefore found it difficult to conceptualize being Asian. P's mom also taught her to "turn a blind eye" when she saw racism happening. P believes this was because her mom wanted P to avoid conflict. P thinks this has impacted her relationships with other minority peers because she did not have Black friends growing up and still does not have many friends of color.
16	White, Asian, Hispanic/Latinx/Middle Eastern, and	P was not explicitly taught about racial issues and feels that she grew up in a predominantly White space. This led her to believe that being Chinese American meant that she was half Chinese and half White because she equated being American with being White. P was aware that she was different and Asian. P

	Black/Native Americans	cannot recall hearing any overt racial messages from her parents and says that she did not begin to think about it until later in life. Through not being able to recall her parents speaking out to intervene, P assumes that they would encourage her to just mind her own business and not intervene.
17	White, Asian, Black/Hispanics, Native Americans/Middle Eastern	P's parents did not give direct messages about race but talked about stereotypes such as certain races not being very intelligent. P was in a diverse elementary school in Maryland, where there were a lot of Asian, Black, Hispanic, and White students, but later she moved to Northern Virginia where her school was mostly White students. P's parents never had a talk with P about racism or how racism is inappropriate
18	White, Asian, Latin Americans/Middle Eastern, and Black	P grew up in a predominantly White, affluent neighborhood where 20% of residents were of Asian descent. P learned early on that she was different from, and not as cool and as attractive as White individuals due to personal and witnessed racial microaggression experiences and a lack of Asian representation on media. P felt ashamed of her Chinese middle name, her food, her culture, and speaking English with an accent. P felt confused and frustrated as a child because she strived to be like a White person, but she knew she could not change herself to look like that. P learned at a young age that if someone is not White, they will experience racial microaggressions. P grew up in a neighborhood where there were not many African American and Latino American people. As a result, P thinks people just say whatever they want, and the targets of racism would not be present to defend themselves. P does not think she has received explicit teaching about racism at home. P's mom would tell her to brush it off or stand up for herself when P returned home feeling upset about the racial microaggressions. P is naturally inclined to stand up to bullies at school, so she stood up for herself when she experienced racism.

Appendix F: Qualitative Analysis

Table F1

Example breakdown for the four types of racism

Participant #	Same and Did Intervene	Same and Did Not Intervene	Lower and Did Intervene	Lower and Did Not Intervene
1	Provided Example	Could not think of Example	Provided Example	Provided Example
3	Provided Example	Provided Example	Provided Example	Example Provided but Deemed Inappropriate
4	Example Provided but Deemed Inappropriate	Provided Example	Provided Example	Provided Example
5	Provided Example	Provided Example	Provided Example	Provided Example
7	Could not think of Example	Provided Example	Provided Example	Provided Example
10	Could not think of Example	Provided Example	Could not think of Example	Provided Example
12	Could not think of Example	Could not think of Example	Provided example	Provided Example
15	Provided Example	Provided Example	Provided Example	Provided Example
16	Provided Example	Provided Example	Could not think of Example	Could not think of Example
17	Could not think of Example	Provided Example	Provided Example	Could not think of Example
18	Provided Example	Provided Example	Provided Example	Provided Example
TOTAL	6	9	9	8

Table F2

Cross Analysis Across the Four Types

DOMAIN 1: Perception of Race	**Frequency Count for Overall Group** N = 11 (unless otherwise stated)
A. Asian Americans Experience both Privilege and Discrimination	G (11)
B. Whites are at the top of the Racial Hierarchy	G (10)
C. People of Color Experience Discrimination Which Places Them Lower on the Ladder	G (10)
D. Racial Hierarchy Was Difficult to Rank	G (10)
E. Participant was not Exposed to Diversity Growing Up	T (8)

		Occurrence			
DOMAIN 2: Witnessed Racism Experience (All 4 combined)		**SD** N = 6	**SN** N = 9	**LD** N = 9	**LN** N = 8
A. Type of Racism					
1. Comments about Racial Features	T (9)	**67% (4)***	33% (3)	11% (1)	38% (3)
2. Generalization/Assumption about POC	T (8)	33% (2)	22% (2)	**67% (6) ***	25% (2)
3. POC were treated as Second Class Customer	T (6)	17% (1)	22% (2)	33% (3)	25% (2)
4. Comments about Language/Culture	V (5)	17% (1)	44% (4)*	0%	0%
B. Personal Reactions about Event					
1. Upset/Uncomfortable with Witnessing the Racist Event	T (9)	17% (1)	22% (2)	44% (4)	38% (3)
2. Shock/Frozen by the Extent of the Racist Event	T (6)	17% (1)	33% (3)	11% (1)	25% (2)
3. Anger and Frustration at the Racist Event	V (5)	50% (3)	22% (2)	22% (2)	0%
4. Feeling Helpless/Powerless	V (5)	17% (1)	22% (2)	11% (1)	25% (2)
5. Concern about Own Well-Being	V (4)	17% (1)	22% (2)	11% (1)	13% (1)
6. Confusion About Whether Event was Racist	V (4)	17% (1)	11% (1)	11% (1)	13% (1)

		SD N = 6	SN N = 9	LD N = 9	LN N = 8
C. Response to Witnessed Racist Event					
1. Minimized/dismissed or Did Not React to the Racist Event	G (11)	0%	**100% (9)**	11% (1)	**100% (8)**
2. Nonaggressivly Challenged the Perpetrator of the Racist Event	T (9)	**67% (4)**	0%	**88% (8)**	0%
3. Provided Support and Validation to Target of the Racist Event	V (5)	**67% (4)***	0%	11% (1)	0%
D. Personal Reflections about Event					
1. Wish Had Directly Challenged Racist Event	T (7)	33% (2)	44% (4)	11% (1)	38% (3)
2. Satisfaction with Decision	T (6)	17% (1)	0%	**44% (4)**	13% (1)
3. Regret for Inaction	V (5)	17% (1)	11% (1)	11% (1)	25% (2)
4. Wish Had Supported Target	V (3)	0%	11% (1)	11% (1)	13% (1)
5. Wish for Support from Others	V (2)	0%	0%	22% (2)	13% (1)
E. Decision Making Factors for Action N = 10					
a. Forces that Facilitated Action During Decision-Making					
1. Felt Responsibility to Act because Familiar With Target	T (6)	**33% (2)**	0%	**44% (4)**	0%
2. Wanted to Help the Target	V (5)	17% (1)	0%	33% (3)	13% (1)
3. Wanted to Educate the Perpetrator that Racism is Bad	V (5)	**33% (2)**	0%	**44% (4)**	0%
4. Experienced Strong Negative Emotional Reaction	V (4)	**33% (2)**	0%	22% (2)	0%
5. The Witnessed Racist Event that was Too Egregious to Ignore	V (3)	17% (1)	0%	33% (3)	13% (1)
6. Felt Responsibility to Act because Familiar with Perpetrator	V (2)	17% (1)	0%	11% (1)	0%

		SD N = 6	SN N= 9	LD N=9	LN N=8
b. Forces that Inhibited Action During Decision-Making					
1. Feared Retaliation	T (9)	33% (2)	44% (4)	22% (2)	50% (5)
2. Social Costs Too High	T (8)	17% (1)	33% (3)	55% (5)*	38% (3)
3. Did Not Feel Invested Enough	T (7)	50% (3)	33% (3)	33% (3)	25% (2)
4. Unsure of How to Respond	V (5)	0%	**33% (3)**	0%	25% (2)
5. Thought it Wouldn't Make a Difference	V (5)	**33% (2)***	0%	0%	**38% (3)***
6. Unsure if Event was Racism	V (3)	0%	11% (1)	0%	38% (3)

DOMAIN 3: Reactions to Interview

A. Gained insight/Awareness   G (10)

B. Aspects of the Interview were Difficult   T (6)

C. Thought Interview was meaningful/important   V (3)

Note.   Frequency count for *Forces that Facilitated Action* was calculated out of 10, which was the number of participants who provided examples of intervening. Differences were also calculated between SD vs. SN and LD vs LN, with **bolded** denoting significance. Difference were calculated between SD vs LD; SN vs LN, with * denoting meaningful differences.

Table F3

Cross Analysis Across the Did Intervene and Did Not Intervene

DOMAIN 1: Perception of Race	Frequency Count for Overall Group N = 11 (unless otherwise noted)		

A. Asian Americans Experience both Privilege
   and Discrimination — G (11)
B. Whites are at the top of the Racial Hierarchy — G (10)
C. People of Color Experience Discrimination
   Which Places Them Lower on the Ladder — G (10)
D. Racial Hierarchy Was Difficult to Rank — G (10)
E. Participant was not Exposed to Diversity Growing Up — T (8)

		Occurrence	
DOMAIN 2: Witnessed Racism Experience (All 4 combined)		**Did Intervene** N = 10	**Did Not Intervene** N = 11
A. Type of Racism			
1. Comments about Racial Features	T (9)	50% (5)	45% (5)
2. Generalization/Assumption about POC	T (8)	**70% (7)**	36% (4)
3. POC were treated as Second Class Customer	T (6)	40% (4)	36% (4)
4. Comments about Language/Culture	V (5)	10% (1)	36% (4)
B. Personal Reactions about Event			
1. Upset/Uncomfortable with Witnessing the Racist Event	T (9)	40% (4)	45% (5)
2. Shock/Frozen by the Extent of the Racist Event	T (6)	20% (2)	45% (5)
3. Anger and Frustration at the Racist Event	V (5)	**50% (5)**	18% (2)
4. Feeling Helpless/Powerless	V (5)	20% (2)	36% (4)
5. Concern about Own Well-Being	V (4)	20% (2)	18% (2)
6. Confusion About Whether Event was Racist	V (4)	20% (2)	20% (2)

		Did Intervene N = 10	Did Not Intervene N = 11
C. Response to Witnessed Racist Event			
1. Minimized/dismissed or did not react to the racist event	G (11)	10% (1)	**100% (11)**
2. Nonaggressivly challenged the Perpetrator of Racist Event	T (9)	**90% (9)**	0%
3. Provided Support and Validation to Target of Racist Event	V (5)	**50% (5)**	0%
D. Personal Reflections about Event			
1. Wish Had Directly Challenged Racist Event	T (7)	30% (3)	**64% (7)**
2. Satisfaction with Decision	T (6)	**50% (5)**	9% (1)
3. Regret for Inaction	V (5)	20% (2)	27% (3)
4. Wish Had Supported Target	V (3)	10% (1)	18% (2)
5. Wish for Support from Others	V (2)	20% (2)	9% (1)
E. Decision Making Factors for Action			
a. Forces that Facilitated Action During Decision-Making		N = 10	
1. Felt Responsibility to Act because Familiar With Target	T (6)	**60% (6)**	0% (0)
2. Wanted to Educate the Perpetrator that Racism is Bad	V (5)	**50% (5)**	0% (0)
3. Experienced Strong Negative Emotional Reaction	V (4)	**40% (4)**	0% (0)
4. Wanted to Help the Target	V (4)	**40% (4)**	0% (0)
5. The Witnessed Racist Event was Too Egregious to Ignore	V (3)	**30% (0)**	0% (0)
6. Felt Responsibility to Act because Familiar with Perpetrator	V (2)	20% (2)	0% (0)

