



Personality and Individual Differences

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/paid



Flexible confronters, informative confronters, and low stakes prodders: A person-centered approach to prejudice confrontation styles



Emma Wedell^{a,*}, Kimberly E. Chaney^b

^a Department of Psychological Sciences, University of Connecticut, United States of America
 ^b Department of Psychology, University at Buffalo, The State University of New York, United States of America

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Prejudice

Confronting

Lay theories

Latent profile analysis

Person-centered analysis

ABSTRACT

When people encounter prejudice, they may respond by expressing disapproval (i.e., confronting prejudice). Prior research has identified five primary features that characterize prejudice confrontations: educational, argumentative, help-seeking, empathy, and humor. In the present research, we used a person-centered approach to identify profiles of individuals based on these self-reported prejudice confrontation styles (PCS). Latent profile analyses were conducted across three online U.S. studies ($N_{total} = 978$) to classify individuals by PCS profiles. Four profiles classified undergraduates' and White adults' PCS: high in educational, help-seeking, empathy, and humor (informative confronters), moderate in educational, help-seeking, empathy, and humor and low in argumentative (low stakes prodders), and low on all subscales (i.e., non-confronters), and moderate-to-high in all subscales (flexible confronters). Informative confronters, low stakes prodders, and non-confronter profiles emerged among the Black sample, but not the flexible confronter profile. Across the three samples, confronter profiles differed in several lay theories of prejudice and intentions to confront prejudice against a range of derogated and disadvantaged groups. These findings identified four primary PCS profiles and illustrated differences across profiles in how people think about and intend to respond to prejudice.

1. Introduction

Prejudice is a pervasive problem in the United States (U.S.; Bravo et al., 2021; Farber et al., 2021). As a result, people must decide how to respond when they experience or observe unfair treatment. Any response made in an effort to communicate distaste or disapproval may be considered a prejudice confrontation (Ashburn-Nardo et al., 2008; Czopp et al., 2006). Prejudice confrontations are tools to attain antioppression goals, including at interpersonal (Chaney et al., 2020; Czopp et al., 2006) and institutional levels (Brown et al., 2021; Wedell et al., 2022). Prejudice confrontations are therefore notable within the category of hierarchy-attenuating behaviors (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999).

Prejudice confrontations encompass a variety of responses, including those that may be characterized as indirect (Lee et al., 2012) or assertive (Dickter & Newton, 2013). Experimental work has demonstrated that outcomes of prejudice confrontations can vary by confrontation style, with implications for the extent to which confronters may be liked, respected, or considered persuasive (Dickter et al., 2012; Woodzicka & Good, 2021). Recent research expanded this work to examine prejudice confrontation styles (PCS) from an individual differences perspective to understand people's various ways of confronting prejudice. Chaney and Sanchez (2022) developed and validated a measure of PCS with five subscales: educational (i.e., educate the perpetrator about why their behavior was offensive), argumentative (i.e., argue with the perpetrator to convey dissent), help-seeking (i.e., seek help from supportive others), empathy (i.e., appeal to empathy for targets of prejudice), and humor (i. e., attempt to use humor to express disapproval). Some PCS were perceived by participants to be more effective at reducing bias (i.e., argumentative, educational, and empathy PCS), whereas others were related to better well-being (i.e., educational and help-seeking were associated with more rumination, and educational and argumentative were associated with greater autonomy; Chaney & Sanchez, 2022). Identifying the PCS which people employ is critical to advancing an understanding of prejudice confrontations as a strategy for prejudice reduction.

A variable-centered approach to PCS was a foundational development in confrontation research, yet there are limited insights provided by considering each PCS in isolation. Even in the initial PCS scale development, it was documented that some people employed more than one style of confrontation at a time (Chaney & Sanchez, 2022). Person-

* Corresponding author. *E-mail address:* emma.wedell@uconn.edu (E. Wedell).

