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Abstract

Racism is a pervasive form of harm which has been found to contribute to negative outcomes for both individuals and society. Toward a more just society, anti-racist activism can create safer environments, reduce structural inequities, and improve interpersonal relations. To address prejudice, many studies have examined how interracial contact reduces prejudice in White Americans; however, less research has focused on the application of these factors on White American antiracist activist behaviors. This study sought to provide further support for Intergroup Contact Theory and the influence of established mediators of empathy and intergroup anxiety on activist behaviors. Data from 384 White American adults were used to examine the associations between interracial contact, interracial anxiety, empathy, colorblind attitudes, and antiracist activism. Multivariate multiple regression analysis was conducted to examine how empathy and intergroup anxiety differentially predict prejudice, individual anti-racist activism, and collective anti-racist activism; as well as if empathy and intergroup anxiety mediate the relations between interracial contact and these outcomes. The analysis found empathy to be a central factor in anti-racist activism of White Americans, mediating the relation between interracial contact and two forms of activism: institutional and individual. Practical implications and future research directions are discussed.
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Racism, the ideology of White superiority, is an inherent, ordinary and normal experience embedded in the society of the United States (Delgado & Stefancic, 2017) which contributes to racial disparities in health, education, and employment among other domains (Williams et al., 2016). To address prejudice in U.S. society, many studies have examined how interracial contact reduces prejudice in White Americans; however, less research has focused on the application of these factors on White American antiracist activism (Dovidio et al., 2017), which may be an important factor in promoting change toward a more equitable society. Studies examining the influence of intergroup contact on activism focus on structural forms of activism such as protesting and writing letters to public officials (Górska et al., 2020; Yi et al., 2019), however, it is equally important to understand factors which contribute to individual-level activism such as interrupting a racist joke. The present research sought to provide further support for Intergroup Contact Theory (Allport, 1954) and the influence of established mediators of intergroup anxiety and empathy (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2008) on prejudice and activist behaviors while examining how these established mediators differentially predict prejudice, individual anti-racist activism, and collective anti-racist activism.

**Racism and Racial Discrimination**

Racial discrimination refers to the behavioral manifestation of racial superiority (e.g., substandard treatment, verbal assault, etc.) at the individual, institutional, and cultural levels (Kirkinis et al., 2018). Social norms have changed over time and as a result racial discrimination has taken different forms (e.g., Jim Crow, redlining, physical aggression, etc.). Often termed “modern racism,” current forms of racial discrimination can be subtle in nature and at times unintentional (Neville et al., 2013). As social tides turned, American society relied on egalitarian principles and values of meritocracy and justice (Neville et al., 2013), however, these principles
continue to ignore systems which function inequitably (e.g., redlining, police brutality, etc.). As a result, people who are unaware of racial inequities (Helms, 1995) as well as those who are attempting to reject overt racism may engage in colorblind ideology (Gushue & Constantine, 2007), a contemporary form of racial prejudice which purports that race should not be discussed and does not influence opportunities in life (Neville et al., 2013).

Within counseling psychology, awareness of racial discrimination has important implications for development as a therapist, as well as implications for interventions to discuss and challenge racism in therapy (Gushue & Constantine, 2007). The APA Multicultural guidelines (2017) discuss the importance of counseling psychologists developing an understanding of themselves as cultural beings, increasing awareness of personal beliefs as well as historical and contemporary expressions of privilege, power, and oppression. These guidelines highlight the harm of colorblind ideology. Counselors who do not engage colorblind ideology may be better able to understand issues facing clients of color, assess the normative nature of client emotions and behaviors, and provide more culturally sensitive treatment (Gushue & Constantine, 2007). Identifying the factors involved in reducing colorblind ideology may be a valuable aspect in training counselors to be competent in working with clients from a variety of backgrounds.

Counseling psychologists also have an ethical responsibility to address prejudicial beliefs of clients when these are inconsistent with the client’s personal morals and negatively impact mental health functioning (Fisher, 2017). Understanding the underlying emotional factors contributing to prejudice may help counselors to address client affective needs and promote change toward adaptive functioning. Finally, counseling psychologists and other professionals who engage in consultation and interventions to reduce prejudice, such as diversity trainings,
may benefit from further refined models of prejudice reduction and promotion of anti-racist activism. In fact, a meta-analysis by Bezrukova and colleagues (2016), found that diversity trainings have moderate to strong effects on cognitive, attitudinal, and skills-based learning, however, the authors did not assess for behavioral changes following diversity training. Examination of factors which contribute to anti-racist activism provides further support for Intergroup Contact Theory (Allport, 1954), which underlies many prejudice reduction interventions.

**Intergroup Contact Theory**

Intergroup Contact Theory is a theory of prejudice reduction which proposes that interactions between two individuals from different groups can foster more positive attitudes toward the outgroup member (e.g., people who identify in a different group on a given demographic, such as race; Vezzali & Stathi, 2016). Researchers purport that when people have little contact with an outgroup, stereotypes and negative affect (e.g., anxiety, fear) can persist because there is limited information to discount these beliefs (Dixon & Rosenbaum, 2004). Conversely, per Intergroup Contact Theory, positive intergroup contact provides a contradictory experience forcing the individual to reevaluate beliefs about non-dominant groups. Increased intergroup contact henceforth provides new information, which has been found to reduce cognitive based prejudices such as stereotypes (Aberson, 2015) and increase perception of outgroup variability (i.e., that groups are not homogenous; Paolini et al., 2004), further countering stereotype beliefs.

Numerous studies have supported Intergroup Contact Theory, demonstrating reduced prejudice as a result of intergroup contact (Dovidio et al., 2017; Harwood et al., 2013). A meta-analysis examining the effect of intergroup contact on prejudice found a small-moderate effect
across multiple forms of prejudice such as racism, heterosexism, and ageism among others (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). Studies specific to race, have found positive interracial contact to have (a) significant small to large inverse relations with negative racial attitudes (Aberson, 2015; Dixon & Rosenbaum, 2004), (b) small-moderate inverse relations with modern racism and colorblind racial attitudes (Miller et al., 2004; Neville et al., 2014; Spanierman et al., 2008), and (c) small direct relations with White college students’ interracial friendship and colorblind racial attitudes across two time points (Spanierman et al., 2008). These relations persist in cross-sectional and longitudinal designs (Northcutt Bohmert & DeMaris, 2015; Neville et al., 2014), thus supporting causal links between intergroup contact and prejudice reduction. Intergroup Contact Theory is well supported in describing the reduction of racial prejudice; however, these relations require further exploration as effect sizes have varied widely across studies.

Variation in effect sizes may be a result of variation in measurement of intergroup contact. Some studies have examined contact through frequency of common interactions (Britt et al., 1996), while other studies have simultaneously examined contact quantity and quality (Curșeu et al., 2007; Voci & Hewstone, 2003). Other studies rated positive qualities of a singular close acquaintance (Aberson, 2015), or rated specific positive qualities of theorized to strengthen the effects of intergroup contact (Tzeng & Jackson, 1994). Finally, other studies have looked as specific forms of contact such as friendships (Paolini et al., 2004, Turner et al., 2007). These measurements examine closeness of a relationship, qualities which influence theory but may not impact closeness, frequency of interaction without regard for intimacy, and intimate interactions without regard for frequency. The different forms of measuring intergroup contact may have an influence on the effect sizes as each operationalization examines a different facet of intergroup contact as well as a different level of relationship strength. The current study
contributes to the literature by providing further insight into the relation between interracial contact and reduction of racial prejudice using a measure which captures frequency of intimate interactions. The relation between this form of interracial contact and reduction of prejudice is valuable to further examine as these experiences are more commonplace than interracial friendship and more impactful than measures of environmental integration without meaningful contact.

Despite variation in effect sizes, the influence of intergroup contact and prejudice has been well established (Dovidio et al., 2017), however the implications for behavioral outcomes require further examination. Due to the long history of racial tensions between Whites and Blacks in the United States, the current study focuses on contact between these two groups. Understanding how interracial contact differentially relates to prejudice reduction and advocacy can inform initiatives to reduce racial prejudice through attitudinal and behavioral change.

**Colorblind Racial Attitudes**

Colorblind racial attitudes/ideology dismiss racism and privilege, emphasize sameness, and endorse the notion that everyone has an equal opportunity to succeed which serves to legitimize the status quo and ignore racial experiences (Neville et al., 2013). Furthermore, the lack of awareness regarding the influence of race in American society results in participation in inequality and inequity (Sue, 2005). Neville and colleagues (2013) argue that colorblind ideology is not a form of modern racism, but instead a manifestation of racial discrimination. However, as discussed, the nature of racism in the United States has changed such that it is often more subtle and at times unintentional. Although people may not intend to engage in behaviors which perpetuate racial inequalities, legitimize a racially stratified status quo, and delegitimize another’s experiences, colorblind ideology is nonetheless one that promotes White racial
superiority and minimizes the plights of people of Color. As such, colorblind ideology functions as a contemporary form of racial prejudice. As Whites hold social power in the United States, it may be valuable to understand the factors in which adherence to colorblind ideology may be weakened and prosocial action promoted. In order to address racism in the United States, people who have social power need to be aware of racial inequities and challenge systemic racism; understanding these mechanisms may allow for directed approaches in combatting racism.

Intergroup contact theory has a strong evidence base for prejudice reduction (Dovidio et al., 2017), and interracial contact has been found to reduce colorblind attitudes (Spanierman et al., 2008). As such, the current study includes colorblind attitudes in the study model as an outcome of interest. Given the strong relationship between interracial contact and attitudinal change, it is expected that interracial contact will be associated with lower colorblind attitudes. Further, the current study will also examine behavioral outcomes; inclusion of colorblind attitudes as an outcome allows for colorblind attitudes to be controlled for when examining the effects of interracial contact on behavioral outcomes.

**Activism**

The current study also focuses on *anti-racist activism* as an outcome of interracial contact, that is, action toward social and political changes that aims to reduce or eliminate racism and negative effects of racism on people of Color (see Szymanski & Lewis, 2015). Activism can be engaged in at both the individual and collective levels. *Individual anti-racist activism*, at times termed assertive bystander intervention (Abbott & Cameron, 2014), refers to behaviors taken by an individual to address racial issues without a larger body of support for the specific action. For example, engaging people in conversations about race or interrupting a racial joke are forms of individual activism (see Pieterse et al., 2016). *Collective anti-racist activism*, at times termed
collective action (Selvanathan et al., 2018), refers to the actions taken by a group in order to address racial issues, even if the group is not physically co-located. For example, writing a letter to a state official or joining a protest are both forms of collective activism (see Pieterse et al., 2016; Selvanathan et al., 2018). These two forms of activism seek to jointly address individual, institutional, and cultural prejudice. As such, both forms of activism may be necessary and critical to addressing racial inequality in the United States. Further, these forms of activism may be differentially endorsed and influenced by interpersonal factors. Engaging in individual activism may be influenced more strongly by fear of negative peer interaction (see Mikulincer et al., 2005; Nelson et al., 2011) or threats of ostracism from other Whites (Spanierman & Heppner, 2004), as interrupting racist events is innately conflict-laden. Alternatively, collective activism may not be influenced by these fears due to the members involved having similar goals, but may involve more interracial communication as anti-racist collective activism behaviors, such as protests, often include the targeted racial group (i.e., Black people). As such it is important to examine these forms of activism separately to understand the nuance in how Intergroup Contact Theory (Allport, 1954) applies to behavioral change.

It is important to note that colorblind attitudes representing contemporary forms of prejudicial attitudes are not proposed to precede anti-racist activism in the current study model. Attitudinal change does not always precede behavioral change (Olson & Stone, 2005); thus these factors are more accurately examined as related constructs without assumption of temporal or causal relation. As such, colorblind attitudes, individual anti-racist activism, and collective anti-racist activism are all examined as outcomes of intergroup contact.