		Did Intervene N = 10	Did Not Intervene N = 11
b. Forces that Inhibited Action During Decision-Making			
1. Feared Retaliation	T (9)	40% (4)	**82% (9)**
2. Social Costs too High	T (8)	60% (6)	55% (6)
3. Did Not Feel Invested Enough	T (7)	60% (6)	45% (5)
4. Unsure of How to Respond	V (5)	0%	**45% (5)**
5. Thought it Wouldn't Make a Difference	V (5)	20% (2)	27% (3)
6. Unsure if Event was Racism	V (3)	0%	**36% (4)**

DOMAIN 3: Reactions to Interview

A. Gained insight/Awareness   G (10)

B. Aspects of the Interview were Difficult   T (6)

C. Thought Interview was meaningful/important   V (3)

Note. Bolded occurrences denote meaningful difference

Table F4

Cross Analysis Across the Same Level on the Ladder and Lower Level on the Ladder

DOMAIN 1: Perception of Race	Frequency Count for Overall Group
	N = 11 (unless otherwise noted)

F. Asian Americans Experience both Privilege and Discrimination	G (11)
G. Whites are at the top of the Racial Hierarchy	G (10)
H. People of Color Experience Discrimination Which Places Them Lower on the Ladder	G (10)
I. Racial Hierarchy Was Difficult to Rank	G (10)
J. Participant was not Exposed to Diversity Growing Up	T (8)

		Occurrence	
DOMAIN 2: Witnessed Racism Experience (All 4 combined)		Same Level N = 10	Lower Level N = 10
A. Type of Racism			
5. Comments about Racial Features	T (9)	**60% (6)**	30%(3)
6. Generalization/Assumption about POC	T (8)	20% (2)	**60% (6)**
7. POC were treated as Second Class Customer	T (6)	20% (2)	40% (4)
8. Comments about Language/Culture	V (5)	**50%(5)**	0% (0)
C. Personal Reactions about Event			
7. Upset/Uncomfortable with Witnessing the Racist Event	T (9)	30%% (3)	**70% (7)**
8. Shock/Frozen by the Extent of the Racist Event	T (6)	30% (3)	30% (3)
9. Anger and Frustration at the Racist Event	V (5)	40% (4)	20% (2)
10. Feeling Helpless/Powerless	V (5)	30% (3)	30% (3)
11. Concern about Own Well-Being	V (4)	30% (3)	20% (2)
12. Confusion About Whether Event was Racist	V (4)	20% (2)	20% (2)

		Same Level N = 10	Lower Level N = 10
D. Response to Witnessed Racist Event			
4. Minimized/dismissed or did not react to the racist event	G (11)	100% (10)	80% (8)
5. Nonaggressivly challenged the Perpetrator of Racist Event	T (9)	40% (4)	**80% (8)**
6. Provided Support and Validation to Target of Racist Event	V (5)	**40% (4)**	10% (1)
E. Personal Reflections about Event			
6. Wish Had Directly Challenged Racist Event	T (7)	**60% (6)**	30% (3)
7. Satisfaction with Decision	T (6)	10% (1)	**50% (5)**
8. Regret for Inaction	V (5)	20% (2)	30% (3)
9. Wish Had Supported Target	V (3)	10% (1)	20% (2)
10. Wish for Support from Others	V (2)	0% (0)	20% (2)
E. Decision Making Factors for Action			
a. Forces that Facilitated Action During Decision-Making	N = 10		
7. Felt Responsibility to Act because Familiar With Target	T (6)	20% (2)	40% (4)
8. Wanted to Educate the Perpetrator that Racism is Bad	V (5)	20% (2)	40% (4)
9. Experienced Strong Negative Emotional Reaction	V (4)	20% (2)	20% (2)
10. Wanted to Help the Target	V (4)	10% (1)	**40% (4)**
11. The Witnessed Racist Event was Too Egregious to Ignore	V (3)	10% (1)	20% (2)
12. Felt Responsibility to Act because Familiar with Perpetrator	V (2)	10% (1)	20% (2)

		Same Level N = 10	Lower Level N = 10
b. Forces that Inhibited Action During Decision-Making			
7. Feared Retaliation	T (9)	60% (6)	60% (6)
8. Social Costs too High	T (8)	40% (4)	60% (6)
9. Did Not Feel Invested Enough	T (7)	50% (5)	40% (4)
10. Unsure of How to Respond	V (5)	30% (3)	20% (2)
11. Thought it Wouldn't Make a Difference	V (5)	20% (2)	30% (3)
12. Unsure if Event was Racism	V (3)	10% (1)	30% (3)

DOMAIN 3: Reactions to Interview

D.   Gained insight/Awareness   G (10)
E. Aspects of the Interview were Difficult   T (6)
F. Thought Interview was meaningful/important   V (3)

Note. Bolded occurrences denote meaningful difference

REFERENCES

Aboud, F., & Joong, A. (2008). Intergroup name-calling and conditions for creating
assertive bystanders. In S. R. Levy & M. Killen (Eds.), *Intergroup attitudes and
relations in childhood through adulthood* (pp. 249-260). Oxford University Press.

Adams, M., Bell, L. A., & Griffin, P. (2007). *Teaching for diversity and social justice: A
sourcebook*. Routledge.

Akoi, K. (1997). Direct democracy, racial group agency, local government law, and
residential racial segregation: Some reflections on radical and plural democracy.
California Western Law Review, 30, 1-5. https://scholarlycommons.law.cwsl.edu/
cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1296&context=cwlr

Alexander, M (2010). *The New Jim Crow: Mass incarceration in the age of colorblindness.*
The New Press.

Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Amaro, H., & Raj, A. (2000). On the margin: Power and women's HIV risk reduction
strategies. *Sex Roles, 42*, 723-749. http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1007059708789

American Psychological Association (2016). "Stress in America: The impact of
discrimination. Stress in American survey." https://www.apa.org/news/
press/releases/stress/ 2015/impact-of-discrimination.pdf

Apfelbaum, E. P., Norton, M. I., & Sommers, S. R. (2012). Racial color blindness:
Emergence, practice, and implications. *Current Directions in Psychological
Science, 21*, 205-209. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0963721411434980

Apple, M. W. (2004). *Ideology & curriculum* (3rd ed.). Routledge.

Arnett, J. J. (2014). *Emerging adulthood: The winding road from the late teens through the twenties.* Oxford Press

Ashburn-Nardo, L., Knowles, M. L., & Monteith, M. J. (2003). Black Americans' implicit racial associations and their implications for intergroup judgment. *Social Cognition, 21*, 61-87. http://dx.doi.org/10.1521/soco.21.1.61.21192

Ashburn-Nardo, L., Morris, K. A., Goodwin, S. A. (2008). The confronting prejudiced responses (CPR) model: Applying CPR in organizations. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 7*(3), 332-342. http://jstor.org/stable/40214552

Asian Americans Advancing Justice (2019). FAQs: Data disaggregation and Asian Americans. https://censuscounts.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/FAQs-on-Data-Disaggregation-and-Asian-Americans.pdf

Banks, T. L. (1998). Both edges of the margin: African Americans and Asians in Mississippi Masala barriers to coalition building. *Asian American Law Journal, 5*, 7-40. https://digitalcommons.law.umaryland.edu/fac_pubs/327/

Banyard, V. L., Moynihan, M. M., & Plante, E. G. (2007). Sexual violence prevention through bystander education: An experimental evaluation. *Journal of Community Psychology, 35*(4), 463-481. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/jcop.20159

Bashi, V., & McDaniel, A. (1997). A theory of immigration and racial stratification. *Journal of Black Studies*, *27*(5), 668-682. http://www.jstor.org/stsable/2784874

Batson, C. D. (1991). *The altruism question: Toward a social-psychological answer.* Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Batson, C. D. (2009). These things called empathy: Eight related but distinct phenomena. In J. Decety & W. J. Ikes (Eds.), *The social neuroscience of empathy* (pp. 3-15). MIT Press.

Batson, C. D., Batson, J. G., Griffitt, C. A., Barrientos, S., Brandt, J. R., Sprengelmeyer, P., & Bayly, M. J. (1989). Negative-state relief and the empathy – altruism hypothesis. *Journal of Personality and Social psychology, 56*(6), 922-933. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.56.6.922

Batson, C.D., Fultz, J. & Schoenrade, P. A. (1987). Distress and empathy: Two qualitatively distinct vicarious emotions with different motivational consequences. *Journal of Personality*, *55,* 19-39. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.1987.tb00426.x

Batson, C. D., & Shaw, L. L. (1991). Evidence for altruism: Toward a pluralism of prosocial motives. *Psychological Inquiry, 2*(2), 107-122. http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15327965pli0202_1

Batson, C. D., Sympson, S. C., Hindman, J. L., Decruz, P., Todd, R. M., Weeks, J. L., Jennings, G., & Burns, C. T. (1996). "I've been there, too": Effect of empathy of prior experience with a need. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 22*(5), 474-482. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0146167296225005

Batts, V. A. (1983). Knowing and changing the cultural script component of racism. *Transactional Analysis Journal, 13*, 355-257. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177 /036215378301300416

Bell, L. A. (1997). Theoretical foundations for social justice education. In M. Adams, L. Bell., & P. Griffin (Eds.), *Teaching for diversity and social justice: A sourcebook* (pp. 3-15). Routledge.

Bell, M. P., Marquardt, D., Berry, D. P. (2014). "Diversity," immigration, and the new American multi-racial hierarchy. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 29*(3), 285-303. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/jmp-08-2012-0242

Bellmore, A., Ma, T., You, J., & Hughes, M. (2012). A two-method investigation of early adolescents' responses upon witnessing peer victimization in school. *Journal of Adolescence, 35*, 1265-1276. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2012.04.012

Bern, D. J. (1970). Self-perception theory. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 6*, 1-62. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60024-6

Bhui, K., Stansfeld, S., McKenzie, K., Karlsen, S., Nazroo, J., Weich, S. (2005). Racial/ethnic discrimination and common mental disorders among workers: Findings from the EMPIRICC study of ethnic minority groups in the United Kingdom. *American Journal of Public Health, 95*(3), 496-501. http://dx.doi.org/10.2105?AJPH.2003.033274

Blanz, M., Mummendey, A., Mielke, R., & Klink, A. (1998). Responding to negative social identity: A taxonomy of identity management strategies. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 28*, 697-729. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002(sici)1099-0992(199809/10)28:5<697::aid-ejsp889>3.0.co;2-#

Blimling, G. (2010). The growth and development of college students. In G. Blimling (Ed.), *The Resident Assistant: Applications and Strategies for working with college students in residence halls.* (7th ed., pp. 133-160). Kendall Hunt.