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2024.112904

Received 31 March 2024; Received in revised form 13 August 2024; Accepted 27 September 2024 Available online 12 October 2024 0191-8869/© 2024 Elsevier Ltd. All rights are reserved, including those for text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies. centered approaches, such as latent profile analysis (LPA), afford insights into how multiple styles may characterize stable differences in an individual person's tendency to confront prejudice. The application of a person-centered approach to PCS would pave the way for deeper integration of prejudice confrontations into the psychology of personality.

LPA is a type of mixture model that is used to identify types of individuals based on multiple continuous measures. Mathematically, LPA is a person-centered analogy to factor analysis: whereas factor analysis identifies groupings of measurement items to which people respond similarly, LPA identifies groupings of *people* who respond to multiple continuous measures similarly (Bartholomew et al., 2011). As such, we used LPA to model PCS across three samples of U.S. undergraduates, White adults, and Black adults. Moreover, we sought to examine factors that may be associated with various prejudice confrontation profiles, including intentions to confront prejudice and beliefs about prejudice. As this research was data-driven, we had no a priori hypotheses about what PCS profiles would emerge.

1.1. Variables that may differ across PCS profiles

PCS profiles might be conceptualized as behavioral repertoires from which people draw when they consider how to respond to prejudice. These behavioral repertoires may reflect underlying differences in prejudice-related cognition and behavioral intentions. Because the inquiries in these studies are exploratory, and because there is little foundational work to draw from that has directly looked at the associations between PCS, we wanted to examine a broad array of variables that might be related to PCS profiles. Following the previous confrontation literature, we focus on outcomes including people's beliefs about how they might respond to prejudice and discrimination (Brown et al., 2021), the post-confrontation outcomes that they anticipate (Good et al., 2012), and the malleability and origins of prejudice (Rattan & Dweck, 2010).

1.1.1. Confrontation behavior and intentions

An objective of prejudice confrontation research is to identify *who* confronts prejudice and in *which* circumstances (Dickter & Newton, 2013). As some prejudices are rated as more serious than others by lay perceivers (such as anti-Black racism vs. sexism, respectively; Czopp & Monteith, 2003), the group targeted by prejudice is an important factor to consider. Much prior work has focused on prejudice confrontations of anti-Black racism and sexism, and it is imperative to also assess prejudice confrontations across a broader range of prejudices. *As intended* confrontation research (Brown et al., 2021; Rattan & Dweck, 2018), the present research examines whether prejudice confrontation intentions broadly, and across types of prejudices, were related to PCS profiles.

1.1.2. Perceived benefits to confronting and concern about potential costs

Prejudice confrontations may be perceived as beneficial by curbing prejudice and stereotyping by the confronted individual (Chaney et al., 2020; Czopp et al., 2006) and encouraging the perpetrator to compensate for the transgression (Mallett & Wagner, 2011). Still, confronters may face the possibility of incurring social or even economic costs (Ashburn-Nardo et al., 2008; Czopp & Monteith, 2003; Good et al., 2012). Potential costs and benefits are considered when individuals decide whether and how to confront prejudice (Ashburn-Nardo et al., 2008). People's PCS styles may therefore relate to their expectations for costs and benefits of confronting prejudice (Becker & Barreto, 2019; Good et al., 2012).

1.1.3. Lay theories of prejudice: Malleability and origins

People's beliefs, or lay theories, about prejudice influence attention to and interpretation of events that transpire in their social worlds. For example, people who believe that prejudice is malleable are more likely to confront a statement that denigrated affirmative action compared to people who believe prejudice is more fixed (Rattan & Dweck, 2010). Beliefs about the origins of prejudice may also invite different reactions to discrimination (Chaney et al., in press; Chaney & Wedell, 2022). Lay theories about the origins of prejudice include the ideas that prejudice results from ignorance (Hodson & Esses, 2005; Sommers & Norton, 2006), malice (Hodson & Esses, 2005; Sommers & Norton, 2006), malice (Hodson & Esses, 2005; Sommers & Norton, 2006), malice (Hodson & Esses, 2005). Each origin implies unique sets of bias-reducing interventions. The belief that prejudice stems from ignorance implies that education can mitigate bias (Carter & Murphy, 2015), whereas the belief that prejudice is learned from others implies that biases may need to be *u*rlearned (Monteith et al., 2002). Therefore, we aimed to examine the associations between PCS profiles and lay theories of prejudice to discern if specific beliefs about prejudice may be related to how people confront prejudice.