Intergroup contact has been found to enhance pro-social behaviors (Abbott & Cameron, 2014; Selvanathan et al., 2018). Some researchers proposed that intergroup contact influences
activism of advantaged group members in several ways including recognition of the illegitimacy
of inequity, fostering solidarity, and increasing inclusiveness (Cakal et al., 2019). As such,
researchers have begun to examine the direct effects of intergroup contact on collective activism
(Tropp & Ulug, 2019; Selvanathan et al., 2018) and individual activism (Abbott & Cameron,
2014; Merrilees et al., 2018; Palmer et al., 2017; Zotti et al., 2019), exploring the theory’s
applicability to action.

In studies examining collective action, Intergroup Contact Theory has been applied to
activism attitudes of advantaged group members (Cakal et al., 2019; Reimer et al., 2017;
Selvanathan et al., 2018), however, Intergroup Contact Theory has had limited testing in terms of
actual activism behaviors (Dovidio et al., 2017; Yi et al., 2019) and differences between
individual and collective activism. The extant studies examining attitudes toward activism have
found that contact has a direct relation with support for activism. In a multi-sample study, Tropp
and Ulug (2019) found that in a sample of White American women, positive contact with Black
people was moderately directly related to willingness to support the Black Lives Matter
movement as well as actual participation in protest. In a second sample of White women who
attended the 2017 Women’s March, Tropp and Ulug (2019) found that the relation between
contact with Black people and willingness to support protests for racial justice was found to be
small and no relation was found between contact and actual participation. Other studies have
replicated the direct relation between interracial contact and White individual’s support for
collective activism in favor of the Black community (Meleadey & Vermue, 2019; Selvanathan et
al. 2018). Given these findings and limited literature on actual behaviors, further examination of
the application of Intergroup Contact Theory to participation in collective activism is warranted.

Regarding individual activism, Abbott and Cameron (2014) found that in British
adolescents, there was a small direct relation between contact with Black and ethnic minority people and assertive bystander intentions. Specifically, students who had more contact with ethnic minorities were more likely to act in an assertive manner in response to a vignette surrounding immigrant name-calling. In a study of American teachers, contact with LGBT people predicted more frequent intervention in homophobic remarks (Greytak & Kosciw, 2014). Alternatively, Palmer and colleagues (2017) found that cross-group friendships were associated with reduced aggressive bystander behavior (i.e., responding to injustice with aggression) and reduced ignoring behaviors in girls, however, was not related to prosocial bystander behaviors. As these outcomes are inconsistent, they require further examination and consideration of explanatory mechanisms. Through examination of potential intermediary variables, the relations between interracial contact and individual anti-racist activism can be more deeply understood.

**Mechanisms of Change**

Understanding the mechanisms by which attitudinal and behavioral changes are influenced by contact allows for a more nuanced and explicit understanding of Intergroup Contact Theory (Allport, 1954). A meta-analysis by Pettigrew & Tropp (2008) found intergroup anxiety, empathy, and knowledge to be three examined mediators within Intergroup Contact Theory (Allport, 1954). The authors found knowledge, while significant overall, was not a strong mediator between intergroup contact and prejudice. However, empathy and intergroup anxiety were both found to be strong explanatory factors in the relation between contact and prejudice (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2008) and have been further supported by later studies (Dovidio et al., 2017; Harwood et al., 2013).

Studies examining intergroup contact and activism have found intergroup anxiety and empathy to be important explanatory factors in this relation as well (Abbott & Cameron, 2014;
Górska et al., 2020; Swart et al., 2011). As such, these two change mechanisms, interracial anxiety and empathy, warranted further examination in a full model to examine how they differentially related to prejudice, individual activism, and collective activism. Understanding the differentiation between attitudinal and behavioral change may aid in tailoring future interventions in prejudice reduction.

**Empathy**

*Empathy* refers to the experience of an emotion triggered by the emotional state of another (Hoffman, 2008), often reflected in feelings and concern for others and their misfortune (Konrath et al., 2011). Empathy is proposed to increase an individual’s ability to relate to another and extend their sense of self to include others (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2008), thereby reducing negative affect, defensiveness, and increasing openness. In the context of interracial relations, empathy may allow a White person to experience concern for the well-being of people of Color, reducing avoidance and prejudice, and increasing engagement in activist behavior. Specific to colorblind attitudes, the extension of the sense of self embodied in empathy may allow White individuals to recognize barriers faced by people of Color rather than attributing disparities to individual failure, thus reducing endorsement of colorblind attitudes. Regarding individual activism, the extension of the sense of self in empathy may increase the likelihood of intervening when others are engaging in prejudicial behavior, as it may cause more personal distress to witness such behavior. Finally, regarding collective activism, the extension of the sense self inherent in empathy may promote desire for systemic equality and motivation to engage.

A meta-analysis identified empathy as a strong change mechanism in the relation between contact and prejudice (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2008). A study by Tam and colleagues (2006) found that quality and quantity of contact with older people increased self-disclosure with
their grandparent, which in turn related to positive attitudes toward the elderly through increased empathy. This study demonstrates the manner in which empathy can be generalized to the larger outgroup following direct contact. Specific to measures of modern racism, college students who endorse higher levels of colorblind racial attitudes expressed less empathy in intergroup conversations (Yi et al., 2019), and psychologists who endorsed colorblind racial attitudes reported less empathy overall (Burkard & Knox, 2004). Empathy has been indicated as an important factor in the generalization of intergroup contact experiences to reducing prejudicial attitudes toward a group. The current study aimed to provide further support for this process in the case of interracial interactions and colorblind attitudes, as well as examine how empathy may influence activist behavior.

Studies have begun to examine the relations between empathy, intergroup contact, and collective activism (Górśka et al., 2020; Selvanathan et al., 2018; Yi et al., 2019). Górśka and colleagues (2020) found that group-specific empathy was moderately related to both protest participation and collective action intentions. Similarly, Selvanathan and colleagues (2018) found that group-specific empathy was strongly directly related to willingness to engage in collective action and moderately directly related to support for the Black Live Matter movement. Further, empathy was found to be a mediator between contact and collective activism in two of the three studies, specifically empathy was no longer a significant mediator when the analysis controlled for negative contact experiences (Selvanathan et al., 2018). Research consistently demonstrates that empathy increases engagement in collective activism (Yi et al., 2019). Creating cohesion with an outgroup may increase desire to combat injustice thus supporting the application of Intergroup Contact Theory to collective activism, however it is less clear how this influences individual activism.
Studies on individual activism and empathy focus on adolescent behaviors in bullying. A meta-analysis on studies of empathy and defending victims of bullying found that empathy has a moderate direct relation with individual activism as defined as defending victims of bullying (Nickerson et al., 2015). Specifically, in a study regarding interracial interactions, Abbott and Cameron (2014) found that adolescents who reported high trait empathy responded in more assertive manners to a name-calling vignette, with empathy significantly mediating the relation between interracial contact and assertive bystander intentions. Studies have consistently found that increased empathy is associated with intervention in bullying (Nickerson & Mele-Taylor, 2014; Nickerson et al., 2008; van Cleemput et al., 2014; van Noorden et al., 2015). Although these trends may reflect those in adulthood, further examination with adult experiences during racist events is warranted.

While the previous literature used a mixture of group-specific and trait empathy measures, the current study focused on trait empathy. The focus on trait empathy is two-fold, first to reduce overlap with measures examining attitudes toward injustice. Measures of group-specific empathy tend to specify empathy in a situation of racial injustice (e.g. “If I heard that a Black person was upset suffering from racial injustice, I would also feel upset”; Selvanathan et al, 2018). Second, to reduce socially desirable responding. Empathy items focused on wrongdoing are likely to evoke socially desirable responses and result in a truncated range of responses, while trait empathy may be less socially charged and provide more honest responses. Finally, a meta-analysis examining the effects of diversity trainings have found no differences in cognitive, affective, or behavioral change based on focus on a specific group or focus on general dynamics of prejudice (Bezrukova et al., 2016). While this outcome was not specific to empathy, it may indicate that specific group focus is not necessary in examining attitudinal and behavioral
Interracial Anxiety

The form of intergroup anxiety that is examined in the current study is *interracial anxiety*. *Interracial Anxiety* in the context of Whites and Blacks, refers to the anticipatory worry regarding unpleasant experiences and personal risk when interacting with a Black person (Britt et al., 1996). As people regularly interact across group boundaries, understanding differences between groups can improve social interactions. When there is confusion or lack of knowledge regarding social expectations, anxiety may arise (Britt et al., 1996). Interracial anxiety is presumed to function as a change mechanism between amount of interracial contact and prejudice (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2008), as reducing physiological, affective, and cognitive threats tends to reduce the tendency toward avoidance (Plant and Devine, 2003) which is one characteristic underlying colorblind racial attitudes (Neville et al., 2013). Further, regarding individual activism, the avoidance of race-related situations inherent in interracial anxiety may also have a small influence in avoiding intervening with other Whites who are engaging in inappropriate behavior. Finally, regarding collective activism, the avoidance of interaction with Blacks may reduce engagement in anti-racist collective activist behaviors as they are often majority-Black groups; interracial anxiety may preclude involvement despite other motivating factors.

Studies examining self-report of interracial anxiety have found direct relations between interracial anxiety and prejudice (Hayward et al., 2017; Plant & Devine, 2003). In a longitudinal analysis, Binder and colleagues (2009) found that intergroup anxiety mediated the relation between intergroup contact and negative attitudes toward the ethnic minority groups for majority group members in a European sample. Studies examining this relation in different groups of
interest have found intergroup anxiety to mediate the relation between cross-group friendship and religious prejudice (Paolini et al., 2004), interracial anxiety to be strongly directly associated with avoidance of interracial interactions and more hostility when engaging in interracial interactions (Plant & Devine, 2003), and interracial anxiety to explain the relation between both positive and negative intergroup contact experiences and prejudice as measured by outgroup evaluations (Hayward et al., 2017). Interracial anxiety has been indicated as an important factor in the ability of interracial contact to influence beliefs, as reducing threat increases openness to experiences. The current study aimed to provide support for the mediating influence of interracial anxiety on the relation between interracial interactions and colorblind attitudes, as well as examine how interracial anxiety may relate to activist behavior.

Intergroup anxiety has been found to have an inverse relation with collective action (Brylka et al., 2015; Górska et al., 2020), lending support to the assertion that intergroup anxiety may serve a mediator in the relation between contact and activist behavior. Brylka and colleagues (2015) examined the relation between intergroup anxiety and collective action, finding that intergroup anxiety was strongly inversely related to collective action support. Similarly, Górska and colleagues (2020) found intergroup anxiety to have a strong inverse relation with collective action intentions. Regarding individual activism, Abbott and Cameron (2014) found small inverse relations between interracial anxiety and assertive bystander intentions, however, did not find interracial anxiety to have a mediating effect between interracial contact and activism. Given that limited studies have directly examined intergroup anxiety as a mediating variable between contact and activism, further analysis is warranted to elucidate how these three variables are associated with one another. The current study sought to further support the literature examining the relations between interracial contact and interracial
anxiety, and interracial anxiety and activism; examining how interracial anxiety is associated with other variables when Intergroup Contact Theory is applied to activist behaviors.