Bonilla-Silva, E. (1997). Rethinking racism: Toward a structural interpretation. *American Sociological Review, 62*(3), 465-480. http://www.jstor.org/stable/2657316

Bonilla-Silva, E. (2001). *White supremacy and racism in the post-Civil Rights era*. Rienner.

Bonilla-Silva, E. (2004). From bi-racial to tri-racial: Towards a new system of racial stratification in the USA. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 27*(6), 931-950. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0141987042000268530

Brinkman, B., Dean, A. M., Simpson, C. K., McGinley, M., & Rosén, L. A. (2015). Bystander intervention during college women's experiences of gender prejudice. *Sex Roles*, *72*, 485-498. http://dx.doi/10.1007/s11199-015-048-x

Brody, L. R. (2000). The socialization of gender differences in emotional expression: Display rules infant temperament, and differentiation. In A. H. Fisher (Ed.), *Gender and emotion: Social psychological perspectives* (pp. 16-34). Cambridge University Press.

Brody, G. H., Chen, Y.-F., Murry, V. M., Ge, X., Simons, R. L., Gibbons, F. X., et al. (2006). Perceived discrimination and the adjustment of African American youths: A five-year longitudinal analysis with contextual moderation effects. *Child Development, 77*(5)*,* 1170-1189. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2006.00927.x

Brown, A. (2019). Key findings on Americans' views of race in 2019. Pew Research Center. https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2019/04/09/key-findings-on-americans-views-of-race-in-2019/

Brown, L. S. (1986). Confronting internalized oppression in sex therapy with lesbians. *Journal of Homosexuality, 12*, 99-107. http://dx.doi.org/10.1300/J082v12n03_09

Burn, S. M. (2009). A situational model of sexual assault prevention through bystander intervention. *Sex Roles, 60*(11-12), 779-792. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11199-008-9581-5

Butler, E. A., Lee, T. L., & Gross, J. J. (2007). Emotion regulation and culture: Are the social consequences of emotion suppression culture-specific? *Emotion, 7*(1), 30-48. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1528-3542.7.1.30

Carlson, M. (2008). I'd rather go along and be considered a man: Masculinity and bystander intervention. *The Journal of Men's Studies, 16*(1), 3-17. http://dx.doi.org/10.3149/jms.1601.3

Casey, E. A. & Ohler, K. (2011). Being a positive bystander: Male antiviolence allies' experiences of "stepping up." *Journal of Interpersonal violence, 27*(1), 62-83. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0886260511416479

Chae, D. H., Takeuchi, D. T., Barbeau, E. M., Bennett, G. G., Lindsey, J. C., Stoddard, A. M., & Krieger, N. (2008). Alcohol disorders among Asian Americans: Associations with unfair treatment, racial/ethnic discrimination, and ethnic identification. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health, 62*(11), 973-979. https://www.jstor.org/stable/20720862

Charles, C. Z. (2003). The dynamics of racial residential segregation. *Annual Review of Sociology, 29*, 167-207. http://www.jstor.org/stable/20036965

Chekroun, P., & Brauer, M. (2002). The bystander effect and social control behavior. The effect of the presence of others on people's reactions to norm violations. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 32*, 853-867. http://dx.doi.org/ 10.1002/ejsp.126

Chen, A. C.-C., Szalacha, L. A., & Menon, U. (2014). Perceived discrimination and its association with mental health and substance use among Asian American and Pacific Islander undergraduate and graduate students. *Journal of American College Health, 62*(6), 390-398. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07448481.2014.917648

Chiang, F., Low, A., & Collins, J. (2013). Two sets of business cards: Responses of Chinese immigrant women entrepreneurs in Canada and Australia to Sexism and Racism. *Cosmopolitan Civil Societies, 5*(2), 63-83. http://dx.doi.org/10.5130/ ccs.v5i2.3117

Cheng, Y. (2011). From campus racism to cyber racism: Discourse of race and Chinese nationalism. *China Quarterly, 207*, 561-579. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/ S0305741011000658

Cheng, L & Espiritu, Y. (1989). Korean business in Black and Hispanic neighborhoods: A study of intergroup relations. *Sociological Perspectives, 32*(4), 521-534. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1389136

Cheryan, S., & Bodengausen, G. V. (2000). When positive stereotypes threaten intellectual performance: The psychological hazards of model minority status. *Psychological Science, 11*, 399-402. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1467-9280.00277

Chiang, W.-T. (2012). The suppression of emotional expression in interpersonal context. *Bulletin of Educational Psychology, 43*(3), 657-680. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/

a0014755

Choi, Y., Park, M., Lee, J. P., Yasui, M., & Kim, T. Y. (2018). Explicating acculturation strategies among Asian American youth: Subtypes and correlates across Filipino and Korean Americans. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 47*(10), 2181-2205. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10964-018-0862-1

Cissner, A. B. (2009). Evaluating the Mentors in Violence Prevention program: Preventing gender violence on a college campus. *Center for Court Innovation*. https://www.courtinnovation.org/sites/default/files/MVP_evaluation.pdf

Clark, K. B., & Clark, M. O. (1947). Racial identification and preference among negro children. In E. L. Hartley (Ed.), *Readings in social psychology*. Holt, Reinhart, and Winston.

Cocker, A. L., Cook-Craig, P. G., Williams, C. M., Fisher, B. S., Clear, E. R., Garcia, L. S., & Hegg, L. (2011). Evaluation of Green Dot: An active bystander intervention to reduce sexual violence on college campuses. *Violence Against Women*, *17*(6), 777-796. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1077801211410264

Cohen, L. L., & Swim, J. K. (1995). The differential impact of gender ratios on women and men: Tokenism, self-confidence, and expectations. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *21*(9), 876-884. http://dx.doi.org/ 10.11770146167295219001

Coles, F. S. (1986). Forced to quit: Sexual harassment complaints and agency response. *Sex Roles*, *14*, 81-95. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF00287850

Connolly, T., & Zeelenberg, M. (2002). Regret in decision making. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 11*(6), 212-216. htpp://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1467-8721.00203

Cortland, C. K., Craig, M. A., Shapiro, J. R., Richeson, J. A., Neel, R., & Goldstein, N. J. (2015). *From prejudice to solidarity: Shared experiences with stigma improve intra-minority intergroup relations.* Unpublished manuscript.

Craig, M. A., & Richeson, J. A. (2016). Stigma-based solidarity: Understanding the psychological foundations of conflict and coalition among members of different stigmatized groups. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 25*(1), 1-7. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0963721415611252

Crandall, C. S., & Eshlerman, A. (2003). A justification-suppression model of the expression and experience of prejudice. *Psychological Bulletin, 129*, 414-446. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-2909.129.3.414

Cuddy, A. J. C., Fiske, S. T., & Glick, P. (2007). The BIAS map: Behaviors from intergroup affect and stereotypes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 92*(4), 631-648. https://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.92.4.631

Cunningham, F. (1987). *Democratic theory and socialism.* Cambridge University Press.

Czopp, A. M., & Monteith, M. J. (2003). Confronting prejudice (literally): Reactions to confrontations of racial and gender bias. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29*(4), 532-544. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0146167202250923

Czopp, A. M., Monteith, M. J., & Mark, A. Y. (2006). Standing up for a change: Reducing bias through interpersonal confrontation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90*(5), 784-803. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.90.5.784

Dalisay, F. & Tan, A. (2009). Assimilation and contrast effects in the priming of Asian American and African American stereotypes through TV exposure. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly, 86*, 7-22. http://dx.doi.org/ 10.1177/107769900908600102

D'Angleo, P. (2011). White fragility. *International Journal of Critical Pedagogy, 3*(3), 54-70. https://libjournal.uncg.edu/ijcp/article/viewFile/249/116

Darley, J. M. & Latané, B. (1968). Bystander intervention in emergences: Diffusion of responsibility. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 8*(4), 377-383. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/h0025589

Das, A. K., & Kemp, S. F. (1997). Between two worlds: Counseling South Asian Americans. Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 25, 23-33. doi:10.1002/j.2161- 1912.1997.tb00313.x

David, E. J. R., & Derthick, A. O. (2014). What is internalized oppression, and so what? In E. J. R. David (Ed.), Internalized oppression: The psychology of marginalized groups (pp. 1-30). Springer.

David, E. J. R. (2014). *Internalized oppression: The psychology of marginalized groups*. Springer.

DeVos, T., & Banaji, M. R. (2005). American = White? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 88*(3), 447-446. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.88.3.447

Dhingra, P. H. (2003). Being American between Black and White: Second-generation Asian American professionals' racial identities. *Journal of Asian American Studies, 6*(2), 116-147. https://muse.jhu.edu/article/51664

Din-Dzietharn, R. Nembhard, W. N., Collins, R., & Davis, S. D. (2004). Perceived stress following race-based discrimination at work is associated with hypertension in African Americans. The metro Atlanta heart disease study 1999-2001. *Social Science & Medicine, 58*, 449-461. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0277-9536(03)00211-9

Dovidio, J. F., & Gaertner, S. L. (1996). Affirmative action, unintentional racial biases, and intergroup relations. *Journal of Social Issues, 52*(4)*, 51-75.* http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540.4560.1996.tb01848.x

Dovidio, J. F., & Gaertner, S. L. (2004). Aversive racism. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology, 36* (p. 1-52). Elsevier Academic Press.

Dovidio, J. F., Gaertner, S. L., Kawakami, K., & Hodson, G. (2002). Why can't we all just get along? Interpersonal biases and interracial distrust. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 8*(2)*,* 88-102. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1099-9809.8.2.88

Dovidio, J. F., Piliavin, J. A., Gaertner, S. L., Schroeder, D. A., & Clark, R. D. III (1991). The arousal: Cost-reward model and the process of intervention: A review of the evidence. In. M. S. Clark (Ed.), *Review of Personality and Social Psychology, Vol. 12 prosocial behavior* (p. 86-118). Sage.

Eagleton, T. (1991). *Ideology.* Verso.