1.2. Current research

Our first aim was to identify groups of individuals by PCS and examine differences in self-reported confrontation behaviors, intentions, and beliefs about prejudice. We identified latent PCS profiles among a racially diverse sample of U.S. undergraduate students (Study 1), U.S. White adults (Study 2), and U.S. Black adults (Study 3). The second aim was to compare profiles in self-reported confrontation frequency (Studied 1–3), intentions to confront prejudice toward a wide range of social groups (Study 1), confrontation and accomplice behavior intentions, concern about costs and beliefs about the benefits of prejudice confrontations, and lay theories of prejudice (Studies 2–3). All study materials are available on OSF: https://osf.io/p2cxt/?view_only=70b 37526df134deab22d4464c80c935e

2. Study 1

Study 1 was an examination of latent PCS profiles and differences across profiles in intentions to confront prejudice. Study 1 recruited U.S. undergraduate participants at a Northeastern U.S. university. Because different groups, such as racial groups (Zou & Cheryan, 2017), may experience different forms of prejudice, we assessed intentions to confront prejudice targeting a range of social groups to discern if profiles were related to intentions to confront prejudice.

2.1. Method

2.1.1. Participants

Participants included undergraduates recruited in Spring 2022 to participate in a 30-min online study in exchange for partial course credit. As large samples are frequently necessary for structural equation modeling (Kline, 2016), we recruited 312 participants to account for exclusions. Thirty-three participants were excluded for incorrectly responding to all three attention check questions (e.g., "select strongly disagree") or not indicating consent for their data to be included in analyses, resulting in an analytic sample of 279 participants ($M_{age} = 18.93$, SD = 1.20).

The sample was primarily cisgender women (n = 209), with the remainder identifying as cisgender men (n = 32), non-binary/genderqueer (n = 11), and questioning or unsure (n = 4) or who another option (n = 19; e.g., transgender man, nonbinary). The sample was predominately White (n = 147), and 34 were Hispanic or Latinx, 28 were Black or African American, 21 were South Asian, 14 were East Asian, 11 were Southeast Asian, two were Middle Eastern or North African, one was Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, and 18 identified with more than one race or ethnicity. On a scale from 1 (*Strongly conservative*) to 7 (*Strongly liberal*), the sample leaned somewhat liberal (M = 5.20, SD = 1.36). Table 1 presents additional demographics.

2.1.2. Procedure

After providing consent, participants responded to measures

E. Wedell and K.E. Chaney

Table 1

Sample characteristics (Study 1).

Demographics	n (%)
Sexual orientation	
Straight or heterosexual	212 (76.8 %)
Gay or lesbian	13 (4.7 %)
Bisexual	30 (10.9 %)
Pansexual	5 (1.8 %)
Queer	5 (1.8 %)
Questioning	8 (2.9 %)
Asexual	3 (1.1 %)
Socioeconomic status	
Poor or just barely making it	9 (3.2 %)
Working or labor class	46 (16.6 %)
Middle class	131 (47.3 %)
Upper middle class	83 (30.0 %)
Wealthy	8 (2.9 %)
Citizenship and visa status	
American-born citizen	244 (88.4 %)
Naturalized citizen	19 (6.9 %)
Immigrant with visa	12 (4.3 %)
Immigrant with non-visa	1 (0.4 %)

pertaining to personality, confrontation behaviors and lay theories, and sociopolitical attitudes.¹ The order of presentation of these three clusters of measures was randomized, as was the presentation order of the measures within the clusters. Lastly, participants provided demographics and were debriefed.