The Current Study

Understanding the factors that predict to prejudice reduction and activism in White Americans may potentially aid in addressing racial problems in the United States. The current study sought to provide further support for Intergroup Contact Theory (Allport, 1954) and the mediators of intergroup anxiety and empathy, examining how empathy and interracial anxiety differentially predict colorblind attitudes, individual anti-racist activism, and collective anti-racist activism. Through including anti-racist activism as outcome variables, the current study seeks to contribute to the literature which examines the ability for Intergroup Contact Theory to apply to behavioral outcomes. Further, by controlling for colorblind attitudes in the model, the current study seeks to provide insight into unique the relations between interracial contact and anti-racist activism, accounting for colorblind attitudes. Toward examining an this model of Intergroup Contact Theory, the following hypotheses were tested:

(I) Interracial contact will predict colorblind attitudes, individual anti-racism activism, and collective anti-racism activism as a linear combination mediated by interracial anxiety and empathy (Figure 1)

(II) Empathy will uniquely mediate the relation between interracial contact and the dependent variables of colorblind attitudes, individual anti-racist activism, and collective anti-racist activism as a linear combination.
   a. There will be a significant indirect effect of interracial contact on colorblind racial attitudes controlling for the other dependent variables through empathy, such that interracial contact will directly predict empathy which in turn will
inversely predict colorblind racial attitudes, controlling for interracial anxiety (see Figure 2).

b. There will be a significant indirect effect of interracial contact on individual anti-racist activism controlling for the other dependent variables through empathy, such that interracial contact will directly predict empathy which in turn will directly predict individual anti-racist activism, controlling for interracial anxiety (see Figure 2).

c. There will be a significant indirect effect of interracial contact on collective anti-racist activism controlling for the other dependent variables through empathy, such that interracial contact will directly predict empathy which in turn will directly predict collective anti-racist activism, controlling for interracial anxiety (see Figure 2).

(III) Interracial anxiety will uniquely mediate the relation between interracial contact and the dependent variables of colorblind attitudes, individual anti-racist activism, and collective anti-racist activism as a linear combination.

a. There will be a significant indirect effect of interracial contact on colorblind racial attitudes controlling for the other dependent variables through interracial anxiety, such that interracial contact will inversely predict interracial anxiety which in turn will directly predict colorblind racial attitudes, controlling for empathy (see Figure 3).

b. There will be a significant indirect effect of interracial contact on individual anti-racist activism controlling for the other dependent variables through interracial anxiety, such that interracial contact will inversely predict
interracial anxiety which in turn will inversely predict individual anti-racist activism, controlling for empathy (see Figure 3).

c. There will be a significant indirect effect of interracial contact on collective anti-racist activism controlling for the other dependent variables through interracial anxiety, such that interracial contact will inversely predict interracial anxiety which in turn will inversely predict collective anti-racist activism, controlling for empathy (see Figure 3).

Method

Participants

Power analysis

As the analysis comprised of one multivariate multiple regression and follow-up analyses, an apriori multivariate power analysis was conducted as well as an additional power analysis to ensure power in follow-up analyses. Prior research was examined in order to determine the appropriate effect size for the power analyses. Pettigrew and Tropp (2006) found the mean correlation for the relation between contact and racial prejudice to be -.21 in a meta-analysis. Studies examining the various paths of the current model found absolute correlation values ranging from .16 to .69 (Abbott & Cameron, 2014; Górska et al., 2020; Nickerson et al., 2015; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2008; Selvanathan et al., 2018; Yi et al., 2019).

To implement the most conservative estimate, the multivariate power analysis was conducted with an expected effect size of .04 and an alpha of .05 to account for the analysis. The initial power analysis indicated that a sample size of 200 would provide an estimated power of .99. The second power analysis, a univariate power analysis, was conducted with an expected
effect size of .05 and an alpha of .017 to assure that the follow-up analyses would have adequate power. The second power analysis indicated that an expanded sample of 300 would provide the additional power to conduct both analyses, with an estimated power of .95. The power analyses indicated that a sample size of 300 would provide .95 power for the multivariate and follow-up analyses. To account for possible attrition a sample of at least 360 participants were recruited.

**Target population.** The inclusion criteria included identifying as monoracial non-Latino/non-Arab White, being at least 18 years old, and having lived in the United States for more than half of their life. Participants were required to have lived in the United States for the majority of their life to ensure that they understand the racial dynamics specific to the history of the United States. Participants needed access to the internet to participate. No other inclusion criteria applied.

**Sample.** Three-hundred eighty-four White American adults participated in the current study. The participants predominantly identified as women (68.8%), heterosexual (65.4%), living in the Northeast (56.5%), and living in suburbs. The participants ranged in age from 19 to 73 ($M = 36.41, SD = 13.44$) and self-identified as middle class (42.2%). Education level was added after the study began, resulting in only 140 participants providing this information. Of these 140 participants, 18.8% reported having a college degree. Table 1 provides detailed demographics of the sample.

**Design Statement**

The study employed a single sample cross-sectional ex post facto design. The predictor in this study was interracial contact and was measured using a modified version of a 12-item interracial contact measure (Stephan & Stephan, 1984). The outcomes measures were contemporary racist attitudes as measured by the Colorblind Racial Attitudes Scale (Neville et
individual anti-racist activism as measured by the Anti-Racist Behavioral Inventory Individual Advocacy Subscale (Pieterse et al., 2016), and collective anti-racist activism as measured by Anti-Racist Behavioral Inventory Institutional Advocacy Subscale (Pieterse et al., 2016). The potential explanatory mechanisms between interracial contact and the three outcome variables were interracial anxiety as measured by The Intergroup Anxiety Toward African Americans Scale (Britt et al., 1996) and empathy as measured by the Interpersonal Reactivity Index Empathic Concern subscale (Davis, 1980; 1983).

Measures

**Demographic Questionnaire.** Participants were asked to complete a short demographic questionnaire to identify their age, race gender, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, approximate income, geographic region of the US, community type (e.g., rural, urban, suburban), and their number of Black friends. Age, race, and country of birth were required items due to the inclusion criteria and number of Black friends was required to inform the study; however, all other demographic variables were optional.

**Interracial Contact.** The original scale was constructed to measure intergroup contact between White and Chicano high school students and contained 12 items (Stephan & Stephan, 1984), however no psychometric data existed for the measure nor was there indication of Likert-type scale anchors. Given the lack of information about the scale and the need to modify items to represent interracial contact with Black people in adults, initial psychometric data on the modified items was needed to ensure adequacy of a modified measure for the current study.

Using the current sample, M. V. Ellis (personal communication, March 2, 2021) derived and tested a 5-item version of the Interracial Contact measure (see Appendix C) using graded response item response theory (IRTPRO; Cai et al., 2011). Items with better fit indices were
retained, yielding the 5-item measure. A confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was then conducted to determine model fit, followed by an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) to check the overall fit. The analysis found preliminary support for good model fit. The CFA was an acceptable fit to the data (RMSEA = .127, 90% CI = [.09 .17], GFI = .96, CFI = .98, NNFI = .96, SRMR = .02). The comparative fit index (CFI) was above the .90 cutoff, non-normed fit index (NNFI) was above the .95 cutoff, and the SRMR was below the .08 cutoff, all suggesting good fit (Kline, 2005). However, the RMSEA was above the suggested cutoff of .08 for good fit. While this indicates that the absolute fit index is unfavorable (Xia & Yang, 2019), discrepancies between CFI and RMSEA do not necessarily indicate that the model is misspecified but may simply highlight the differences between relative and absolute fit (Lai & Green, 2016). The follow-up EFA examined the one-factor model. Factors were extracted using maximum likelihood. All items loaded on one factor with loadings > .75 and the overall model explained 74% of the variance.

The final measure of Interracial Contact was a 5-item measure regarding intimate and neutral experiences with Black people. The Interracial Contact measure used a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (never) to 5 (all the time). All items were summed to create a total score, ranging from 5 to 25, with higher score indicating more intimate interracial contact interactions. Example items are: “Invited a Black people to your house” and “Confided in Black people.” Cronbach’s alpha for the current study was 0.91.

**Interracial Anxiety.** The Intergroup Anxiety Toward African Americans Scale (IATAA; Britt et al., 1996) is a 11-item measure of an individual’s level of anxiety when interacting with Black people in various settings. The IATAA uses a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 0 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree). Items indicating low anxiety will be reverse coded; then all items were summed and averaged to create a total score, ranging from 0 to 4, with higher
scores indicating higher greater anxiety. Example items are: “I would feel nervous if I had to sit alone in a room with a Black person and start a conversation” and “I worry about coming across as a racist when I talk with Blacks.”

Britt and colleagues (1996) demonstrated strong internal consistency with Cronbach’s alpha of .82-.84 across three studies of White undergraduate students. Convergent validity was demonstrated through moderate correlation between IATAA and general intergroup anxiety (r = .44, p < .0001). Britt and colleagues report that discriminant validity was demonstrated through principal components analysis of the IATAA, general intergroup anxiety and modern racism which found a three-component structure. No items from any of the component scales (reflecting the different measures) loaded greater than .40 on another scale, suggesting distinction among component scales. Shook and Fazio (2011) reported an alpha coefficient of .89 for the IATAA with a White college freshman sample. Cronbach’s alpha for the current study was .82.

**Empathy.** Interpersonal Reactivity Index (IRI; Davis, 1980, 1983) is a 28-item scale measuring both the cognitive and affective aspects of empathy using a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 0 (does not describe me well) to 4 (describes me very well). The scale consists of four subscales of seven items each measuring: Empathic Concern, Perspective-Taking, Fantasy, and Personal Distress. Konrath (2013) notes that the subscales measure multiple dimensions of empathy rather than global empathy. As such, Konrath indicates that it would be appropriate to use one subscale for a given research purpose rather than the entire scale. The current study only administered and used the Empathic Concern subscale which had strong validity and reliability. The Empathic Concern subscale measures an individual’s ability to feel for others in distress (e.g., “I often have tender, concerned feelings for people less fortunate than me.”). Scores range from 0 to 28 with higher scores indicating higher tendency to feel empathic toward others in
In Davis (1980), the dissertation in which the IRI was created, the author conducted confirmatory maximum likelihood factor analysis, test-retest reliability, and internal reliability analyses. The Jöreskog factor analyses with oblique rotation revealed four subscales which emerged clearly for both men and women. The 2-2.5 month test-retest reliability for the Empathic Concern subscale was .70 for women and .72 for men. The Cronbach’s alpha of the scale was .68 for men and .73 for women. Davis (1983) demonstrated convergent validity of the Empathic Concern scale through significant inverse correlations between the Empathic Concern scale and the Masculinity-Femininity PAQ scale which measures lack of emotional vulnerability. The IRI also had strong correlations with other established scales of empathy. Discriminant validity was demonstrated through lack of relations between the Empathic Concern scale and self-esteem or intelligence scales. Furthermore, intercorrelations of the IRI scales demonstrated small to moderate correlations between Empathic Concern and other scales, with correlations ranging from .11 to .33. O’Brien and colleagues (2013) reported alpha coefficients of .72-.83 for the Empathic Concern subscale using two nationally representative adult samples and one predominantly White adult sample. Cronbach’s alpha for the current study is .83.

**Colorblind Ideology.** The Color-Blind Racial Attitudes Scale (CoBRAS; Neville et al., 2000) is a 20-item scale measuring the belief that race does not matter, using a 6-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 6 (*strongly agree*). The measure consists of three subscales: Racial Privilege (e.g., “Everyone who works hard, no matter what race they are, has an equal chance to become rich”), Institutional Discrimination (e.g., “It is important that people begin to think of themselves as American and not African American, Mexican American or Italian American.”), and Blatant Racial Issues (e.g., “Racism may have been a problem in the
past, it is not an important problem today”). The current study uses the total score which combines the items of all subscales to examine overall colorblind attitudes. The total scores range from 20 to 120. Higher scores represent higher endorsement of beliefs that race does not and should not matter.