Eagly, A. H., & Crowley, M. (1986). Gender and helping behavior: A meta-analytic review of the social psychological literature. *Psychological Bulletin, 100*(3), 283-308. http://dx.doi.org.101037/0033-2909.100.3.283

Eagly, A. H., Wood, W., & Chaiken, S. (1978). Causal inferences about communicators and their effect on opinion change. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 36*(4), 424-435. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.36.4.424

Edlagan, C., & Vaghul, K. (2016). How data disaggregation matters for Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders. Washington Center for Equitable Growth. https://equitablegrowth.org/how-data-disaggregation-matters-for-asian-americans-and-pacific-islanders/

Edwards, K. E. (2006). Aspiring social justice ally identity development: A conceptual model. *NASPA Journal, 43*, 39-60. http://www.keithedwards.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/09/AAIDNASPA.pdf

Ellemers, N., Wilke, H., & van Knippenberg, A. (1993). Effects of legitimacy of low group or individual status on individual and collective status-enhancement strategies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 64*, 766-778. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.64.5.766

Eisenberg, N. & Eggum, N. D. (2009). Empathic responding: Sympathy and personal distress. In J. Decety & W. J. Ikes (Eds.), *The social neuroscience of empathy* (p. 72-84). MIT Press

Espelage, D. L., & Swearer, S. M. (2008). Addressing research gaps in the intersection between homophobia and bullying. *School Psychology Review, 37*(2), 155-159. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02796015.2008.12087890

Essed, P. (1991). *Understanding everyday racism.* Sage.

Fang, C. Y., & Myers, H. F. (2001). The effects of racial stressors and hostility on

    cardiovascular reactivity in African Americans and Caucasian men. *Health*

    Psychology, 20, 64-70. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0278-6133.20.1.64

Feagin, J. R. (1991). The continuing significance of race: Anti-Black discrimination in

    public places. *American Sociological review, 56*(1), 101-116. http://dx.doi.org/

    10.2307/2095676

Feagin, J. R. (2010). *Racist America: Roots, current realities, and future reparations*

    (2nd ed.). Routledge

Feagin, J. R., & Sikes, M. P. (1994). *Living with racism: The Black middle-class*

    experience. Beacon Press.

Fenton, R. A., & Mott, H. L. (2018). Evaluation of the Intervention Initiative: A

    bystander intervention program to prevent violence against women in universities.

    Violence and Victims, 33(4), 645-662. http://dx.doi.org/10.1891/0886-6708.VV-

    D-16-00074

Fenton, R. A., Mott, H. L., McCartan, K., & Rumney, P. N. S. (2014). *The intervention*

    initiative toolkit and website. Retrieved from http://www1.uwe.ac.uk/bl/research/

    interventioninitiative/thetoolkit.aspx.

Festinger, L. (1962). *A theory of cognitive dissonance*, (Vol. 2). Stanford University.

Fischer, P., Greitmeyer, T., Pollozek, F., & Frey, D. (2005). The unresponsive bystander:

    Are bystanders more responsive in dangerous emergencies. *European Journal of*

    Social psychology, 36(2), 267-278. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.297

Fisher, P. Krueger, J. I., Greitemeyer, T., Vogrincic, C., Kastenmüller, A., Frey,

    D…Kainbacher, M. (2011). The bystander-effect: A meta-analytic review on

bystander intervention in dangerous and non-dangerous emergencies. *Psychological Bulletin*, 137(4)*. 517-537.* http://dx.doi.org/10.10.1037/a0023304

Fong, C. (2001). Social preferences, self-interest, and the demand for redistribution. *Journal of Public Economics, 82*, 225-246. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/s0047-2727(00)00141-9

Fourie, M.M., Stein, D.J., Solms, M., Gobodo-Madikizela, P., & Decty, J. (2019)*.* Effects of early adversity and social discrimination on empathy for complex mental states: An fMRI investigation. *Scientific Reports,* 9. https://doi.org/10.1038/ s41598-019-49298-4

Freire, P. (1973). *Education for critical consciousness*. Continuum

Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Continuum (Original work published 1973)

Friedman, R., Chi, S., & Liu, L. A. (2006). An expectancy model of Chinese American differences in conflict avoiding. *Journal of International Business Studies, 37*(4), 76-91. http://dx.doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.jins.840017

Gaertner, S. L., Dovidio, J. F., Anastasio, P. A., Bachman, B. A., & Rust, M. C. (1993). *The Common ingroup identity model: recategorization and the reduction of intergroup bias*. John Wiley & Sons.

Gao, G. (1996). Self and other: A Chinese perspective on interpersonal relationships. In W. B. Gudykunst, S. Ting-Toomey, & T. Nishisa (Eds.), *Communication in personal relationships across cultures* (pp. 81-101). Sage

Gao, G., & Ting-Toomey S. (1998). *Communicating effective with the Chinse.* Sage

Garcia, M., Kosutic, I., McDowell, T., & Anderson, S. A. (2009). Raising critical consciousness in family therapy supervision. *Journal of Feminist Family Therapy, 21*(1), 18-38. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08952830802683673

Gee, G. C., Ro, A., Shariff-Marco, S., Chae, D. (2009). Racial discrimination and health among Asian Americans: Evidence, assessment, and directions for future research. *Epidemiological Review, 31*(1), 130-151. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/epirev/mxp009

Gilens, M. (1999). *Why Americans hate welfare: Race, media, and the politics of antipoverty policy.* University of Chicago Press.

Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (2001). An ambivalent alliance: Hostile and benevolent sexism as complementary justification for gender inequality. *American Psychology, 56*(2)*,* 109-118. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/cbo9781139022736.005

Gilovich, T., & Medvec, V. H. (1995). The experience of regret: What, when, and why. *Psychological review, 102*(2), 379-395. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.102.2.379

Goff, P. A., & Kahn, K. B. (2012). Racial bias in policing: Why we know less than we should. *Social Issues and Policy Review, 6*(1), 177-210. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-2409.2011.01039.x

Gold, S. (2004). From Jim Crow to racial hegemony: Evolving explanations of racial hierarchy. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 27*(6), 951-968. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0141987042000268549

Goodman, D. (2011). *Promoting diversity and social justice: Educating people from privileged groups*. Routledge.

Goodwin, S. & Devos, T. (2002). *American identity under siege: National and racial identities in the wake of September 11ᵗʰ attack.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society for Experimental Social Psychology, Columbus, OH.

Gill, R., & Matheson, K. (2006). Responses to discrimination: The role of emotion and expectations for emotional regulation. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 32*, 149-161. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0146167205279906

Gratch, L. V., Bassett, M. E., & Attra, S. L. (1995). The relationship of gender and ethnicity to self-silencing and depression among college students. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 19*(4), 509-515. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111.j.1471-6302.1995.tb00089.x

Greenwald, A. G. (1980). The totalitarian ego: Fabrication and revision of personal history. *American Psychologist, 35*(7), 603-618. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037//0003-066x.35.7.603

Gudykunst, B. W., & Matsumoto, Y. (1996). Cross-cultural variability of communication in personal relationships. In W. B. Gudykunst, S. Ting-Toomey, & T. Nishida (Eds.), *Communication in personal relationships across cultures.* (pp.19-56). Sage

Gudykunst, W. B., Matsumoto, Y., Ting-Toomey, S., & Nishisa, T. (1996). The influence of cultural individualism-collectivism, self-construals, and individual values on communication styles across cultures. *Human Communication Research, 22*(4), 510-543. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2958.1996.tb00377.x

Gulker, J. E., Mark, A. Y., & Monteith, M. J. (2013). Confronting prejudice: The who, what and why of confrontation effectiveness. *Social Influences*, *8*(4)*,* 280-293. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15534510.2012.736879

Gupta, A., Szymanski, D. M., & Leong, F. L. (2011). The "model minority myth": Internalized racialism of positive stereotypes as correlates of psychological distress, and attitudes toward help-seeking. *Asian American Journal of Psychology, 2*(2), 101-114. doi:10.1037/a0024183

Hafer, C. L. (2000). Do innocent victims threaten the belief in a just world? Evidence from a modified Stroop task. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 79*(2), 165-173. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.79.2.165

Haines, E. L., & Jost, J. T. (2000). Placating the powerless: Effects of legitimate and illegitimate explanation on affect, memory, and stereotyping. *Social Justice Research, 13*, 219-236. http://www.psych.nyu.edu/jost/ Haines%20&%20Jost%20(2000)Placating%20the%20powerless1.pdf

Hall, E. T. (1999). Context and meaning. In L. A. Samovar & R. E. Porter (Eds.), *Intercultural communication: A reader* (8th ed.,). Wadsworth.

Hancock, A. (2011). *Solidarity politics for millennials: A guide to ending the oppression Olympics*. Palgrave Macmillian.

Hayes, B. E. (2019). Bystander intervention to abusive behavior on social networking websites. *Violence against Women, 25*(4), 463-483. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/ 1077801218793221

Harari, H., Harari, O., & White, R. V. (1985). The reaction to rape by American male

    bystanders. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 125*, 653-658.

    https://dx.oi.org/10.1080/00334545.1985.9712039

Harris, V. A., & Robinson, C. E. (1973). Bystander intervention: Group size and victim

    status. *Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society*, *2*, 8-10. https://dx.doi.org/

    10.3758/BF03327696

Hawkins, D. L., Pepler, D. J., Craig, W. M. (2001). Naturalistic observations of peer

    interventions in bullying. *Review of Social Development, 10*(4), 512-527.

    http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1467-9507.00178

Healey, J. F. (2004). *Diversity and Society*. Pine Force Press.

Helms, J. E., Nicolas, G., & Green, C. E. (2012). Racism and ethnoviolence as trauma

    enhancing professional and research training. *Traumatology, 18*(1), 65-74.

    http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1534765610396728

Hernández, T. K. (2007). "Latino inter-ethnic employment discrimination and the

    'diversity' defense." *Harvard Civil Rights-Civil Liberties Law Review, 42*(2),

    259-316. https://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/faculty_scholarship/13

Hill, C. E. (2014). *Helping skills: Facilitating exploration, insight, and action*. American

    Psychological Association.

Hill, C. E., Knox, S., Thompson, B. J., Williams, E. N., Hess, S. A., & Ladany, N.

    (2005). Consensual qualitative research: An update. *Journal of Counseling*

    Psychology, 52(2), 196-205. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.52.2.196

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

Hinkle, S., & Brown, R. J. (1990). Intergroup comparisons and social identity. In D. Abrams, & M. A. Hogg (Eds.), *Social identity theory: Constructive and critical advances* (pp. 48-70). Springer Verlag.

hooks, b. (2004). *The will to change: Men, masculinity, and love.* Atria books.

Hogg, M. A., & Abrams, D. (1988). *Social identifications: A social psychology of intergroup relations and group processes*. Routledge.

Hortensius, R., & de Gelder, B. (2018). From empathy to apathy: The bystander effect revisited. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *27*(4), 249-256. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0963721417749653

Hsee, C. K., Hatfield, E., Carlson, J. G., & Chemtob, C. (1990). The effect of power on susceptibility to emotional contagion. *Cognition & Emotion, 4*(4), 327-340. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02699939008408081

Huynh, V. W., & Fuligni, A. J. (2010). Discrimination hurts: The academic, psychological, and physical well-being of adolescents. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 20*(4), 916-941. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-7795.2010.00670.x

Hyers, L. L. (2007). Resisting prejudice every day: Exploring women's assertive responses to anti-Black racism, anti-Semitism, heterosexism, and sexism. *Sex Roles, 56*, 1-12. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11199-006-9142-8

Iceland, J. (2017). *Race and ethnicity in America.* University of California Press.