2.1.3. Materials

For all measures, necessary items were reverse-scored and composite scores were created by averaging responses, unless otherwise specified. Table 2 presents bivariate correlations, internal consistency statistics, and descriptive statistics for PCS and auxiliary variables. All items of composite measures are listed in the Supplemental Materials.

2.1.3.1. Prejudice confrontation styles. PCS were assessed with the 22item PCS Scale (Chaney & Sanchez, 2022). Participants were prompted, "Rate the following statements based on how true they are of you. When I witness or experience someone do or say something discriminatory..." on a scale from 1 (*Not at all true of me*) to 5 (*Very true of me*). Participants responded to five items that assess educational PCS (e.g., "I let them know I am surprised they hold such prejudiced beliefs"), five items for argumentative PCS (e.g., "I express my feelings, even if it means shouting"), five items for help-seeking PCS (e.g., "I try to get advice from someone before confronting them"), four items for empathy PCS (e.g., "I let them know they have hurt me"), and three items for humor PCS (e.g., "I make a joke about it and hope they understand I disagree").

2.1.3.2. Confrontation frequency. The frequency with which participants confront prejudice was assessed on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = *Never* to 7 = Every *time*) with the item, "How often do you confront someone when they have said something prejudiced?"

2.1.3.3. Intentions to confront prejudice. Intentions to confront prejudice directed toward 45 social groups were assessed on feeling thermometers ($0 = Not \ at \ all \ to \ 100 = Extremely$). These groups were partially derived from a list of socially stigmatized groups that were the focus of a previous study on the associations of feelings of warmth toward these groups and sociopolitical attitudes (Duckitt & Sibley, 2007), and

additional social groups were included for the purposes of the present study. The additional groups encompass a broad array of groups that may be salient to college students, including those pertaining to gender (e.g., non-binary people; Dolezal et al., 2023) and behavioral inclinations (e.g., people who choose not to be vaccinated against COVID-19; Khubchandani et al., 2022). Participants indicated, "How likely would you be to confront someone for expressing prejudice or discrimination against" these 45 social groups, presented in a randomized order. Supplemental Table 1 presents descriptive statistics for confrontation intentions toward each social group.

We conducted an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) to identify the structure of responses. Following recommendations on EFA steps and interpretation (Hooper, 2012), we extracted factors using Principal Axis Factoring method with Promax rotation. According to the Kaiser criterion, five factors emerged with eigenvalues >1; however, as no items loaded over 0.40 onto the fifth factor, we interpreted a four-factor solution. Items that loaded over 0.40 onto only one factor were retained as part of the factor. Factor 1 explained 43.28 % of the variance extracted and included intentions to confront prejudice toward traditionally marginalized social groups, including racial and ethnic minorities and immigrants. Factor 2 (9.39 % of the variance extracted) included intentions to confront prejudice toward dissident social groups, including atheists and people who criticize authority. Factor 3 (6.51 % of the variance extracted) included intentions to confront prejudice toward traditionally conservative social groups, including Republicans and White people. Factor 4 (3.36 % of the variance extracted) included intentions to confront prejudice toward dangerous social groups, including people who disrupt safety and security, and violent criminals. Table 3 presents the full pattern matrix results. Three of these categories have been previously identified in the dual process model of prejudice and ideology (i.e., marginalized social groups, dissident social groups, and dangerous social groups; (Asbrock et al., 2010; Duckitt & Sibley, 2007), and the fourth category (i.e., conservative social groups) has been conventionally associated with right-wing and societally privileged groups in research employing a broader range of targets (Brandt & Crawford, 2016).

In line the EFA results, we computed mean responses to intentions to confront prejudice toward the groups included in the four factors to create composite scores for intentions to confront prejudice toward marginalized, dissident, conservative, and dangerous social groups.