Neville and colleagues (2000) conducted a principal components analysis and a confirmatory factor analysis, finding three factors to comprise the CoBRAS. For the total score, the scale had a split-half reliability of .72, two-week test-retest reliability of .68, and Cronbach’s alpha of .86. Concurrent validity was demonstrated through strong correlations between CoBRAS total score and measures of belief in a just world and modern racism, ranging from .52 to .61. Discriminant validity was demonstrated through lack of relation between the CoBRAS total score and social desirability. Cronbach’s alpha for the current sample is .96.

**Anti-Racism Activism.** The Anti-Racism Behavioral Inventory (ARBI; Pieterse et al., 2016) is a 21-item measure of anti-racism awareness and engagement using a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The measure was created specifically for White people and consists of three subscales: Awareness of Racism, Individual Advocacy, and Institutional Advocacy. The current study uses the Individual Advocacy subscale to examine the participants activity in antiracism at the individual level (e.g., “When I hear people telling racist jokes and using negative racial stereotypes, I usually confront them”) and the Institutional Advocacy subscale to examine participants collective activism (e.g., “I volunteer with anti-racist or racial justice organizations”). The Individual Advocacy subscale consists of 9-items, one of which is reversed scored; scores range from 9 to 45 with higher scores representing higher engagement in anti-racist individual activism. The Institutional Advocacy subscale consists of 5-items; scores range from 5 to 25 with higher scores representing higher engagement
in anti-racist collective activism.

Pieterse and colleagues (2016) conducted an exploratory factor analysis, confirmatory factor analysis, and assessed convergent validity and reliability. Convergent validity for the Individual Advocacy and Institutional Advocacy subscales was demonstrated through moderate inverse relations with colorblind racial attitudes, with correlations ranging from -.38 to -.26; and moderate to strong relations with low prejudice, with correlations ranging from .29 to .53. Three week test-retest reliability of .91 and Cronbach’s alpha of .78 was found for the Individual Advocacy subscale. Three week test-retest reliability of .86 and Cronbach’s alpha of .76 was found for the Institutional Advocacy subscale. Keum (2021) reported Cronbach’s alpha coefficients of .87 for the Individual Advocacy subscale and .89 for Institutional Advocacy subscale in a White adult sample. Cronbach’s alphas for the current sample are .90 for Individual Advocacy or .81 for Institutional Advocacy.

**Procedures**

Participants were recruited through snowball sampling beginning with friends and colleagues, general college student leadership groups, and social media. Social media and email recruitment letters included a description of the study aim, inclusion criteria, expected time commitment, contact information for follow-up questions, IRB information, information regarding incentive and likelihood of receiving the incentive, and the link to participate.

Participants who self-selected into the study followed the link onto Qualtrics. When entering the study, participants received the informed consent followed by inclusion criteria questions. If participants did not fit the inclusion criteria, they were sent to the final page thanking them for participation and did not complete the questionnaire. The participants who qualified for the study proceeded to the study measures which were administered in a
counterbalanced order. All questions were required with the exception of demographic questions unrelated to the inclusion criteria. After completing the questionnaire, participants were provided a debriefing statement explaining the purpose of the study in greater detail and an option to participate in a random drawing for 1 of 15 $15 Visa egiftcards; 15 egiftcards were awarded in total. If participants chose to enter into the random drawing, they were directed to a separate page to provide their email address; this ensured that identifying participant information was not connected to responses. All procedures were preapproved by IRB and adhered to APA ethical standards.

Results

Preliminary Analyses

Tests of assumptions

As multivariate multiple regression was utilized in the analyses, the assumptions of linearity, normality, no multicollinearity, and homoscedasticity were tested. Visual inspection of the bivariate scatterplots of each predictor with each outcome variable (nine plots) indicated linear relationships among all variables. Visual inspection of the p-p plots of standardized residuals and skewness statistics below the cutoff of 2 indicated normality assumption was met. The assumption of no multicollinearity was met as the variance inflation factors scores were below 1.2 and tolerance scores were above 0.85 for the predictors. However, the dependent variables were strongly related with correlations ranging from -.55 to -.74. The statistical model accounts for this intercorrelation by using standardized discriminant coefficients to aid in interpretation (Haase & Ellis, 1987). Finally, visual inspection of the plot of the standardized residuals against the predicted values were linear, indicating homoscedasticity.

Outliers
Outliers were identified through examination of Cook’s Distance, Deleted Studentized residuals, Standardized df betas, Centered Leverage, and Mahalanobis distances. Assessment of Cook’s distance indicated that no cases exceeded a value of 1.0. Regarding deleted studentized residuals, four cases exceeded the cutoff value of 3. Assessment of standardized df beta statistics indicated that no cases exceeded the cutoff value of 1. Centered leverage values indicated that seven cases were larger than the cutoff value of 3k/n (.03125). Three of these same cases exceeded $p < .001$ critical value when assessing for Mahalanobis distance. In total 8 cases exceeded at least one criterion and 3 cases exceeded two criterion. However, as no case violated three criterion thereby representing a substantial multivariate outlier, no cases were removed from analysis.

**Counterbalancing**

To reduce the influence of possible order effects, participants viewed study measures in a random order. Seven-hundred and twenty permutations were possible with the randomization. A MANOVA examined if the counterbalanced order of measures influenced the study variables. The order in which the measure was provided to participants had no effect on study variables, $F(30, 1785) = 1.27, p = .149, \hat{\beta}_{MV}^2 = .004, 95\% CI = [.00, .02]$.

**Age**

Age was identified as a potential confound as studies have found stronger effects of intergroup contact on prejudice in children and college students than effects in adults (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006; Wölfer et al, 2016). A MANOVA determined if age influenced any of the study variables. Age was a significant multivariate predictor of the study variables as a linear combination ($F(6, 377) = 8.82, p < .001, \hat{\beta}_{MV}^2 = .11, 95\% CI = [.06, .17]$, where Colorblind Attitudes was the only study variable significantly influenced by age ($F(1, 382) = 31.14, p =$
.0001, $\hat{p}^2 = .002$, 95% CI = [.00, .02]). Age was examined post-hoc to determine if the statistical model changes in any meaningful way when age is and is not included.

**Descriptive statistics and intercorrelations**

The means, standard deviations, minimums, and maximums were reported for all study variables (Table 2). Number of Black friends was collected as it has been used as a proxy for interracial contact in the past, however it is not reported in the current analysis due to difficulty discerning a numerical response for each participant. Specifically, some participants provided ranges and some provided multiple numbers based on level of closeness. All study variables and potential covariates were included in correlation analysis (Table 1). Age was included post-hoc as age had moderate correlations with Colorblind attitudes ($p<.01$). Date of participation was also included post-hoc due to significant historical events occurring during data collection. Specifically, the presidential election and the attack on United States Capitol occurred during data collection. Given the racial tensions underlying the election and comparison of the reactions to the attack on the United States Capitol with reactions to the Black Lives Matter movement, a post-hoc analysis of date of participation was warranted. Date of participation was significantly correlated with Colorblind Attitudes ($p<.01$).

**Primary Analyses**

**Analytic approach**

IBM Statistical Product and Service Solutions (SPSS) software was used to conduct multivariate multiple regressions and follow-up analyses. A multivariate multiple regression tested the unique effects of Interracial Contact, IATAA, and Empathic Concern each in predicting Colorblind Racial Attitudes, Anti-Racism Individual Advocacy, and Anti-Racism Institutional Advocacy as a linear combination, while controlling for the other predictors (Haase
The dependent variables were examined as a linear combination, to take into account multicollinearity among dependent variables. Follow-up analyses of the unique effects using univariate $F$-tests and standardized discriminant function coefficients ($sdfc$s) assessed the contributions of each predictor to each dependent variable controlling for the other predictors and other dependent variables (Haase & Ellis, 1987). These follow-up analyses provided the indirect effects of the predictor on the dependent variables through the mediators. Lastly, a multivariate single predictor regression examined contact as the predictor to test if the effect sizes differed when the mediators were not included in the model (See “Tests of Predictor” in Table 3).

**Findings**

**Influence of Interracial Contact.** The mediation model, tested by multivariate multiple regression analysis, with interracial contact predicting colorblind attitudes, individual anti-racist advocacy, and institutional anti-racist advocacy mediated by interracial anxiety and empathy (Hypothesis 1) was partially supported (see Figure 4; Table 3). Interracial contact significantly predicted the linear combination of dependent variables when no other predictors were included in the model ($V = .15$, $F(3, 380) = 21.59, p < .001, \hat{\rho}_{MV}^2 = .14$), and this relation was mediated as the strength of the initial relation decreased to $\hat{\rho}_{MV}^2 = .07$ when empathy and interracial anxiety were included in the model.

The unique mediating effect of empathy on the relation between interracial contact and the dependent variables of colorblind attitudes, individual anti-racist advocacy, and institutional anti-racist advocacy (Hypothesis 2) was partially supported by the tests of unique effects (see Figure 5; Table 3). Interracial contact was significantly associated with Empathy (zero-order adj. $R^2 = .04$) and Empathy was significantly associated with Colorblind Attitudes ($F(1, 379) = 49.67$, $p < .001$).
However, interracial contact was not a significant predictor of colorblind attitudes when mediators were not included in the model ($F(1, 382) = 5.53, p = .019$, $\hat{\rho}^2 = .01$, $sdfc = -0.76$) nor when they were in the model ($F(1, 379) = 1.73, p = .19$, $\hat{\rho}^2 = .002$, $sdfc = -0.72$) therefore the unique mediating effect on colorblind attitudes (Hypothesis 2a) was not supported.

Follow up analysis determined that Empathy was significantly associated ARBI Individual Advocacy ($F(1, 379) = 88.60, p < .001$, $\hat{\rho}^2 = .19$, $sdfc = -0.90$). The indirect effect of interracial contact on individual anti-racist advocacy through empathy, controlling for interracial anxiety and the other dependent variables (Hypothesis 2b), was supported. The relation between interracial contact and individual anti-racist advocacy ($F(1, 382) = 41.18, p < .001$, $\hat{\rho}^2 = .09$, $sdfc = -1.01$) decreased to $\hat{\rho}^2 = .05$ when mediators were included in the model, indicating mediation.

Empathy was also significantly associated with ARBI Institutional Advocacy ($F(1, 379) = 39.81, p < .001$, $\hat{\rho}^2 = .09$, $sdfc = -0.10$). The indirect effect of interracial contact on institutional anti-racist advocacy through empathy, controlling for interracial anxiety and the other dependent variables (Hypothesis 2c), was also supported. The relation between interracial contact and institutional anti-racist advocacy ($F(1, 382) = 39.80, p < .001$, $\hat{\rho}^2 = .09$, $sdfc = -0.53$) when mediators were included in the model decreased to $\hat{\rho}^2 = .05$ when mediators were included in the model, indicating mediation. Notably, examination of the standardized discriminant coefficient functions in the relations between interracial contact and anti-racist advocacy suggest that despite similar values in effect size, interracial contact is a more important predictor of individual anti-racist advocacy ($sdfc = -1.01$) than institutional anti-racist advocacy.
The unique mediating effect of interracial anxiety on the relation between interracial contact and the dependent variables of colorblind attitudes, individual anti-racist advocacy, and institutional anti-racist advocacy (Hypothesis 3) was not supported by the tests of unique effects (see Figure 6; Table 3). While interracial contact was a significantly associated with interracial anxiety (zero-order adj. $R^2 = .11$) and Interracial Anxiety was a significant predictor of the multivariate linear combination (Pillai’s $V = .03, F(3, 377) = 3.90, p = .009, \hat{\rho}^2_{MV} = .02$), Interracial Anxiety was not a significant unique predictor of the dependent variables in the follow-up analyses and was not supported as a unique mediator in this model.