Ickes, W. (1993). Empathic accuracy. *Journal of Personality*, *61*(4), 587-610.

> http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.1993.tb00783.x

Ickes, W., Gesn, P. R., & Graham, T. (2000). Gender differences in empathic accuracy:

> Differential ability or differential motivation? *Personal Relationships, 7*(1), 95-

> 109. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1475.6811.2000.tb00006.x

Inman, E. M., Chaudoir, S. R., Galvinhill, P. R., & Sheehy, A. M. (2018). The

> effectiveness of the Brining in the Bystander program among first-year students at

> a religiously affiliated liberal arts college. *Journal of Social and Political*

> *Psychology, 6*(2), 511-525. http://dx.doi.org/10.5964/jspp.v6i2.971

Jack, D. C., & Dill, D. (1992). The silencing the self-scale: Schemas of intimacy

> associated with depression in women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 16*(1), 97-

> 106. Http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.1992.tb00242.x

Jackman, M. R. (1994). *The velvet glove: Paternalism and conflict in gender, class, and*

> *racial relations.* University of California Press.

Jackman, M. R., & Senter, M. S. (1983). Different, therefore unequal: Beliefs about trait

> differences between groups of unequal status. *Research in Social Stratification*

> *and Mobility*, *2,* 309-335.

Jackson, J. S., Brown, K. T., & Kirby, D. C. (1998). International perspectives on

> prejudice and racism. In J. L. Eberhardt & S. T. Fiske (Eds.), *Confronting racism:*

> *The problem and the response* (p. 101-135). Sage Publications

Jemal, A. (2017). Critical consciousness: A critique and critical analysis on the literature.

> *Urban Review, 49*, 602-626. http://dx.doi.org.10.1007/s11256-017.0411-3

Johnson, A. G. (2013). *Aren't systems just people?* http://www.agjohnson.us/glad/arent-systems-just-people/

Jones, J. M. (199). *Prejudice and racism* (2nd ed.). McGraw-Hill.

Jordan, M. (2006). Blacks vs. Latinos at work: More African Americans claim they are passed over for Hispanics in hiring. *Wall Street Journal, 24*, p. B1

Jost, J. T. (2001). Outgroup favoritism and the theory of system justification: An experimental paradigm for investigating the effects of socio-economic success on stereotype content. In G. Moskowitz (Ed.), *Cognitive social psychology: The Princeton symposium on the legacy and future of social cognition* (pp. 89-201). Erlbaum.

Jost, J. T. (2017). Working class conservatism: A system justification perspective. *Current Opinion in Psychology, 18*, 73-78. http://www.psych.nyu.edu/jost/Working%20Class%20Conservatism.pdf

Jost, J. T., & Banaji, M. R. (1994). The role of stereotyping in system-justification and the production of false consciousness. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 33*, 1-27. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8309.1994.tb01008.x

Jost, J. T., Banaji, M. R., & Nosek, B. A. (2004). A decade of system justification theory: Accumulated evidence of conscious and unconscious bolstering of the status quo. *Political Psychology, 25*, 881-919. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9221.2004.00402.x

Jost, J. T. & Burgess, D. (2000). Attitudinal ambivalence and the conflict between group and system justification motives in low status groups. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 26*, 293-305. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0146167200265003

Jost, J. T., Gaucher, D., & Stern, C. (2015). "The world isn't fair": A system justification perspective on social stratification and inequality. In. M. Mikulincer & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), *APA handbook of personality and social psychology* (Vol 2, pp. 317-340). American Psychological Association.

Jost, J. T., Glaser, J., Kruglanski, A. W., & Wulloway, F. (2003). Political conservatism as motivated social cognition. *Psychological Bulletin, 129*, 339-375. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.129.3.339

Jost, J. T., & Hunyady, O. (2002). The psychology of system justification and the palliative function of ideology. *European Review of Social Psychology, 13*, 111-153. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10463280240000046

Jost, J. T., & Hunyady, O. (2005). Antecedents and consequences of system-justifying ideologies. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 14*, 260-265. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.0963-7214.2005.00377.x

Jost, J. T., Hwakins, C. B., Nosek, B. A., Hennes, E. P., Stern, C., Gosling, S. D., & Graham, J. (2014). Belief in a just god (and a just society): A system justification perspective on religious ideology. *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology, 34*, 56-81. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0033220

Jost, J. T., & Kay, A. C. (2005). Exposure to benevolent sexism and complementary gender stereotypes: Consequences for specific and diffuse forms of system justification. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 88*, 498-509. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.88.3.498

Jost, J. T., Kiveyz, Y., Rubini, M., Guermandi, G., & Mosso, C. (2005). System-justifying functions of complementary regional and ethnic stereotypes: Cross-national evidence. *Social Justice Research, 18*, 305- 333. http://dx.doi.org/ 10.1007/s11211-005-6827-z

Jost, J. T., Kruglanski, A. W., & Simon, L. (1999). Effects of epistemic motivation on conservatism, intolerance and other system-justifying attitudes. In L. L. Thompson, J. M. Levine, & D. M. Messick (Eds.), *LEA's organization and management series. Shared cognition in organizations: The management of knowledge* (pp. 91-116). Mawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Jost, J. T., Liviatan, I., van der Toorn, J., Ledgerwood, A., Mandisodza, A., & Nosek, B. A. (2010). System justification: How do we know it's motivated. In D. R. Bobocel, A. C. Kay, M. P. Zanna, & J. M. Olson (Eds.), *The psychology of justice and legitimacy: The Ontario Symposium* (Vol. 11, pp. 173-203). Erlbaum.

Jost, J. T., Pelham, B. W., & Carvallo, M. R. (2002). Non-conscious forms of system justification: Cognitive, affective, and behavioral preferences for higher status groups. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 38*, 586-602. http://dx.doi.org /10.1016/s0022-1031(02)00505

Jost, J. T., Pelham, B. W., Sheldon, O., & Sullivan, B. N. (2003). Social inequality and the reduction of ideological dissonance on behalf of the system: Evidence of enhanced system justification among the disadvantaged. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 33*, 13-36. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.127

Kaiser, C. R., & Miller, C. T. (2001). Stop complaining! The social of making

 attributions to discrimination. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 27*(2),

 254-263. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0146167201272010

Kaiser, C. R., & Miller, C. T. (2003). Derogating the victim: The interpersonal

 consequences of blaming events on discrimination. *Group Processes and

 Intergroup Relations, 6*(3), 227-237. https://depts.washington.edu/silab/

 Documents/Kaiser%20&%20Miller%20(2003).pdf

Kam, C. C. S., & Bond, M. H. (2008). Role of emotions and behavioral responses in

 mediating the impact of face loss on relationship deterioration: Are Chinese more

 face-sensitive than Americans? *Asian Journal of Social Psychology, 11*(2), 175-

 184. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-839X.2008.00254.x

Kappen, D. M., & Branscome, N. R. (2001). The effects of reasons given for ineligibility

 on perceived gender discrimination and feelings of injustice. *British Journal of

 Social Psychology, 40*, 295-313. http://dx.doi.org/10.1348/014466601164768

Katz, J. (1995). Reconstructing masculinity in the locker room: The Mentors in Violence

 Prevention Project. *Harvard Educational Review, 65*, 163-174.

 http://dx.doi.org/10.17763/haer.65.2.55533188520136ul

Katz, I., & Hass, R. G. (1988). Racial ambivalence and American value conflict:

 Correlational and priming studies of dual cognitive structures. *Journal of

 Personality and Social Psychology, 55*, 893-905. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-

 3514.55.6.893

Kawakami, K., Dunn, E., Karmali, F., & Dovidio, J. F. (2009). Mispredicting affective and behavioral responses to racism. *Science*, *323*(5911)*,* 276-278. http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/science.1164951.

Kay, A. C., & Friesen, J. (2011). On social stability and social change: understanding when system justification does and does not occur. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 20*(6), 360-364. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/ 0963721411422059

Kay, A. C., Gaucher, D., Peach, J. M., Laurin, K., Friesen, J., Zanna, M. P., & Spencer, S. J. (2009). Inequality, discrimination, and the power of the status quo: Direct evidence for a motivation to see the way things are as the way they should be. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 97*(3), 421-434. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0015997

Kay, A. C., Jimenez, M. C., & Jost, J. T. (2002). Sour grapes, sweet lemons, and the anticipatory rationalization of the status quo. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 28*(9), 1300-1312. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/01461672022812014

Kay, A. C., & Jost, J. T. (2003). Complementary justice: Effects of "poor but happy" and "poor but honest" stereotype exemplars on system justification and implicit activation of the justice motive. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 85*, 823-837. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.85.5.823

Kay, A. C., Jost, J. T., & Young, S. (2005). Victim-derogation and victim-enhancement as alternate routes to system justification. *Psychological Science, 16*(3), 204-246. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.0956-7976.2005.00810.x

Keltner, D., Gruenfeld, D. H., & Anderson, C. (2003). Power, approach, and inhibition. *Psychological Review, 110*, 265-284. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.110.2.265

Kessler, R. C., Mickelson, K., Williams, D. R. (1999). The prevalence, distribution and mental health correlates of perceived discrimination in the United States. *Journal of health and Social behavior, 40*(3), 208-230. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2676349

Kettrey, H. H., & Marx, R. A. (2019). Does the gendered approach of bystander programs matter in the prevention of sexual assault among adolescents and college students? A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, *48,* 2037-2053. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10508-019-01503-1

Kim, C. J. (1999). The racial triangulation of Asian Americans. *Politics and Society, 27*(1), 105-138. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0032329299027001005

Kim, C. J. (2004). Unyielding positions: A critique of the "race" debate. *Ethnicities, 4*(3), 337-355. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1468796804045238

Kivel, P. (2002). *Uprooting racism: How White people can work for racial justice*. New Society Publishers.

Klein, K. J., & Hodges, S. D. (2001). Gender differences, motivation, and empathic accuracy: When it pays to understand. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 27*(6), 720-730. http://dx.doi/10.1177/0146167201276007

Kluegel, J. R., & Smith, E. R. (1986). Beliefs about inequality: American's view of what is and what ought to be. *Social institutions and social change. Beliefs about inequality: Americans' views of what is and what out to be.* Aldine de Gruyter.

Kowalski, M. (1996). Complaints and complaining functions, antecedents, and consequences. *Psychological Bulletin, 119*, 179-195. http://dx.doi.org/ 10.1037/0033-2909.119.2.179

Kuo, W. H. (1995). Coping with racial discrimination: The case of Asian Americans. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 18*(1), 109-127. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/ 01419870.1995.9993856

Ladany, N., Thompson, B. J., & Hill, C. E. (2012). Cross-analysis. In C. E. Hill (Ed.), *Consensual qualitative research: A practical resource for investigating social science phenomena* (p. 117-134). American Psychological Association.