2.1.4. Data analysis plan

For all studies, LPAs were conducted in Mplus version 7 with the five PCS subscales (Chaney & Sanchez, 2022) as indicators for one-profile through five-profile solutions. Although we relied primarily on Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC) and the bootstrap likelihood ratio test to evaluate profile solutions and identify the best-fitting model across the studies, our holistic approach to profile enumeration included consideration of multiple fit statistics and ratio tests to decide between models. We report Akaike Information Criterion (AIC), BIC, sample-size adjusted BIC, entropy, Vuong-Lo-Mendell-Rubin log likelihood ratio test, bootstrap likelihood ratio test, and Lo-Mendell-Rubin adjusted likelihood ratio test. AIC (Akaike, 1973) and BIC (Schwarz, 1978) are extensions goodness of fit extensions of the maximum likelihood estimate. Lower AIC and BIC values indicate good model fit. As model fit under the maximum likelihood principle improves as the model complexity (e.g., the number of latent profiles) increases, AIC and BIC penalize models for complexity to favor models that are more parsimonious (Chakrabarti & Ghosh, 2011). As our goal was to select the most accurate and parsimonious latent profile model, we opted to prefer BIC over AIC should the two indices provide incongruent information (Chakrabarti & Ghosh, 2011). Model entropy is reported as a metric of classification accuracy (Celeux & Soromenho, 1996). Lastly, we report the smallest *n* estimated to represent a profile in each model to ensure a balance between model fit, entropy, and model utility.

To test equality of means across profiles on continuous auxiliary

¹ Measures and analyses including personality measures are not reported here as they are outside the scope of the present research.

Bivariate correlations among prejudice confrontation styles and outcome variables (Study 1).

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Μ	SD
1. Educational PCS	<u>0</u> .86										3.70	0.85
2. Argumentative PCS	0.17	0.84									2.53	0.91
3. Help-Seeking PCS	0.41	0.05	0.75								3.54	0.74
4. Empathy PCS	0.34	0.18	0.40	<u>0</u> .92							3.39	1.03
5. Humor PCS	0.07	0.09	-0.07	-0.02	0.87						2.79	1.12
6. Confrontation frequency	0.59	0.29	0.29	0.35	-0.14	-					4.50	1.50
7. CI: Marginalized social groups	0.53	0.16	0.36	0.27	-0.05	0.61	<u>0</u> .98				72.72	23.03
8. CI: Dissident social groups	0.41	0.23	0.18	0.17	-0.01	0.48	0.62	<u>0</u> .76			45.28	21.08
9. CI: Conservative social groups	0.08	0.05	-0.01	0.03	0.01	0.18	0.19	0.19	0.82		34.66	21.75
10. Dangerous social groups	0.12	0.16	0.04	0.01	0.04	0.13	0.06	0.31	0.26	<u>0</u> .78	30.36	19.40

Note. Significant correlations (p < .05) are bolded for emphasis. Cronbach's alphas are underlined and shown on the diagonals. PCS = prejudice confrontation style; CI = Confrontation intentions. General confrontation frequency was assessed with one item: "How often do you confront someone when they have said something prejudiced?"

variables, we used the automatic Bolck-Croon-Hagenaars (BCH; Bolck et al., 2004) approach (i.e., "auxiliary = Y(BCH)" command in Mplus; Asparouhov & Muthén, 2014). The automatic BCH approach uses a weighted ANOVA to correct for classification error in estimating equality of means across profiles (Asparouhov & Muthén, 2014; Bakk & Vermunt, 2016).

2.2. Results

2.2.1. Profile solutions

Based on the model results, a four-profile solution was identified as the best-fitting model (see Table 4 for fit statistics). BIC decreased from the one- through three-profile solutions and increased slightly in the four- and five-profile solutions; however, AIC and adjusted BIC were lowest for the four-profile solution. Moreover, VLMR, BLRT, and LMR were significant in the four-profile solution, indicating improved fit relative to the three-profile solution. Additionally, entropy increased in the four-profile compared to the three-profile solution. Therefore, we retained the four-profile model for interpretation based on the model results.