**Post Hoc Analyses**

**Age and historical influence.** Given interracial contact has been found to have a stronger effect on children and college students in previous studies (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006; Wölfer et al, 2016), age was examined post-hoc to determine if it was an important variable to control for in the model of interest. Further, during the data collection major historical events occurred which may have influenced study findings (e.g., 2020 Presidential Election, 1/6/2021 Capitol riot, etc.). As such, a post hoc test examined the full model of interest controlling for age and date of participation (Table 4; Figure 7 and Figure 8). In the single predictor tests, age was found to be a significant predictor of the multivariate linear combination (Pillai’s $V = .11, F(3, 380) = 16.01, p < .001, \hat{\rho}^2_{MV} = .11$), as was date of participation (Pillai’s $V = .07, F(3, 380) = 9.54, p < .001, \hat{\rho}^2_{MV} = .06$). However, the post-hoc full model did not differ from the study model outcomes, in that no paths changed regarding statistical significance and changes in effects sizes were trivial ($< .03$), indicating that participant's age and date of participation did not influence the results. Notably, neither age nor date of participation was significantly correlated with
Empathy nor Interracial Anxiety (see Table 2).

**Interracial Anxiety.** Although interracial anxiety was not a significant mediator in the model, the correlation table suggested that there were relations between interracial anxiety and the dependent variables. As such, a single predictor model with Interracial Anxiety as the single predictor was examined to explore possible influences (see Figure 9; Table 5). Interracial Anxiety was found to be a significant predictor of the multivariate linear combination (Pillai’s V = .09, F(3, 380) = 11.72, p < .001, $\hat{\beta}^2_{MV} = .08$). Follow up analysis determined that Interracial Anxiety was significantly associated with ARBI Individual Advocacy ($F(1, 382) = 16.92, p < .001$, $\hat{\beta}^2 = .04, sdfs = -1.31$) and ARBI Institutional Advocacy ($F(1, 382) = 11.81, p = .001$, $\hat{\beta}^2 = .03, sdfs = -0.30$), but not with Colorblind Attitudes ($F(1, 382) = 0.17, p = .677$, $\hat{\beta}^2 < .001, sdfs = -1.08$). Examination of the standardized discriminant coefficient functions suggest that despite similar values in effect size, interracial anxiety was a much more important predictor of individual advocacy ($sdfs = -1.31$) than institutional advocacy ($sdfs = -0.30$). While these effect sizes are small, their disappearance when interracial contact and empathy were in the model suggest these relations were mediated.

**Discussion**

Racism is a pervasive form of harm which has been found across various domains such as healthcare, education, legal, employment, sand housing services (Krieger, 2014). At the individual level, racial discrimination and race-related stress contribute to depression, anxiety, and traumatization for people of Color (Carter, 2007). Toward a more just society, anti-racist activism can create safer environments for people of Color, modify societal structures which contribute to inequities, and improve interpersonal relations. In examining the application of intergroup contact theory to anti-racist activism, this study found empathy to be a central factor...
in anti-racist activism of White Americans, mediating the relation between interracial contact and two forms of activism.

**Contextual Factors**

The findings of this study must be understood within the context of the sample. The participants in this sample largely identified as women, middle class, living in the northeast, and living in the suburbs. While the majority identified as heterosexual, 34.6% identified with an LGBTQ+ identity, a larger proportion than the general population (Gates, 2011). As such, these findings are not generalizable to the general public. Comparison of measure means (see Table 6) suggest that this sample may also be atypical. While no norm comparison could be completed for Interracial Contact given changes in the items and target sample, all other measures with the exception of empathy were significantly different from previous samples, with effect sizes ranging from .08 to .52. The current sample had lower interracial anxiety and colorblind attitudes, and higher individual and collective activism than the comparison studies (Neville et al., 2000; Pieterse et al., 2016; Shook & Fazio, 2011). Notably the effect sizes for the lower levels of interracial anxiety and colorblind attitudes were strong, (.37) and (.52) respectively. This restriction in range may have contributed to the lack of relations with these two variables in the larger model.

It is important to note that the comparison studies with significant differences were conducted five years ago or more. As such, cultural changes over time may be contributing to the noted differences. Specifically, colorblind attitudes have been discussed in many classrooms and identified as an inappropriate response to racial interactions and inequities. Further, recent increase in protests and the Black Lives Matter movement may have influenced the activism experiences of the sample in comparison to previous samples, and increases in the population of
Color may have influenced the current sample’s interracial attitudes.

As compared to the general public and previous samples, this sample is largely comprised of people who have low colorblind attitudes and high activist behaviors and are educated, women, and identify as LGBTQ+. This combination of features has implications for the study findings as well as the interpretation. The majority of the sample having marginalized identities (e.g., women and LGBTQ+) may contribute to an internal drive for social justice, as displayed in decreased interracial anxiety and increased activism. It may be that the participant’s own experiences of oppression have influenced how they relate with others and their attitudes toward social justice issues (see Case, 2012). Further, these study variables may be associated differently with this sample, than would be seen in a sample representative of the general public. These intersectional identities will be further discussed throughout the discussion, specifically how they may influence findings throughout the discussion.

**Interpretation of Major Findings**

The primary aim of the current study was to explore the mechanisms by which interracial contact contributes to prejudice reduction and anti-racist activism, while examining these relations within a singular model to account for interrelations. Intergroup contact theory has developed a strong foundation in explaining how people reduce prejudice and begin to examine the world from alternative points of view (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2008; Dovidio et al., 2017). However, to change environments and systems at micro and macro levels, we may need to examine what prompts behavior against racism.

The current study examined a sample of participants who primarily identified as educated, women, and LGBTQ+. The findings indicated that in this sample, interracial contact
with Black people predicts greater individual activism and collective activism, supporting previous research examining the influence of intergroup contact on activism (Abbott & Cameron, 2014; Selvanathan et al., 2018). Previous research found a direct relation between intergroup contact and assertive bystander intervention (Abbott & Cameron, 2014), and intergroup contact and support for collective activism (Selvanathan et al., 2018). Consistent with these findings, interracial contact explained 9.5% of the variance in individual activism and 9.2% of the variance in collective activism. These results support the notion that intergroup contact can increase an individual’s desire to engage in activism on behalf of an outgroup member.

Importantly, this study has combined previously separate literature on individual activism and collective activism, allowing for examination within one model and understanding the relative weight of these relations as forms of activism are strongly interrelated. Although the percentages of explained variance are similar, individual activism was more strongly influenced by interracial contact than was collective activism. When considering impact on workplace culture or counseling environments, interracial contact is a valuable factor to consider as increasing the likelihood of intervention. Alternatively, other factors such as interracial friendship have been found to be impactful on prejudice reduction (Spanierman et al., 2008; McClelland & Linnander, 2006) and support for affirmative action (Northcutt Bohmert & DeMaris, 2015). Although no known study examines the relative effect of interracial friendship on different forms of anti-racism activism, this form of contact may be more important in getting people to dedicate time out of their lives toward larger societal change targeted by collective activism.

Empathy was found to be the key variable in the model. Empathy was a significant mediator of the relation between interracial contact and anti-racist activism, supporting prior
research examining the role of empathy in the relation between interracial contact and individual activism (Abbott & Cameron, 2014) as well as in the relation between interracial contact on collective activism (Selvanathan et al., 2018; Yi et al., 2019). Feeling connected with another’s pain may be an essential piece in making the choice to fight out against another’s oppression. Empathic concern prompts people to feel for those outside of themselves with little gain (Berry et al., 2018). As such, it is a vital factor in challenging a larger system of racism which is often perpetrated by people and institutions in power.

As noted previously, the sample composition of primarily women and LBGTQ+ identified people with low colorblind attitudes may contribute to empathic connection with oppression faced by Black people. Given the long history of sexism and heterosexism faced by these two groups, recognizing another’s experience and feeling connected with their pain may be more readily achievable. While the average empathy scores were not significantly different from scores in other samples, the participants lived experience may have changed how empathy functioned in this study.

Notably, this study examined trait-empathy rather than state-empathy to reduce focus on racial experiences and socially desirable responding. This change in operationalization is important as the participants were not asked if they empathize with oppression-specific experiences. As such, the associations found imply that interracial contact is related to trait empathy which is also related to activist behavior. While a vital factor, this highlights the correlational nature rather than causal nature of these relations. Specifically, a few intimate interracial interactions may not change an individual’s trait-level attributes, however interracial contact may be related to these attributes.

Activism requires people to devote time and resources to challenging the status quo. A
qualitative study of White women reflecting on anti-racist identity and ally behaviors, discussed activism as the daily acts of confronting racism and often viewed anti-racism as a way of life rather than specific behaviors (Case, 2012). While many people may be moved to engage in activism from personal experience (Nelson et al., 2008), for White Americans conducting anti-racist activism, this personal experience may be interracial contact and/or understanding oppression through experiences of sexism (Case, 2012). Empathic concern has been understood as an other-oriented emotional response in which a person feels affiliation and self-relevance when feeling for another; and has been found to reliably motivate prosocial action (Berry et al., 2018). Experiences of sexism and heterosexism may contribute to self-relevance of another’s plight, given the structural similarities in oppression. Further, connecting with people of Color may contribute to feeling affiliated with and the self-relevance of racial oppression specifically, thus promoting anti-racist activism.

In examining the interrelations of the model, the findings suggests that empathy has a stronger influence on individual activism than with collective activism. Empathy explained almost 19% of the variance in individual anti-racist activism, demonstrating a strong and important relationship. It is promising to recognize that empathy may promote feeling pulled to intervene at the individual level, which can in turn create safer environments. These interventions may be challenging as the person risks social rejection for aligning with an oppressed person/group. It may be that given the sample demographics, the risk for social rejection is less apparent and the desire to stand up to oppression more intrinsically valuable, however further research is needed to explore this dynamic. As opposed to individual anti-racist activism, challenging institutions requires more time commitment and may be perceived as more requiring more effort. Other factors such as anger (Selvanathan et al., 2018) may provide insight
into what encourages people to engage in the level of commitment necessary for institutional anti-racist activism.

Although the findings support previous research on the application of intergroup contact theory to activism (Abbott & Cameron, 2014; Selvanathan et al., 2018), the current study found no relation between interracial contact and colorblind attitudes. As the link between contact and prejudice is the initial relation of interest in Intergroup Contact Theory (Allport, 1954), it was an unexpected result. One possible explanation is that the current sample had low colorblind attitudes as compared to previous sample, this restriction of the range of scores may have influenced the ability of the analyses to find significant effects. Another possible explanation for differences in this finding, is that previous studies of intergroup contact theory do not use colorblind attitudes to operationalize prejudice.

Colorblind attitudes are consistent with the evolution of racial discrimination in the United States (Neville et al., 2013) and was chosen to represent a modern manifestation of racism, however this change in operationalization may have influenced the findings. Previous operationalizations used in intergroup contact theory have explored emotional reactions to outgroup members (Paolini et al., 2004) and explicit beliefs of about attributes of outgroup members (Abbot & Cameron, 2014). Further, studies which operationalize prejudice as colorblind attitudes have used interracial friendship to operationalize interracial contact (Neville et al., 2014; Spanierman et al., 2008). In a similar vein, colorblind attitudes represent an ideology that includes a belief that ignoring race promotes equality. As intergroup contact has been found to reduce negative emotions toward and assumptions about an outgroup, it may be that there is less of an influence on people who believe they are promoting equality rather than superiority. This distinction may explain why interracial friendship may be more appropriate when
examining influence on colorblind attitudes, as these interactions go beyond reducing negative emotions toward promoting understanding of perspectives.