Lane, R. E. (1962). The fear of equality. In R. E. Lane (Ed.), *Political ideology: Why the American common man believes what he does* (pp. 57-81). Free Press.

Latané, B. & Darley, J. M (1970). *The unresponsive bystander: Why doesn't he help?* Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Latané, B., & Nida, S. (1981). Ten years of research on group size and helping. *Psychological Bulletin, 89*(2), 30-324. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909- 89.2.308

Laurin, K., Fitzsimons, G. M., & Kay, A. C. (2011). Social disadvantages and the self-regulatory function of justice beliefs. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 100*, 149-171. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0021343

Laurin, K., Shepherd, S. & Kay, A. C. (2010a). System inescapability and defense of the status quo: System-justifying consequences of restricted exit opportunities. *Psychological Science, 21*, 1075-1082. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/ 095679710375448

Laurin, K., Shepherd, S., & Kay, A. C. (2010b). Restricted emigration, system inescapability, and defense of the status quo: System-justifying consequences of restricted exist opportunities. *Psychological Science, 21*, 1075-1082. http://dx.doi.org.10.1177/09567976103755448

Lee, C.-W. (2002). Referent role and styles of handling interpersonal conflict: Evidence from a national ample of Korean local government employees. *The International Journal of Conflict Management, 13*(2), 127-141. http://dx.doi.org/ 10.1108/eb022871

Lee, J. (2016). *Coping with racial/ethnic discrimination: The role of color-blind racial ideology among Asian Americans* (doctoral dissertation). https://conservancy. umn.edu/handle/11299/182802

Lee, J., & Bean, F. D. (2007). Redrawing the color line? *City and Community, 6*(1), 49-62. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6040.2007.00198.x

Lee, E. A., Soto, J. A., Swim, J. K., Bernstein, M. J. (2012). Bitter reproach or sweet revenge: Cultural differences in response to racism. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 38*(7), 920-932. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/ 0146167212440292

Lent, R. W., & Brown, S. D. (2006). On conceptualizing and assessing social cognitive constructs in career research: A measurement guide. *Journal of Career Assessment, 14*, 12-35. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1069072705281364

Lerner, M. (1980). *The belief in a just world: A fundamental delusion.* University of Waterloo.

Levine, M. (1999). Rethinking bystander non-intervention: Social categorization and the

    evidence of witnessing at the James Bugler trial. *Human Relations, 52*(9), 1-23.

    http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/001872679905200902

Levine, M., Cassidy, C., Brazier, G., & Reicher, S. (2002). Self-categorization and

    bystander non-intervention: Two experimental studies. *Journal of Applied Social*

    Psychology, 32(7), 1452-1463. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-

    1816.2002.tb01446.x

Levine, M. & Crowther, S. (2009). The responsive bystander: How social group

    membership and group size can encourage as well as inhibit bystander

    intervention. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 95*(6), 1429-1439.

    http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0012634

Levine, M., Philpot, R., & Kovalenko, A. G. (2019). Rethinking the bystander effect in

    violence reduction training programs. *Social Issues and Policy Review, 14*(1), 1-

    24. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/sipr.12063

Levin, M., Prosser, A., Evans, D., & Reicher, S. (2005). Identity and emergency

    intervention: How social group membership and inclusiveness of group

    boundaries shape helping behavior. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin,*

    31(4), 443-453. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0146167204271651

Levine, M., & Thompson, K. (2004). Identity, place, and bystander intervention: Social

    categories and helping after natural disasters. *The Journal of Social Psychology,*

    144(3), 229-245. http://dx.doi.org/10.3200/SOCP.144.3.229-245

Lewis, A. E. (2003). *Race in the schoolyard: Negotiating the color line in classrooms*

    and communities. Rutgers University Press

Lim, L. L. (2009). The influence of harmony motives and implicit beliefs on conflict styles of the collectivist. *International Journal of Psychology, 44*(6), 401-409. Http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00207590802512765

Link, M. W., & Oldendick, R. W. (1996). Social construction and White attitudes toward equal opportunity and multiculturalism. *The Journal of Politics, 58*(1), 149-168. http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayJournal?jid=JOP

Lipsky, S. (1987). *Internalized racism.* Seattle, WA: Rational Island Publishers.

Liu, W. M. (2017). White male power and privilege: The relationship between White supremacy and social class. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 64*(4), 349-358. http://ex.doi.org/10.1037/cou0000227

Liu, J., Hiu, C., Lee, C., & Chen, Z. X. (2012). Fulfilling obligations: Why Chinese employees stay. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 23*(1), 35-51. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2011.606119

Liu, W. M., Liu, R. Z., Garrison, Y. L., Kim, J.Y.C., Chan, L., Ho, Y.C.S., Yeung, C. W. (2019). Racial trauma, microaggressions, and becoming racially innocuous: The role of acculturation and white supremacist ideology. *American psychologist, 74*(1), 143-155. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/amp0000368

Lodge, J., & Frydenberg, E. (2005). The role of peer bystanders in school bullying: Positive steps toward promoting peaceful schools. *Theory into Practice, 44*, 329-336. https://www.jstor.org/stable/3496976

Loewen, J. (1971). *The Mississippi Chinese: Between Black and White.* Harvard University Press

Lowe, R. D., Levine, M., & Best, R. M. (2012). Bystander reaction to women fighting:

    Developing a theory of intervention. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 27*(9),

    1802-1826. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0886260511430393

Mackie, D. M., DeVos T., & Smith, E. R. (2000). Intergroup emotions: Explaining

    offensive action tendencies in an intergroup context. *Journal of Personality and

    Social Psychology, 79*(4), 602-616. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037//0022-

    3514.79.4.602

Magee, J. C., & Galinsky, A. (2008). Social hierarchy: The self-reinforcing nature of

    power and status. *Academy of Management Annals*, *2*(1). 351-398.

    http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/19416520802211628

Mallett, R. K., Huntsinger, J. R., & Swim, J. K. (2011). The role of system-justification

    motivation, group status and system threat in directing support for hate crimes

    legislation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 47*(2), 384-390.

    http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2010.10.014.

Mallett, R. K., & Wagner, D. E. (2011). The unexpectedly positive consequences of

    confronting sexism. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 47*(1), 215-220.

    http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2010.10.001

Marinari, M. (2005). Racial formation and success among Korean high school students.

    The Urban Review, 37(5), 375-398. http://dx.doi.org.10.1007/s11256-005-0019-x

Marshall, M. N. (1996). Sampling for qualitative research. *Family Practice, 13,* 522-525.

Martorana, P. V., Galinsky, A. D., & Rao, H. (2005). From system justification to system

    condemnation: Antecedents of attempts to change power hierarchies. *Status and

    Groups, 7,* 285-315. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1534-0856(05)07012-X

Mauss, I. B., Butler, E. A., Roberts, N. A., & Chu, A. (2010). Emotion control values and responding to an anger provocation in Asian American and European American individuals. *Cognition and Emotion, 24*(6), 1026-1043. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02699930903122273

McConahay, J. B. (1986). Modern racism, ambivalence, and the Modern Racism Scale. In J. F. Dovidio & S. L. Gaertner (Eds.), *Prejudice, discrimination and racism* (pp. 91-126). Academic Press.

Meyerson, D. (1991). *False consciousness*. Clarendon Press.

Miller, M. J. & Sendrowitz, K. (2011). Counseling psychology trainee's social justice interest and commitment. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 58*(2), 159-169. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a002263

Miller, M. J., Sendrowitz, K., Connacher, C., Blanco, S., Muñiz de la Peña, C., Morere, L., Bernardi, S. (2007). *Development of the SIQ.* Unpublished manuscript

Miller, M. J., Sendrowitz, K., Connacher, C., Blanco, S., Muñiz de la Peña, C., Morere, L. (2009). College students' social justice interest and commitment: A social-cognitive perspective. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 56*(4), 495-507. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0017220

Mizock, L., & Page, K. V. (2016). Evaluating the ally role: Contributions, limitations, and the activist position in counseling and psychology. *Journal for Social Action in Counseling and Psychology*, *8*(1), 17-33. http://dx.doi.org/10.10.33043/JSACP.8.1.17-33

Moore, J. L., & Constantine, M. G. (2005). Development and initial validation of the collectivistic coping styles measure with African, Asian, and Latin American

international students. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling, 27*(4), 329-347. http://dx.doi.org/10.17744/mehc.27.4.frcqxuy1we5nwpqe

Munin, A., Speight, S. L. (2010). Factors influencing the ally development of college students. *Journal of Equity & Excellence in Education, 43*(2), 249-264. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10665681003704337

Musesu, S. D., & Kiang, P. N. (2009). Deconstructing the model minority myth and how it contributes to the invisible minority reality in higher education research. *New Directions for Institutional Research, 142*(9)*,* 5-15. http://dx.doi.org/ 10.1002/ir.292

Museus, S. D., & Truong, K. A. (2009). Disaggregating qualitative data from Asian American college students in campus racial climate research and assessment. *New Directions for Institutional Research, 142*, 17-26. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ir

Napier, J. L., & Jost, J. T. (2008). Why are conservatives happier than liberals? *Psychological Science, 19*(2), 565-572. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2008.02124.x

Neville, H. A., Coleman, M. N., Falconer, J. W., & Holmes, D. (2005). Color-blind racial ideology and psychological false consciousness among African Americans. *Journal of Black Psychology, 31*, 27-45. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/ 0095798404268287

Neville, H. A., Lilly, R. L., Duran, G., Lee, R. M., & Browne, L. (2000). Construction and initial validation of the Color-Blind Racial Attitudes Scale (CoBRAS). *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 47*(1), 59-70. Httpp://dx.doi.org/ 10.1037/0022-0167.47.1.59

Nicksa, S. C. (2014). Bystander's willingness to report theft, physical assault, and sexual assault: The impact of gender, anonymity, and relationship with the offender. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 29*(2), 217-236. http://dx.doi.org/ 10.1177/0886260513505146

Nickereson, R. S. (1999). How we know – and sometimes misjudge – what others know: Imputing one's own knowledge to others. *Psychology Bulletin, 125*(6), 737-759. https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/2850/3fb675e59d00a8cca49bc37d474e07888ae2. pdf

Niemann, Y. F., Jennings, L., Rozelle, R. M., Baxter, J. C., & Sullivan, E. (1994). Use of free responses and cluster analysis to determine stereotypes of eight groups. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 20*(4), 379-390. http://dx.doi.org/ 10.1177/0146167294204005

Noh, S., Beiser, M., Kaspar, V., Hou, F., & Rummens, J. (1999). Perceived racial discrimination, depression, and coping: A study of Southeast Asian refugees in Canada. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 40*(3), 193-207. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2676348

Nosek, B. A., Banaji, M. R., & Greenwald, A. G. (2002). Harvesting implicit group attitudes and beliefs from a demonstration web site. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice, 6*(1), 101-115. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037//1089-2699.6.1.101

Oerzel, J., Ting-Toomey, S., Chew-Sanchez, M. I., Harris, R., Wilcox, R., & Stumpf, S. Face and facework in conflicts with parents and siblings: A cross-cultural

comparison of Germans, Japanese, Mexicans, and U.S. Americans. *Journal of Family Communications, 3*(2), 67-93. http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/ S15327698JFC0302_01

Ohbuchi, K. I., & Atsumi, E. (2010). Avoidance brings Japanese employees what they care about conflict management: Its functionality and "good member" image. *Negotiation and Conflict Management Research, 3*(2), 117-129. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1750-4716.2010.00052.x

Ohbuchi, K.-I., Fukushima, O., & Tedeschi, J. T. (1999). Cultural values in conflict management: Goal orientation, goal attainment, and tactical decision. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 30*(1), 51-71. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/ 0022022199030001003

Omi, M., & Winant, H. (1994). *Racial formation in the United States from the 1960s to the 1990s*. (2nd ed). Routledge.