Profile 1 participants (8.1 % of the sample) reported low use of all five PCS. We named this profile "non-confronters" because participants indicated unlikeliness to confront prejudice using any PCS (see Fig. 1 for Study 1 PCS subscale values among each profile displayed in bar chart format; see Supplemental Fig. 1 for equivalent data in line chart format). Profile 2 (32.6 %) reported moderate levels of educational PCS and averaged near the scale midpoint (i.e., 3 = neutral or unsure) for all other PCS. We named this profile "low stakes prodders" after an indirect confrontation strategy observed among people motivated to avoid interpersonal costs to confronting (Woodzicka & Good, 2021). Participants in this profile reported moderate levels of argumentative, helpseeking, empathy, and humor PCS and slightly higher on educational PCS. Profile 3, the largest profile, (38.7 %) reported high likelihood of confronting with educational, help-seeking, and empathy PCS and low argumentative and humor PCS. We named this profile "informative confronters" as participants indicated confronting by informing the perpetrator about the impact of their actions and seeking input from trusted sources if needed before confronting. Profile 4 (20.4 %) responded high in educational, argumentative, help-seeking, and empathy PCS and at higher levels of these PCS compared to the other three profiles, although this profile reported a comparable level of humor PCS. We named this profile "flexible confronters" because participants reported relying on a wide variety of PCS.

The four descriptive profile names were derived from the profile analysis results. Yet, on their own it is unclear whether the names reflect participants' reported behavior. We compared the prejudice confrontation frequency and intentions associated with each profile as a face validity check for the profile names.

2.2.2. Equality of means

Tests of equality of means across profiles demonstrated significant differences in self-reported frequency of prejudice confrontations and intentions to confront prejudice toward the four social group categories identified in the EFA (See Table 5). Supplemental Table 1 presents the full results for intentions to confront prejudice toward all 45 social groups.

2.2.2.1. Confrontation frequency. Flexible confronters reported confronting prejudice significantly more frequently than informative confronters, Wald $\chi^2 = 22.61$, p < .001, low stakes prodders, Wald $\chi^2 = 22.84$, p < .001, and non-confronters, Wald $\chi^2 = 109.96$, p < .001. There was no significant difference in confrontation frequency between informative confronters and low stakes prodders, Wald $\chi^2 = 0.77$, p = .379, but both informative confronters, Wald $\chi^2 = 51.50$, p < .001, and low stakes prodders, Wald $\chi^2 = 51.50$, p < .001, and low stakes prodders, Wald $\chi^2 = 31.38$, p < .001, reported confronting prejudice significantly more frequently than non-confronters. The retrospective behavioral results are consistent with the descriptive profile names, suggesting utility of the names for depicting the profiles.

2.2.2.2. Intentions to confront prejudice. All profiles differed significantly in mean intentions to confront prejudice toward marginalized social groups. Flexible confronters reported significantly higher intentions to confront prejudice toward marginalized social groups than informative confronters, Wald $\chi^2 = 8.93$, p = .003, low stakes prodders, Wald $\chi^2 = 18.34$, p < .001, and non-confronters, Wald $\chi^2 = 53.00$, p < .001. Informative confronters reported significantly higher intentions to confront prejudice toward marginalized social groups than low stakes prodders, Wald $\chi^2 = 4.75$, p = .029, and non-confronters, Wald $\chi^2 = 32.89$, p < .001. Lastly, low stakes prodders reported significantly higher intentions to confront prejudice toward marginalized social groups than non-confronters, Wald $\chi^2 = 14.84$, p < .001.