Previous studies have also found intergroup anxiety to have inverse relations with activism (Abbott & Cameron, 2014; Brylka et al., 2015; Górska et al., 2020), however, this study found interracial anxiety to have no influence on colorblind attitudes or anti-racist activism. The current sample may have also contributed to nonsignificant findings in that there appears to be restriction on the range of reported levels of interracial anxiety. Although not skewed, most participants reported low levels of interracial anxiety, limiting the ability of the analysis to examine across the full range of experiences.

Notably, this finding is consistent with Abbott and Cameron’s (2014) finding that despite the inverse relation between intergroup anxiety and activist intentions, intergroup contact did not have an indirect effect on activist intentions through intergroup anxiety. Given the aforementioned relations between variables, it may be that this relation requires more complex examination. The post-hoc analysis demonstrated that interracial anxiety was related to anti-racist activism, although only explaining a small proportion of the variance. While a larger sample would be needed to make true inferences about this finding, the disappearance of this relation in the full model suggests that interracial anxiety may have been mediated.

**Strengths and Limitations**

This study sought to explore how the established change mechanisms of intergroup contact theory, interracial anxiety and empathy, predict behavioral outcomes of individual and collective activism. This is an important step in developing an understanding of prejudice reduction strategies and examining of how established mediators differentially predict prejudice, individual activism, and collective action. One strength of the study is the examination of all
variables of interest in one model, allowing for examination of multicollinearity and which variables are more influential in the overlapping relationships. This approach allows for each variable to be controlled when examining unique relations, strengthening the understanding of the role of each mediator as well as the role of the behavioral outcomes controlling for attitudinal outcomes. Further, the study uses psychometrically strong measures, apriori power analysis, and accounts for type II errors rates (e.g., Bonferroni correction). Finally, this study examined two different types of activism allowing for distinction between the two processes and adding to the literature of each. As these two forms of activism have not been examined in concert, there was less evidence of the relative strength of these relationships given the high intercorrelation. Further, understanding what promotes each form of activism is valuable for institutions and practitioners hoping to foster one form over the other.

While the study has many strengths, there are also important limitations. The study is cross-sectional in nature, however the phenomena proposed is causal. Researchers have highlighted potential biases resulting from cross-sectional models’ inability to control for prior variable scores and inability to determine if relations reflect an influence over time or a stable relation between variables (Maxwell & Cole, 2009). Given this important limitation, this study may provide a basis for conducting longitudinal work with the same variables. Second, the phenomenon of intergroup contact has been expanded to include intergroup friendship (Turner et al., 2007) and extended contact (e.g., knowing someone with intergroup contact; Tausch et al., 2011); however, this study did not examine these expanded operationalizations. Studies have found differing effects from these alternative operationalizations and thus future research may examine if the study findings are supported or made stronger through these various operationalizations. Further, the interracial contact measure in the study represented intimate
interactions rather than general interactions, has had only preliminary psychometric testing, and has not been used in previous studies. The participants also self-selected into the study which may have contributed to people who felt strongly about interracial interactions engaging in the study. The measures used in the study are also generally face valid which may influence participant reporting more socially desirable responses. Finally, the study sample was not representative of the general population, they were primarily women, educated, and LGBTQ+ and has significantly different scores on many of the study variables, as such the findings may be sample specific. All of these factors limit the generalizability of the findings.

**Practice Implications**

Counseling psychologists function within many roles including providing mental health treatment, teaching students, and conducting advocacy. As treatment providers, psychologists must create a safe and inclusive environment for clients of all identities. However, African American clients experience disparities in quality of services (Feagin & Bennefield, 2014), diagnosis (Gara et al., 2019), and treatment engagement (Maura & Weisman de Mamani, 2017). Students of Color at predominantly white institutions also experience microaggressions (Mills, 2020; Pieterse et al., 2019) and have a higher rate of attrition (Callahan et al., 2018). While not the sample of the current study, it may be that by promoting empathy in these spaces, people may be more likely to interrupt and challenge racist events. Further research in this area is warranted.

**Research Implications**

To further understand the application of Intergroup Contact Theory (Allport, 1954) to anti-racist activism, it is necessary to replicate these findings with a broader more representative sample, as well as develop a deeper understanding of these relations through longitudinal
Another line of inquiry is to examine potential moderating and mediating variables such as anger (Selvanathan et al., 2017), racial identity, openness to diversity (Chao et al., 2015), and racial socialization. As these variables have theoretical relationships to empathy development and activist behaviors, it is important to further develop a model of behavior activation with these variables in the model. Understanding how both more malleable and static variables relate to the model can inform trainings.

A second line of inquiry is to examine the effects of different forms of interracial contact. The current study uses a new instrument in assessing interracial contact which examines frequency of intimate interactions. Future research may benefit from comparing the variable effects of interracial contact via location, quality of intimate interracial contact, and quantity of interracial friendship. Given the different operationalizations and effect sizes across studies, there may be value in exploring how the quality of an interracial relationship influences attitudinal and behavioral change differently than location or quantity.

A third line of inquiry is to explore how Intergroup Contact Theory (Allport, 1954) can be applied within Counseling Psychology programs. Within training programs, it may be valuable to improve representation of people of Color toward increasing interracial contact and interpersonal experiences. Further, program location has been identified as an area which can promote cross-cultural empathy development, as trainees have more collaboration and contact with the communities they will serve (Dyche & Zayas, 2001). Further, Chao and colleagues (2015) found that openness to diversity promoted empathy despite racial identity status. Toward promoting openness to diversity, programs can include the work of authors of Color in lectures, community engagement activities, film discussions, and reflective multicultural coursework (Chao et al., 2015). Further, in theories courses more emphasis can be given to non-Eurocentric
theories and treatments (Chao et al., 2015), and in psychopathology courses more effort can be placed in describing the toll of racism on people of Color, specifically racial trauma (Kirkinis et al., 2018; Roberson & Carter, 2021) and mental health disparities (Carter et al., 2018). Further research may assess the influence of multicultural coursework and proposed training changes in counseling psychology trainees. Examining the effects of training implications is an important step in understanding how to promote anti-racist activism within the counseling profession.

Finally, future research needs to examine how intersectional identities influence the relations within Intergroup Contact Theory (Allport, 1954). The majority of the current study sample held an oppressed identity which may have influenced their experiences of interracial contact, interracial anxiety, empathy, prejudice, and activism. Examining an individual’s experiences of discrimination in other domains may provide valuable insights into individual factors which may moderate the relations within the larger model.

**Conclusion**

Intergroup Contact Theory (Allport, 1954) has been influential in understanding prejudice reduction and has been applied to activist behaviors across various identities and groups. Understanding the how Black-White interracial contact promotes anti-racist activism in White Americans may be valuable for promoting action and challenging systems of oppression. In the current sample of people who identified as primarily women and LBGTQ+, empathy emerged as a strong and important explanatory factor in the relation between interracial contact and individual anti-racist activism, and a moderate explanatory factor in the relation between interracial contact and institutional anti-racist activism. The findings require replication with a broader sample and with longitudinal data. Further research into the influence of intersectional identities, different forms of interracial contact, and moderating variables is warranted.
References


Binder, J., Zagefka, H., Brown, R., Funke, F., Kessler, T., Mummendey, A., Maquil, A., Demoulin, S., & Leyens, J. P. (2009). Does contact reduce prejudice or does prejudice reduce contact? A longitudinal test of the contact hypothesis among majority and


https://doi.org/10.1037/tep0000203


https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.2011.01737.x


https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430217690908


### Table 1

**Demographics of Sample**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>36.41</td>
<td>13.44</td>
<td>19-73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>109,150.71</td>
<td>104045.70</td>
<td>0-1,2000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Not Reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gender**

- Woman: 264 (68.8)
- Man: 88 (22.9)
- Non-Binary: 14 (3.6)
- Other (Agender, Genderqueer, GNC…): 8 (2.1)

**Sexual Orientation**

- Heterosexual: 251 (65.4)
- Lesbian: 11 (2.9)
- Gay: 11 (2.9)
- Bisexual: 47 (12.2)
- Queer (only): 18 (4.7)
- Asexual: 4 (1.0)
- Pansexual: 8 (2.1)
- Other (Demisexual, Straight-ish, Questioning…): 11 (2.9)

**Socioeconomic Status**

- Lower Class: 1 (0.3)
- Working Class: 53 (13.8)
- Lower Middle Class: 55 (14.3)
- Middle Class: 162 (42.2)
- Upper Middle Class: 98 (25.5)
- Upper Class: 14 (3.6)

**Highest Education**

- High School: 5 (3.6)
- Some College: 15 (10.7)
- College: 72 (51.4)
- Master's: 31 (22.1)
- Doctorate: 16 (11.4)
- Other: 1 (0.7)

**Geographic Region of US**

- Northeast: 217 (56.5)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Type</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

Variable Correlations and Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Age</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Date of Participation</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Interracial Contact</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>(.91)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Empathy</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.21*</td>
<td>(.83)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Interracial Anxiety</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.33*</td>
<td>-0.20*</td>
<td>(.82)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Colorblind Attitudes</td>
<td>0.28*</td>
<td>0.21*</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.35*</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>(.96)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. ARBI Individual</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.31*</td>
<td>0.48*</td>
<td>-0.21*</td>
<td>-0.74*</td>
<td>(.90)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. ARBI Institutional</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.31*</td>
<td>0.36*</td>
<td>-0.17*</td>
<td>-0.55*</td>
<td>0.69*</td>
<td>(.81)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Age</td>
<td>36.41</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15.89</td>
<td>22.31</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>43.40</td>
<td>34.38</td>
<td>12.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Date of Participation</td>
<td>13.44</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>22.66</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>4.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Interracial Contact</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Empathy</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .001

Note. Cronbach’s alphas are found on the diagonal.
Table 3

**Multivariate Multiple Regression Analyses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tests of predictor</th>
<th>Pillai’s $V$</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>$\hat{\rho}_{MV}^2$</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>$\hat{\rho}^2$</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>$sdfc$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interracial Contact - Outcomes</td>
<td>0.146</td>
<td>21.59</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>Colorblind Attitudes</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.012 (0.00, 0.03)</td>
<td>-0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ARBI Individual</td>
<td>41.18</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.095 (0.05, 0.14)</td>
<td>-1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ARBI Institutional</td>
<td>39.80</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.092 (0.05, 0.14)</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tests of unique effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Colorblind Attitudes</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.002 (0.00, 0.00)</td>
<td>-0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interracial Contact - Outcomes</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>11.09</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>ARBI Individual</td>
<td>18.79</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.045 (0.01, 0.07)</td>
<td>-0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ARBI Institutional</td>
<td>21.43</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.051 (0.01, 0.08)</td>
<td>-0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathic Concern - Outcomes</td>
<td>0.190</td>
<td>29.61</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.184</td>
<td>Colorblind Attitudes</td>
<td>49.67</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.114 (0.06, 0.16)</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ARBI Individual</td>
<td>88.60</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.187 (0.12, 0.24)</td>
<td>-0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ARBI Institutional</td>
<td>39.81</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.093 (0.04, 0.13)</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interracial Anxiety - Outcomes</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>Colorblind Attitudes</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>0.175</td>
<td>0.002 (0.00, 0.00)</td>
<td>-1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ARBI Individual</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>0.231</td>
<td>0.001 (0.00, 0.00)</td>
<td>-1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ARBI Institutional</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.439</td>
<td>0.000 (0.00, 0.00)</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $\alpha_{pc} = .017$. $\hat{\rho}_{MV}^2$ is the estimated population multivariate effect size; $sdfc$ = standardized discriminant function coefficient;