Osajima, K. (1993). The hidden injuries of race. In L. A. Revilla, G. M. Nomura, S. Wong, & S. Hune (Eds.), *Bearing dreams, shaping visions: Asian Pacific American perspectives* (pp. 81-91). Washington State University

Osajima, K. (2005). Asian Americans as the model minority: An analysis of the popular press image in the 1960s and 1980s. In K. Ono (Ed.), *A companion to Asian American studies* (pp. 215-225). Blackwell.

Overbeck, J. R., Jost, J. T., Mosso, C. O., & Flizik, A. (2004). Resistant versus acquiescent responses to ingroup inferiority as a function of social dominance orientation in the USA and Italy. *Group Processes and Ingroup Relations, 7*(1), 35-54. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1368430204039972

Owuamalam, C. K., Rubin, M., Spears, R. (2016). The system justification conundrum: Re-examining the cognitive dissonance basis for system justification. *Frontiers in Psychology, 7*. http://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.1889

Owuamalam, C. K., Rubin, M., Spears, R., Weerabangsa, M. M. (2017). Why do people from low-status groups support class systems that disadvantage them? A test of two mainstream explanations in Malaysia and Australia. *Journal of Social Issues, 73*, 80-98. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/josi.12205

Oyserman, D., Coon, H. M., & Kemmelmeier, M. (2002). Rethinking individualism and collectivism: Evaluation of theoretical assumption and meta-analyses. *Psychological Bulletin, 128*(1), 3-72. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.128.1.3

Palmer, J. E., Nicksa, S. C., McMahon, S. (2018). Does who you know affect how you act? The impact of relationships on bystander intervention in interpersonal violence situations. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 33*(17), 2623-2642. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0886260516628292

Park, Y. S., & Kim, B. S. K., (2008). Asian and European American cultural values and communication styles among Asian American and European American college students. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 14*(1), 47-56. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1099-9809.14.1.47

Patton, M. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. Sage.

Pettigrew, T. F., & Meertens, R. W. (1995). Subtle and blatant prejudice in Western Europe. *European Journal of Social psychology, 25*(1), 57-75. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2420250106

Petty, R. E., Fleming, M. A., Prister, J. R., & Feinstein, A. H. (2001). Individual versus group interest violation: Surprise as a determinant of argument scrutiny and persuasion. *Social Cognition, 19*(14), 418-442. http://dx.doi.org/10.1521/soco/19.4.418.20758

Pew Research Center (2012). The rise of Asian Americans.https://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2012/06/19/the-rise-of-asian-americans

Pheterson, G. (1986). Alliances between women: Overcoming internalized oppression and internalized domination. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 12*(1), 146-160. http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/494302

Philpot, R., Liebst, L. S., Levine, M., Bernasco, W., & Lindegaard, M. R. (2019). Would I be helped? Cross-national CCTV footage shows that intervention is the norm in public conflicts. *American Psychologist, 75*(1), 66-75. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/amp0000469

Pierce, C., Carew, J., Pierce-Gonzalez, D., & Willis, D. (1978). An experiment in racism: TV commercials. In C. Pierce (Ed.), *Television and education* (pp. 62-88). Sage.

Plant, E. A., & Devine, P. G. (1998). Internal and external motivation to respond without prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75*(3), 811-832. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.75.3.811

Polkinghorne, D. E. (1991). Qualitative procedures for counseling research. In C. E. Watkins & L. J. Scheider (Eds.), *Research in counseling* (pp.163-204). Erlbaum

Prashad, V. (2001). *The Karama of Brown folk*. Minnesota Press.

Prilleltensky, I., & Laurier, W. (1996). Polities change, oppression remains: On the psychology and politics of oppression. *Political Psychology, 17*(1), 127-148. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3791946

Pronk, J., Olthof, T., & Goossens, F. (2014). Factors influencing interventions on behalf of victims of bullying: A counterfactual approach to the social cognitions of outsides and defenders. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 36*, 267-291. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1086063

Pyke, K. D. (2010). What is internalized racial oppression and why don't we study it: Acknowledging racism's hidden injuries. *Sociological Perspectives, 53*(4)*,* 551-572. http://dx.doi.org/10.1525/sop.2010.53.4.551

Pyszczynski, T., Solomon, S., & Greenberg, J. (2003). *In the wake of 9/11: The psychology of terror.* American Psychological Association

Rahim, M. A. (1986). Referent role and styles of handling interpersonal conflict. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 126*(1), 79-86. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080. 00224545.1986.9713573

Randall, B. A., & Wenner, J. R. (2014). Adopting a multidimensional perspective on college students' prosocial behaviors. In L. M. Padilla-Walker & G. Carlo (Eds.), *Prosocial development: A multidimensional perspective* (pp. 374-392*)*. Oxford University Press

Rasinski, H. M., & Czopp, A. M. (2010). The effect of target status on witnesses' reactions to confrontation bias. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 32*(1), 8-16. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01973530903539754

Reid, L. D., & Foels, R. (2010). Cognitive complexity and the perception of subtle

    racism. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 32*(4), 291-201.

    http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01973533.2010.519217

Root, M. P. P. (1995). The psychology of Asian American women. In H. Landrine (Ed.),

    Bringing cultural diversity to feminist psychology: Theory, research, and practice

    (pp. 265-301). American Psychological Association.

Ross, A. S., & Braband, J. (1973). Effect of increased responsibility on bystander

    intervention: II. The cue value of a blind person. *Journal of Personality and*

    Social Psychology, 25(2), 254-258. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/h0033964

Rothbaum F., & Rusk, N. (2011). Pathways to emotion regulation: Cultural differences in

    internalization. In X. Chen & K. H. Rubin (Eds.), *Social, emotional, and*

    personality development in context. Socioemotional development in cultural

    context (pp. 99-127). The Guilford Press.

Rudman, L. A., Feinberg, J., & Fairchild, K. (2002). Minority members' implicit

    attitudes: Automatic ingroup bias as a function of group status. *Social Cognition,*

    20(4), 294-320. http://dx.doi.org/10.1521/soco.20.4.294.19908

Rumbaut, R. G. (1994). The crucible within: Ethnic identity, self-esteem, and segmented

    assimilation among children of immigrants. *International Migration Review,*

    28(4), 748-794. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2547157

Saad, L. (2003). *Iraq war triggers major rally effect: Falls just short of 1991 surge in*

    public attitudes (Poll analyses, Gallup Organization). Retrieved 12 July 2004

    from http://www.gallup.com/content/login/aspx?ci=8074

Salmivalli, C., Voeten, R., & Poskiparta, E. (2011). Bystanders matter: Association between reinforcing, defending, and the frequency of bullying behavior in classrooms. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology, 40*(5), 668-676. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15374416.2011.597090

Sanders-Thompson, V. L. (1996). Perceived experiences of racism as stressful life events. *Community mental health journal, 32*(3), 223-233. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF02249424

Schwartz, S. H., & Clausen, G. T. (1970). Responsibility, norms, and helping in an emergency. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 16*(2), 99-310. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/h0029842

Scully, M., & Rowe, M. (2009). Bystander training within organizations. *Journal of the international Ombudsman Association*, *2*(1)*,* 1-9. https://mitsloan.mit.edu/shared/ods/documents/?PublicationDocumentID=5396

Sears, D. O. (1988). Symbolic racism. In P. A. Katz & D. A. Taylor (Eds.), *Eliminating racism*: *Profiles in controversy* (pp. 53-84). Plenum.

Settles, I. H., Buchanan, N. T., & Dotson, K. (2018). Scrutinized but not recognized: (In)visibility and hypervisibility experience of faculty of color. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 113*, 62-74. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2018.06.003

Shelton, J. N., Richeson, J. A., Salvatore, J., & Hill, D. M. (2006). Silence is not golden: The intrapersonal consequences of not confronting prejudice. In S. Levin & C. van Laar (Eds.), *Stigma and intergroup inequality: Social psychological perspectives* (pp. 65-81). Erlbaum.

Shelton, J. N., & Stewart, R. E. (2004). Confronting perpetrators of prejudice: The inhibitory effects of social costs. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 28*(3), 215-233. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.2004.00138.x.

Shepherd, S., & Kay, A. C. (2012). On the perpetuation of ignorance: System dependence, system justification, and the motivated avoidance of sociopolitical information. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 102*(2), 264-280. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0026272

Sidanius, J. & Pratto, F. (1999). *Social dominance: An intergroup theory of social hierarchy of oppression*. Cambridge University Press.

Smith, W. A. (2004). Black faculty coping with racial battle fatigue: The campus racial climate in a post-civil rights era. In D. Cleveland (Ed.), *A long way to go: Conversations about race by African American faculty and graduate students at predominately White institutions* (pp. 171-190). Peter Lang.

Smith, W. A. (2009). Higher education: Racial battle fatigue. In R. T. Schaefer (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of race, ethnicity, and society* (pp. 615-618). Sage.

Smith, W. A., Hung, M., & Franklin, J. D. (2011). Racial battle fatigue and the miseducation of Black men: Microaggressions, societal problems and environmental stress. *The Journal of Negro Education, 80*(1), 63-82. https://www.jstor.org/stable/41341106

Sniderman, P. M., & Piazza T. (1993). *The scar of race*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap.

Song, M. (2004). Introduction: Who's at the bottom? Examining claims about racial hierarchy. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 27*(6), 859-877. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0141987042000268503

Stalder, D. R. (2008). Revisting the issue of safety in numbers: The likelihood of

    receiving help from a group. *Journal of Social Influence, 3*(1), 24-33.

    http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15534510701766181

Stangnor, C., Swim, J. K., Van Allen, K. L., & Sechrist, G. B. (2002). Reporting

    discrimination in public and private contexts. *Journal of Personality and Social*

    Psychology, 82(1), 69-74. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.82.1.69

Staub, E. (2011). *Overcoming evil: Genocide, violent conflict, and terrorism.* Oxford

    University Press.