Regarding intentions to confront prejudice toward dissident social groups, flexible confronters again reported significantly higher intentions to confront prejudice than informative confronters, Wald $\chi^2 = 10.93$, p = .001, low stakes prodders, Wald $\chi^2 = 7.53$, p = .006, and nonconfronters, Wald $\chi^2 = 44.021$, p < .001. Both informative confronters, Wald $\chi^2 = 16.70$, p < .001, reported higher intentions to confront prejudice toward dissident social groups than non-confronters. No significant difference emerged between informative confronters and low stakes prodders, Wald $\chi^2 = 0.04$, p = .850.

Intentions to confront prejudice toward conservative social groups did not differ significantly across the four profiles.

Lastly, significant differences in mean intentions to confront prejudice toward dangerous social groups emerged between profiles. Low stakes prodders reported significantly higher intentions than informative confronters, Wald $\chi^2 = 5.00$, p = .025, and non-confronters, Wald χ^2 = 20.23, p < .001. Flexible confronters, Wald $\chi^2 = 11.43$, p = .001, and

Exploratory factor analysis for intentions to confront prejudice toward social groups (Study 1).

Social groups	Marginalized	Dissident	Conservative	Dangerous
	social groups	social	social groups	social
	(Factor 1)	groups	(Factor 3)	groups
		Factor 2		(Factor 4)
People with				
physical	0.98	-0.30	0.07	0.00
disabilities	0.06	0.19	0.01	0.02
Hispanic/Latiny	0.90	-0.18	-0.01	0.03
people	0.90	-0.02	0.01	-0.01
Multiracial	0.00	0.07	0.07	0.00
people	0.90	-0.07	0.07	-0.02
Middle Eastern/				
North African	0.90	-0.01	-0.01	0.02
people				
Documented	0.89	0.89	-0.09	0.08
People with				
intellectual	0.88	-0.11	0.05	-0.05
disabilities				
Asian people	0.88	-0.03	-0.05	-0.01
Gay men	0.84	-0.10	0.01	0.04
Muslims	0.83	0.05	-0.02	-0.03
Transgender	0.81	-0.04	-0.07	0.04
people	0.91	0.08	0.02	0.06
Jewish people	0.81	-0.08	0.02	-0.00
Native	0.75	0.02	0.07	0.01
Hawaiians/	0.50	0.14	0.00	0.00
Pacific	0.79	0.14	0.02	0.02
Islanders				
American				
Indians/Alaska	0.79	0.11	-0.04	0.05
Natives Bisevual men	0.78	0.02	0.01	0.02
Lesbian women	0.78	0.02	-0.01	-0.12
Undocumented		0.01	0.07	0.112
immigrants	0.76	0.04	-0.24	0.27
People who are	0.73	0.08	0.01	-0.02
overweight	0.70	0.00	0.01	0.02
Bisexual women	0.73	0.10	0.00	-0.08
Non-Dinary	0.66	0.16	-0.11	0.01
Psychiatric				
patients	0.65	0.19	-0.01	-0.10
Feminists	0.56	0.10	-0.08	0.05
Unattractive	0.55	0.25	0.15	-0.14
people	0.00	0.20	0.15	0.11
Satanists	-0.23	0.66	0.03	0.08
Atheists	0.24	0.61	0.05	-0.11
People who	-0.00	0.50	-0.04	0.41
criticize	0.00	0.48	0.12	0.05
authority				
Sex workers	0.23	0.48	-0.01	0.04
Left-wing	0.25	0.44	-0.10	0.12
protestors	0.20	0.11	0.10	0.12
Housewives	0.29	0.40	0.17	-0.09
Democrats Unemployed	0.32	0.38	0.02	0.08
neonle	0.37	0.37	0.02	-0.03
Drug users	0.25	0.35	-0.11	0.30
Republicans	-0.10	0.11	0.77	0.03
Right-wing	_0.08	_0.01	0.76	014
protestors	-0.00	0.01	0.70	0.14
White people	0.00	0.13	0.65	-0.11
reopie who				
be vaccinated	-0.07	-0.21	0.60	0.28
against	0.07	5.21	0.00	5.20
COVID-19				
Christians	0.23	-0.02	0.59	-0.01
Men	0.17	0.16	0.48	-0.08