Outcomes = Colorblind Attitudes, Individual Anti-Racist Behavior, and Institutional Anti-Racist Behavior as a multivariate set; ARBI Individual = Individual Anti-Racist Behavior; ARBI Institutional = Institutional Anti-Racist Behavior.
Table 4

Post-Hoc Multivariate Multiple Regression Analyses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tests of predictor</th>
<th>Pillai’s $V$</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>$\hat{\beta}_{MV}^2$</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>$\hat{\beta}^2$</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>sdfc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interracial Contact - Outcomes</td>
<td>0.146</td>
<td>21.59</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>Colorblind Attitudes</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.012 (0.00, 0.03)</td>
<td>-0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ARBI Individual</td>
<td>41.18</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.095 (0.05, 0.14)</td>
<td>-1.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ARBI Institutional</td>
<td>39.80</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.092 (0.05, 0.14)</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age - Outcomes</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>16.01</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>Colorblind Attitudes</td>
<td>31.14</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.073 (0.03, 0.12)</td>
<td>-1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ARBI Individual</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>0.006 (0.00, 0.02)</td>
<td>-0.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ARBI Institutional</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.801</td>
<td>0.000 (0.00, 0.00)</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Participation - Outcomes</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>9.54</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>Colorblind Attitudes</td>
<td>17.60</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.042 (0.01, 0.07)</td>
<td>-1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ARBI Individual</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>0.236</td>
<td>0.001 (0.00, 0.00)</td>
<td>-0.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ARBI Institutional</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.962</td>
<td>0.000 (0.00, 0.00)</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tests of unique effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interracial Contact - Outcomes</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>10.73</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>Colorblind Attitudes</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>0.005 (0.00, 0.00)</td>
<td>-0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ARBI Individual</td>
<td>20.11</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.048 (0.01, 0.07)</td>
<td>-0.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ARBI Institutional</td>
<td>21.56</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.051 (0.01, 0.08)</td>
<td>-0.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age - Outcomes</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>13.84</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>Colorblind Attitudes</td>
<td>32.71</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.077 (0.03, 0.11)</td>
<td>-1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ARBI Individual</td>
<td>6.31</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.014 (0.00, 0.19)</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ARBI Institutional</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.528</td>
<td>0.000 (0.00, 0.00)</td>
<td>-0.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Participation - Outcomes</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>Colorblind Attitudes</td>
<td>15.98</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.038 (0.00, 0.06)</td>
<td>-1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ARBI Individual</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>0.004 (0.00, 0.00)</td>
<td>-0.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ARBI Institutional</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.000 (0.00, 0.00)</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathic Concern - Outcomes</td>
<td>0.199</td>
<td>31.06</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.192</td>
<td>Colorblind Attitudes</td>
<td>59.53</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.134 (0.07, 0.18)</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ARBI Individual</td>
<td>91.98</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.194 (0.12, 0.24)</td>
<td>-0.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ARBI Institutional</td>
<td>39.88</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.093 (0.04, 0.13)</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interracial Anxiety - Outcomes</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>Colorblind Attitudes</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.275</td>
<td>0.001 (0.00, 0.00)</td>
<td>-1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ARBI Individual</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>0.172</td>
<td>0.002 (0.00, 0.00)</td>
<td>-1.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ARBI Institutional</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.419</td>
<td>0.000 (0.00, 0.00)</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $\alpha_{pc} = .017$. $\hat{\beta}_{MV}^2$ is the estimated population multivariate effect size; sdfc = standardized discriminant function coefficient;

Outcomes = Colorblind Attitudes, Individual Anti-Racist Behavior, and Institutional Anti-Racist Behavior as a multivariate set; ARBI Individual = Individual Anti-Racist Behavior; ARBI Institutional = Institutional Anti-Racist Behavior.
Table 5

Post-Hoc Multivariate Regression Analyses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pillai’s V</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>$\hat{\beta}^2_{MV}$</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>sdfc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interracial Anxiety - Outcomes</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>11.72</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>Colorblind Attitudes</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ARBI Individual</td>
<td>16.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ARBI Institutional</td>
<td>11.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $\alpha_{pc} = .017$. $\hat{\beta}^2_{MV}$ is the estimated population multivariate effect size; sdfc = standardized discriminant function coefficient; Outcomes = Colorblind Attitudes, Individual Anti-Racist Behavior, and Institutional Anti-Racist Behavior as a multivariate set; ARBI Individual = Individual Anti-Racist Behavior; ARBI Institutional = Institutional Anti-Racist Behavior.
### Table 6

**Mean Comparison Statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Current Sample Mean</th>
<th>Current Sample SD</th>
<th>Comparison Study Means</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Eta Sq</th>
<th>$\hat{\rho}^2$</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>3.25 Versey et al., 2019</td>
<td>-2.04733</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>0.03877</td>
<td>0.01803</td>
<td>0.00824</td>
<td>(.002, .047)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interracial Anxiety</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>1.44 Shook &amp; Fazio, 2011</td>
<td>-15.17104</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>0.000001</td>
<td>0.37537</td>
<td>0.37374</td>
<td>(.31, .44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorblind Attitudes</td>
<td>43.40</td>
<td>22.66</td>
<td>67.22 Neville et al., 2000</td>
<td>-20.59906</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>0.000001</td>
<td>0.52559</td>
<td>0.52435</td>
<td>(.47, .58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARBI Individual</td>
<td>34.38</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>32.22 Pieterse et al., 2016</td>
<td>5.87878</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>0.000001</td>
<td>0.08277</td>
<td>0.08037</td>
<td>(.04, .13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARBI Institutional</td>
<td>12.43</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>9.92 Pieterse et al., 2016</td>
<td>11.33312</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>0.000001</td>
<td>0.25113</td>
<td>0.24918</td>
<td>(.19, .31)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1

*Hypothesis I: Indirect effects of interracial contact on colorblind attitudes, individual anti-racism, and institutional anti-racism as a linear combination through interracial anxiety and empathic concern*
Figure 2

Hypothesis II: Indirect effects of interracial contact on colorblind attitudes, individual anti-racism, and institutional anti-racism through empathic concern
Hypothesis III: Indirect effects of interracial contact on colorblind attitudes, individual anti-racism, and institutional anti-racism through interracial anxiety
Observed indirect effects of interracial contact on colorblind attitudes, individual anti-racism, and institutional anti-racism as a linear combination through interracial anxiety and empathic concern

Note. All paths significant p < .01. Path coefficients from interracial contact to mediators are shrunken $R^2$, coefficients from interracial contact, empathy, and interracial anxiety to the linear combination of dependent variables are $\hat{\beta}_{M_r}$. The $c$ path indicates the coefficient when mediators are not included in the model, the $c'$ path indicates the coefficient when mediators are included in the model.
Figure 5

Observed indirect effects of interracial contact on colorblind attitudes, individual anti-racism, and institutional anti-racism through empathic concern

Note. Paths in solid lines are significant p < .01. Path coefficient from interracial contact to empathy is shrunken $R^2$, coefficients from interracial contact and empathy to the dependent variables of colorblind attitudes, individual anti-racism, and institutional anti-racism are $\hat{\beta}$. The c path indicates the coefficient when mediators are not included in the model, the c’ path indicates the coefficient when mediators are included in the model. Standardized discriminant function coefficients (sdfc) are indicated in the parentheses to account for intercorrelation, sdfc with the same superscript are comparable.
Observed indirect effects of interracial contact on colorblind attitudes, individual anti-racism, and institutional anti-racism through interracial anxiety

Note. Paths in solid lines are significant p <.01. Path coefficient from interracial contact to interracial anxiety is shrunken $R^2$, coefficients from interracial contact and interracial anxiety to the dependent variables of colorblind attitudes, individual anti-racism, and institutional anti-racism are $\hat{\beta}^2$. The c path indicates the coefficient when mediators are not included in the model, the c’ path indicates the coefficient when mediators are included in the model. Standardized discriminant function coefficients ($sdfc$) are indicated in the parentheses to account for intercorrelation, $sdfc$ with the same superscript are comparable.
Figure 7

Post Hoc Analysis: Full indirect effect model on linear combination with age and date of participation

Note. Paths in solid lines are significant p < .01. Path coefficients from predictors to mediators are shrunken $R^2$, coefficients from predictors and mediators to the linear combination of dependent variables are $\beta_{MV}$. 
Post Hoc Analysis: Full indirect effect model on linear combination with age and date of participation

Note. Paths in solid lines are significant p < .01. Path coefficients from predictors to mediators are shrunken $R^2$, coefficients from predictors and mediators to the dependent variables of colorblind attitudes, individual anti-racism, and institutional anti-racism are $\hat{\beta}^2$. The c path indicates the coefficient when mediators are not included in the model, the c' path indicates the coefficient when mediators are included in the model. Standardized discriminant function coefficients ($sdfc$) are indicated in the parentheses to account for intercorrelation, $sdfc$ with the same superscript are comparable.
Figure 9

*Post Hoc Analysis: Interracial anxiety single predictor model*

![Diagram](image)

*Note.* Paths in solid lines are significant $p < .001$. The path coefficient from interracial anxiety to the linear combination of dependent variables is $\hat{\beta}_\text{mv}^2$. Path coefficients from interracial anxiety to the dependent variables of colorblind attitudes, individual anti-racism, and institutional anti-racism are $\hat{\beta}^2$. Standardized discriminant function coefficients ($\text{sdfc}$) are indicated in the parentheses to account for intercorrelation, $\text{sdfc}$ with the same superscript are comparable.
Appendix A: Recruitment Materials

Hello!

You are invited to share your experiences in a short 10-15 minute survey exploring the influence of interracial experiences on attitudes, emotions, and behaviors toward people of Color. Your responses are valuable and would help the field to better understand factors which influence positive interracial experiences.
Please consider participating in this study if you are:

- 18 or older
- Identify as a White person
- Have lived in the United States for the majority of your life

Upon completion of the study, you will have the opportunity to enter a drawing for a chance to win one of fifteen $15 gift cards.

Your participation is voluntary and confidential. You may choose to end participation at any time. Please follow the link below to access the informed consent and survey:
https://albany.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_37O7hTcrhJ7bX37

Password: experience
Thank you for your time!
Katheryn Roberson

If you have any additional questions regarding any aspect of this research project, please do not hesitate to contact Katheryn Roberson (kroberson@albany.edu) or Dr. Alex Pieterse at the University at Albany, apieterse@albany.edu.

If you have any questions concerning your rights as a participant, you may contact the Office of Regulatory and Research Compliance, at the University at Albany, at (866) 857-5459 or rco@albany.edu. The IRB Study Number is 20X269.
If you identify as White, are over 18, and have lived mostly in the United States please consider participating in a study exploring the influence of interracial experiences on attitudes, emotions, and behaviors.

Chance to win a $15 e-gift card!!

IRB Study #20X269
Appendix B: Consent Form

**Researcher(s):** Katheryn Roberson, Ed.M., M.A., SUNY Albany

**Faculty sponsor:** Alex Pieterse, Ph.D, SUNY Albany

**Description of research.** The study is designed to gain information about the interracial interactions and how interracial experiences influence attitudes, emotions, and behaviors toward people of Color. This information is important to better understand factors which influence positive interracial experiences. **Please consider participating in this study if you are 18 or older, identify as White, and have lived in the United States for most of your life.**

**Procedures.** To be eligible to participate you must be a White person, 18 or older, who has lived in the United States for most of your life. If you participate in this research study, you will be invited to complete a series of questionnaires about demographic information, interracial interactions, emotions in interracial interactions, general feelings toward others, attitudes regarding race relations, and behaviors in race-related interactions. The online survey should take approximately 10-15 minutes to complete.