Staub, E. (2019). Witnesses/Bystander: The tragic fruits of passivity, the power of

    bystanders, and promoting active bystandership in children, adults, and groups.

    Journal of Social Issues, 75(4), 1262-1293. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/josi.12351

Stein, G. L, Gonzalez, L. M., & Huq, N. (2012). Cultural stressors and the hopelessness

    model of depressive symptoms in Latino adolescents. *Journal of Youth and*

    Adolescents, 41(10), 1339-1349. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10964-012-9756-8

Stinson, L., & Ickes, W. (1992). Empathic accuracy in the interactions of male friends

    versus male strangers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 62*(5), 787-

    797. http://dx.doi.org/10.10.1037//0022-3514.62.5.787

Sue, D. W. (2005). Racism and the conspiracy of silence: Presidential address. *The*

    Counseling Psychologist, 33(1), 100-114. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/

    0011000004270686

Sue, D. W., Alsaidi, S., Awad, M. N., Glaeser, E., Calle, C. Z., & Mendez, N. (2019).

    Disarming racial microaggressions: Microinterventions strategies for targets,

White allies, and bystanders. *American Psychologist, 74*(1), 128-142.

http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/amp0000296

Sue, D. W., Buccer, J., Lin, A. I., Nadal, K. L., & Torinio, G. C. (2007). Racial

microaggressions and the Asian American experience. *Cultural Diversity and*

Ethnic Minority Psychology, 13(1), 72-81. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1099-

9809.12.1.72

Sue, D. W., Capodilupo, C. M., & Holder, A. M. B. (2008). Racial microaggressions in

the life experiences of Black Americans. *Professional Psychology: Research and*

Practice, 39(3), 329-336. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0735-7028.39.3.329

Sue, D. W., & Constantine, M. G. (2007). Racial microaggressions as instigators of

difficulty dialogues on race: Implications for student affairs educators and

students. *College Student Affairs Journal, 26*(2), 136-143.

https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ899387.pdf

Sue, D. W., & Sue, D. (2003). *Counseling the culturally diverse: Theory and practice.*

Wiley.

Swim, J. K., Cohen, L. L., & Hyers, L. L. (1998). Experiencing everyday prejudice and

discrimination. In J. K. Swim & C. Stangor (Eds.), *Prejudice: The target's*

perspective (p. 37-60). Academic Press.

Swim, J. K., Eyssell, K. M., Murdoch, E. Q., & Ferguson, M. J. (2010). Self-silencing to

sexism. *Journal of Social Issues, 66*(3), 493-507. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/

j.1540-4560.2010.01658.x

Swim, J. K., Hyers, L. L., Cohen, L. L., Fitzgerald, D. C., & Bylsma, W. H. (2003).

African American college students' experiences with everyday racism:

Characteristics of and responses to these incidents. *Journal of Black Psychology,
29*(1), 38-67. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0095798402239228

Swim, J. K. & Thomas, M. A. (2006). Responding to everyday discrimination: A
synthesis of research on goal-directed, self-regulatory coping behaviors. In S.
Levin, & C. van Laar (Eds.), *Stigma and group inequality.* Lawrence Erlbaum
Associates

Tajfel, H. (1981). *Human groups and social categories.* Cambridge University

Tajfel, H. (1982). Social Psychology of Intergroup relations. *Annual Review of
Psychology, 33*, 1-39. http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ps.33.020182.000245

Tajfel, J. C., & Turner, J. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G.
Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations.*
Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S.
Worchel & W. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations.* Nelson-Hall.

Takaki, R. (1993). *A different mirror: A history of multicultural America.* Little, Brown
& Co.

Tawa, J. (2013). *The influences of social identities and resource competition on Blacks'
and Asians' social distance: A virtual world method*. University of Massachusetts
Press.

Thoits, P. A. (1991). On merging identity theory and stress research. *Social Psychology
Quarterly, 54*(2), 101-112. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2786929

Thompson, C. E., & Neville, H. A. (1999). Racism, mental health, and mental health
practice. *The Counseling Psychology, 27*(2), 155-223. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/

0011000099272001

Ting-Toomey, S. (2005). Identity negotiation theory: Crossing cultural boundaries. In W. B. Gudykunst (Ed.), *Theorizing about intercultural communication* (pp. 211-233). Sage publications Ltd.

Ting-Toomey, S., Yee-Jung, K. K., Shapiro, R. B., Garcia, W., Wright, T. J., & Oetzel, J. G. (2000). Ethnic/cultural identity salience and conflict styles in four US ethnic groups. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 24*(1), 47-81. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0147-1767(99)00023-1

Tjosvold, D., & Sun, H. F. (2002). Understanding conflict avoidance: Relationship, motivations, actions and consequences. *International Journal of Conflict Management, 13*(2), 142-164. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/eb022872

Triandis, H. C. (1990). Cross-cultural studies of individualism and collectivism. In J. J. Berman (Ed.), *Current theory and research in motivation,* (Vol. 37). *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation, 1989: Cross-cultural perspectives* (pp. 41-133). University of Nebraska Press.

Tsai, W., & Lau, A. S. (2013). Cultural differences in emotion regulation during self-reflection on negative personal experience. *Cognition & Emotion, 27*(3), 416-429. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02699931.2012.715080

Tuan, M. (1998). *Forever foreigners or honorary Whites? The Asian ethnic experience today.* Rutgers University Press.

Turner, J. C., Hogg, M. A., Oakes, P. J., Reicher, S. D., & Wetherell, M. C. (1987). *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory.* Basil Blackwell

Tyler, T. R., & Huo, Y. J., (2002). Trust in the law: Encouraging public cooperation with the police and courts. Russell-Sage.

US Bureau of the Census (2012). Facts for features: Asian American heritage month. http://www.census.gov. ezproxy1.lib.asu.edu/newsroom/releases/pdf/ cb12ff09_asian.pdf.

van den Bos, K., Müller, P. A., & van Bussel, A. A. L. (2009). Helping to overcome intervention inertia in bystander's dilemmas: Behavioral disinhibition can improve the greater good. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 45*(4), 873-878. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2009.03.014

Van der Toorn, J., & Jost, J. T. (2014). Twenty years of system justification theory: Introduction to the special issue on ideology and system justification processes. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 17*(4), 413-419. http://dx.doi.org/ 10.1177/1368430214531509

Van der Toorn, J., Tyler, T. R., & Jost, J. T. (2011). More than fair: Outcome dependence, system justification, and the perceived legitimacy of authority figures. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 47*(1), 127-138. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2010.09.003

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. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/ 0146167211416130

Wang, J., Siy, J. O., & Cheryan, S. (2011). Racial discrimination and mental health among Asian American youth. In F. Leong, L. Juang, & D. B. Qin (Eds.), *Asian*

American and Pacific Islander children and mental health (pp. 219-242). ABC-CLIO

Watts, R. J., & Flanagan, C. (2007). Pushing the envelope on youth civic engagement: A developmental and liberation psychology perspective. *Journal of Community Psychology, 35*(6), 779-792. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/jcop.20178

Weitzman, A., Cowan, S., & Walsh, K. (2017). Bystander intervention on behalf of sexual assault and intimate partner violence victims. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 35*(7), 1694-1718. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0886260517696873

Williams, D. R. (2018). Stress and the mental health of populations of color: Advancing our understanding of race-related stressors. *Journal of health and social behavior, 59*(4), 466-485. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0022146518814251

Williams, M. J. & Chen, S. (2014). When "mom's the boss": Control over domestic decision making reduces women's interest in workplace power. *Group Process & Intergroup Relations, 17*(4), 436-452. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1368430213497065

Williams, D. R., Neighbors, H. W., & Jackson, J. S. (2003). Racial/ethnic discrimination and health: Findings from community studies. *American Journal of Public Health, 93*(2), 200-208. http://dx.doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.93.2.200

Williams, D. R., & Williams-Morris, R. (2000). Racial and mental health: The African American experience. *Ethnicity & Health, 5*(3), 243-268. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/135578500200009356

Wong, F., Halgin, R. (2006). The "model minority": Bane or blessing for Asian Americans? *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 34*(1), 38-49. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/j.2161-1912.2006.tb00025.x

Wu, F. H. (2002). *Yellow: Race in American beyond Black and White*. Basic Books

Xu, J., & Lee, J. C. (2013). The marginalized "model" minority: An empirical examination of the racial triangulation of Asian Americans. *Social Forces, 91*(4), 1363-1397. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/sf/sot049

Xu, X., Zuo, X., Wang, X., & Han, S. (2009). Do you feel my pain? Racial group membership modulates empathic neural responses. *Journal of Neuroscience, 29*(26), 8525-2529. http://dx.doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2418-09.2009

Yeh, C. J., Arora, A. W., & Wu, K. A. (2006). A new theoretical model of collectivistic coping. In P. T. P. Wong & L. C. J. (Eds.), *International and Cultural Psychology Series. Handbook of multicultural perspectives on stress and coping* (pp. 55-72). Spring Publications.

Yip, T. (2016). To be or not to be: How ethnic/racial stereotypes influence ethnic/racial disidentification and psychological mood. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology, 22*(1), 38-46. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/cdp0000036

Yip, T., Gee, G. C., & Takeuchi, D. T. (2008). Racial discrimination and psychological distress: The impact of ethnic identity an age among immigrant and United States-born Asian adults. *Developmental Psychology, 44*(3), 787-800. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.44.3.787

Yoo, H. C., Burrolo, K. S., & Steger, M. F. (2010). A preliminary report on a new measure: Internalization of the Model Minority Myth Measure (IM-4) and its

psychological correlates among Asian American college students. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 57*(1), 114-127. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0017871

Yoo, H. C., Gee, G. C., Lowthrop, C. K., Robertson, J. (2010). Self-reported racial discrimination and substance use among Asian Americans in Arizona. *Journal of Immigrant and Minority Health, 12*(5), 683-690. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10903-009-9306-z

Zhou, M. (2004). Are Asian Americans becoming "White?" *Contexts, 3*(1), 29-37. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1525/ctx.2004.3.1.29

Zoccola, P. M., Green, M. C., Karoutsos, E., Katona, S. M., & Sabini, J. (2011). The embarrassed bystander: Embarrassability and the inhibition of helping. *Personality and Individual Differences, 51*(8), 959-9. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2011.07/026

Zou, L. X., & Cheryan, S. (2017). Two axes of subordination: A new model of racial position. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 112*(5), 696-717. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/pspa000080

Zou, L. X., & Dickter, C. L. (2013). Perceptions of racial confrontation: The role of color blindness and comment ambiguity. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, *19*(1). 92-96. http://dx.doi.org/10.10.1037/a003115