**Voluntary Participation.** Your participation in this project is voluntary. You may choose to leave the study at any time (by exiting the website and closing the browser). I will retain and analyze the information you have provided up until the point you have left the study unless you request that your data be excluded from any analysis and/or destroyed. To request that your data be excluded, please contact kroberson@albany.edu.

**Risks or Discomforts.** There is minimal risk associated with your participation in this study. Potential risks and/or discomforts of participation may include minimal discomfort answering some survey items. However, these items should provoke no greater discomfort than one might experience in daily life activities.

**Benefits.** Possible benefits of participation include helping to provide data that could benefit the understanding of thoughts and actions influenced by interracial experiences. Although you may not receive direct benefit from your participation, others may ultimately benefit from the knowledge obtained from this research.

**Confidentiality.** Your participation will be confidential. The researcher will not be collecting names or IP addresses in order to keep your information safe throughout this study. Each participant will instead be identified by a number, rather than an identifying information. Thus, your name will not appear on the questionnaire forms and the study website will not retain any identifying information of the computer that you complete the study on. The data collected will be kept on a password-protected computer. Therefore, your individual identity will be kept private when information is presented or published about this study as the survey is anonymous and there will be no way to identify your responses.
All information obtained in this study is strictly confidential unless disclosure is required by law. In addition, the Institutional Review Board, the sponsor of the study (e.g. NIH, FDA, etc.) and University or government officials responsible for monitoring this study may inspect these records.

This project has been approved by the University at Albany Institutional Review Board. Approval of this project only signifies that the procedures adequately protect the rights and welfare of the participants. Please note that absolute confidentiality cannot be guaranteed due to the limited protections of Internet access. Please be sure to close your browser when finished so no one will be able to see what you have been doing.

**Contact Information:** If you have any questions about this study, please contact the Investigator: Katheryn Roberson, Ed.M., M.A. at kroberson@albany.edu; or the Faculty Sponsor: Alex Pieterse, Ph.D, at apieterse@albany.edu.

**IRB contact about your rights in the study or to report a complaint.** Research at the University Albany, involving human participants, is carried out under the oversight of the Institutional Review Board (IRB). This research has been reviewed and approved by the IRB. If you have any questions concerning your rights as a research subject or if you wish to report any concerns about the study, you may contact University at Albany Office for Pre-Award and Compliance Services at 1-866-857-5459 or hsconcerns@albany.edu.

---

**Please take all the time you need to read through this document and decide whether you would like to participate in this research study.**

Please indicate your decision by selecting the appropriate response on the following question. If you select that you consent to participate, press "Continue". If you decide that you do not consent, please exit the study. Please keep this form for your records.

*I have read, or been informed of, the information about this study. I hereby consent to participate in the study.*
Appendix C: Demographic Questionnaire

Age: ________ *
Gender: __________________

Race (check one): *
  o  White
  o  Black or African American
  o  American Indian or Alaska Native
  o  Asian
  o  Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
  o  Hispanic/Latinx
  o  Arab
  o  Biracial

Have you lived the majority of your life in the United States?
  o  Yes
  o  No ______________

Sexual Orientation: ______________

Socioeconomic Status
  o  Lower Class
  o  Working Class
  o  Lower Middle Class
  o  Middle Class
  o  Upper Middle Class
  o  Upper Class

Approximate household income: ______________

Occupation

Highest Education
  o  High School
  o  Some College
  o  College
  o  Master’s Degree
  o  Doctoral Degree
  o  Other

Geographic Region of the United States
  o  Northeast
- Southeast
- Midwest
- Southwest
- West

**Community Type**
- Rural
- Urban
- Suburban

How many Black friends do you have? _____________________ *

* Denotes required items

*Note. Occupation and Highest Level of Education were added after participation began*
Appendix D: Interracial Contact Scale

Positive
1. Talked to on the telephone
2. Been to a Chicano’s house to visit
3. Confided in Chicanos
4. Gone someplace with Chicanos
5. Invited Chicanos to your house
6. Played on the same team together
7. Sat next to in the cafeteria
8. Worked on a project with
9. Helped on a school assignment
10. Lent them something

Negative
1. Had arguments or fights with Chicanos
2. Been called names by Chicanos

Interracial Contact Scale - Modified
(Used in the current study)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>All the time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Been to a Black person’s house to visit
2. Confided in Black people
3. Gone someplace with Black people
4. Invited Black people to your house
5. Lent Black people something
Appendix E: Intergroup Anxiety Toward African Americans Scale

0 1 2 3 4
Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

1. I would feel nervous if I had to sit alone in a room with a Black person and start a conversation.
2. I just do not know what to expect from Black people.
3. Although I do not consider myself a racist, I do not know how to present myself around Black people.
4. My lack of knowledge about the Black culture prevents me from feeling completely comfortable around Black people.
5. I can interact with Black people without experiencing much anxiety.
6. If I were at a party, I would have no problem starting a conversation with a Black person.
7. It makes me uncomfortable to bring up the topic of racism around Black people.
8. I experience little anxiety when I talk to Black people.
9. The cultural differences between Blacks and Whites make interactions between Blacks and Whites awkward.
10. I would experience some anxiety if I were the only White person in a room full of Black people.
11. I worry about coming across as a racist when I talk with Black people.
Appendix F: Interpersonal Reactivity Scale – Empathy Scale

The following statements inquire about your thoughts and feelings in a variety of situations. For each item, indicate how well it describes you by choosing the appropriate letter on the scale at the top of the page: A, B, C, D, or E. When you have decided on your answer, fill in the letter next to the item number. READ EACH ITEM CAREFULLY BEFORE RESPONDING. Answer as honestly as you can. Thank you.

Full Scale:
1. I daydream and fantasize, with some regularity, about things that might happen to me. (FS)
2. I often have tender, concerned feelings for people less fortunate than me. (EC)
3. I sometimes find it difficult to see things from the "other guy's" point of view. (PT)
4. Sometimes I don't feel very sorry for other people when they are having problems. (EC)
5. I really get involved with the feelings of the characters in a novel. (FS)
6. In emergency situations, I feel apprehensive and ill-at-ease. (PD)
7. I am usually objective when I watch a movie or play, and I don't often get completely caught up in it. (FS)
8. I try to look at everybody's side of a disagreement before I make a decision. (PT)
9. When I see someone being taken advantage of, I feel kind of protective towards them. (EC)
10. I sometimes feel helpless when I am in the middle of a very emotional situation. (PD)
11. I sometimes try to understand my friends better by imagining how things look from their perspective. (PT)
12. Becoming extremely involved in a good book or movie is somewhat rare for me. (FS)
13. When I see someone get hurt, I tend to remain calm. (PD)
14. Other people's misfortunes do not usually disturb me a great deal. (EC)
15. If I'm sure I'm right about something, I don't waste much time listening to other people's arguments. (PT)
16. After seeing a play or movie, I have felt as though I were one of the characters. (FS)
17. Being in a tense emotional situation scares me. (PD)
18. When I see someone being treated unfairly, I sometimes don't feel very much pity for them. (EC)
19. I am usually pretty effective in dealing with emergencies. (PD)
20. I am often quite touched by things that I see happen. (EC)
21. I believe that there are two sides to every question and try to look at them both. (PT)
22. I would describe myself as a pretty soft-hearted person. (EC)
23. When I watch a good movie, I can very easily put myself in the place of a leading character. (FS)
24. I tend to lose control during emergencies. (PD)
25. When I'm upset at someone, I usually try to "put myself in his shoes" for a while. (PT)
26. When I am reading an interesting story or novel, I imagine how I would feel if the events in the story were happening to me. (FS)
27. When I see someone who badly needs help in an emergency, I go to pieces. (PD)
28. Before criticizing somebody, I try to imagine how I would feel if I were in their place. (PT)
NOTE: (-) denotes item to be scored in reverse fashion

Empathic Concern Subscale
1. I often have tender, concerned feelings for people less fortunate than me.
2. Sometimes I don't feel very sorry for other people when they are having problems. (-)
3. When I see someone being taken advantage of, I feel kind of protective towards them.
4. Other people's misfortunes do not usually disturb me a great deal. (-)
5. When I see someone being treated unfairly, I sometimes don't feel very much pity for them. (-)
6. I am often quite touched by things that I see happen.
7. I would describe myself as a pretty soft-hearted person.
NOTE: (-) denotes item to be scored in reverse fashion

A = 0   B = 1   C = 2   D = 3   E = 4
Except for reversed-scored items, which are scored:
A = 4   B = 3   C = 2   D = 1   E = 0
Appendix G: Colorblind Racial Attitudes Scale

Below is a set of questions that deal with social issues in the United States (U.S.). Using the 6-point scale, please give your honest rating about the degree to which you personally agree or disagree with each statement. Please be as open and honest as you can; there are no right or wrong answers. Record your response to the left of each item.

1. Strongly Disagree   2. 3. 4. 5. 6. Strongly Agree

1. Everyone who works hard, no matter what race they are, has an equal chance to become rich.
2. Race plays a major role in the type of social services (such as type of health care or day care) that people receive in the U.S.
3. It is important that people begin to think of themselves as American and not African American, Mexican American, or Italian American.
4. Due to racial discrimination, programs such as affirmative action are necessary to create equality.
5. Racism is a major problem in the U.S.
6. Race is very important in determining who is successful and who is not.
7. Racism may have been a problem in the past, it is not an important problem today.
8. Racial and ethnic minorities do not have the same opportunities as White people in the U.S.
9. White people in the U.S. are discriminated against because of the color of their skin.
10. Talking about racial issues causes unnecessary tension.
11. It is important for political leaders to talk about racism to help work through or solve society’s problems.
12. White people in the U.S. have certain advantages because of the color of their skin.
13. Immigrants should try to fit into the culture and values of the U.S.
14. English should be the only official language in the U.S.
15. White people are more to blame for racial discrimination than racial and ethnic minorities.
16. Social policies, such as affirmative action, discriminate unfairly against white people.
17. It is important for public schools to teach about the history and contributions of racial and ethnic minorities.
18. Racial and ethnic minorities in the U.S. have certain advantages because of the color of their skin.
19. Racial problems in the U.S. are rare, isolated problems.
20. Race plays an important role in who gets sent to prison.
Appendix H: Antiracism Behavioral Inventory

Please indicate how much you agree with the following statements by using the response format below. There are no right or wrong answers. Just respond as honestly as you can.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. When I hear people telling racist jokes and using negative racial stereotypes, I usually confront them</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I give money to organizations working against racism and discrimination</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I actively seek to understand how I participate in both intentional and unintentional racism</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I feel guilty and ashamed when I think of the history of racism and slavery in the US</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I actively seek to educate myself about the experience of racism</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. When I read in articles in newspapers or magazines that are perpetuating racist ideas I generally write a letter to the editor</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I interrupt racist conversations and jokes when I hear my friends talking that way</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I am actively involved in exposing companies that uphold exclusionary and racist practices</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. It bothers me that my country has yet to acknowledge the impact of slavery</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I have challenged acts of racism that I have witnessed in my workplace or at school</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The US should offer some type of payment to the descendants of enslaved Africans</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I make it a point to educate myself about the experience of historically oppressed groups in the US (e.g. slavery, internment of Japanese, American Indians and the trail of tears etc.)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. The US has not acknowledged the impact of slavery.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Because of racism in the US Blacks do not have the same educational opportunities as compared to Whites.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I often speak to my friends about the problem of racism in the US and what we can do about it.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Within the US racism, is largely perpetuated by the White racial majority</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I write letters to local and state politicians to voice my concerns about racism</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I do not like to talk about racism in public</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I volunteer with anti-racist or racial justice organizations</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I interrupt racist conversations and jokes when I hear them in my family</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. The police unfairly target Black men and Latino’s.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>