Table 3 (continued)

Social groups	Marginalized social groups (Factor 1)	Dissident social groups Factor 2	Conservative social groups (Factor 3)	Dangerous social groups (Factor 4)
People who make society dangerous	-0.03	-0.02	-0.02	0.81
People who disrupt safety and security	0.06	-0.02	0.15	0.67
Violent criminals	-0.01	0.10	0.00	0.61
Terrorists	-0.22	0.13	-0.01	0.52
People who cause disunity	0.21	0.05	0.18	0.41

Note. Items with factor loadings 0.40 or less on all factors or loaded >0.40 on two or more factors are indicated in italics and were not retained.

Table 4

Fit statistics for prejudice confrontation style latent profile analyses with 1–5 profiles for Study 1.

Fit statistics	Number of profiles										
	1	2	3	4	5						
AIC	3739.73	3653.81	3627.11	3611.99	3613.45						
BIC	3776.04	3711.91	3706.99	3713.66	3736.91						
Adjusted BIC	3744.33	3661.18	3637.23	3624.88	3629.10						
Entropy	-	0.77	0.64	0.70	0.72						
VLMR	-	0.047	0.179	0.023	0.812						
BLRT	-	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	0.667						
LMR	-	0.050	0.186	0.026	0.818						
Smallest n	279	39	22	23	24						

Note. AIC = Akaike information criterion; BIC = Bayesian information criterion; VLMR = Vuong-Lo-Mendell-Rubin log likelihood ratio test *p*-value; BLRT = bootstrap likelihood ratio test *p*-value; LMR = Lo-Mendell-Rubin adjusted likelihood ratio test *p*-value. Fit statistics for the selected profile solution are bolded for emphasis.

informative confronters, Wald $\chi^2 = 9.75$, p = .002, also reported higher intentions than non-confronters. Flexible confronters' intentions did not significantly differ from low stakes prodders, Wald $\chi^2 = 0.88$, p = .349, or informative confronters, Wald $\chi^2 = 0.71$, p = .401.

2.3. Discussion

Study 1 afforded an initial demonstration of a four-profile solution for PCS. The most populous profile was informative confronters, which reported high use of educational, help-seeking, and empathy PCS and relatively lower use of argumentative and humor PCS. Low stakes prodders endorsed moderate use of educational PCS and generally neither endorsed nor denied the use of argumentative, help-seeking, empathy, and humor PCS. Flexible confronters provided the highest endorsement of educational, argumentative, help-seeking, and empathy PCS of the four profiles and indicated similar use of humor PCS relative to other profiles. This profile broadly resembled informative confronters in PCS, with its relatively higher levels of argumentative PCS being the primary distinguishing characteristic. Finally, non-confronters indicated low use of all five PCS. Across profiles, we observed low variance in reported use of humor PCS.

When considering intended confrontations, the greatest distinctions between profiles were observed with intentions to confront prejudice toward marginalized social groups. Flexible, informative, and low stakes prodders all reported high intentions to confront prejudice toward marginalized social groups. In contrast, flexible confronters were the only profile that also reported higher intentions to confront prejudice toward dissident social groups compared to the other profiles. All profiles reported low intentions to confront prejudice toward conservative social groups and dangerous social groups. These findings demonstrate



Educational 🗳 Argumentative 🔲 Help-Seeking 🚍 Empathy 🗆 Humor

Fig. 1. Latent Profile Solution (Study 1). Note. Estimated mean scores of prejudice confrontation style latent profiles with profile counts and percentages based on most likely latent profile membership for a four-profile solution for Study 1.

Mean comparisons across latent profiles on confrontation frequency and intentions to confront prejudice toward social groups for Study 1.

Confrontation outcomes	Prejudice confrontation sty		Wald χ^2	р-		
	Non-confronters (Profile 1)	Low stakes prodders (Profile 2)	Informative confronters (Profile 3)	Flexible confronters (Profile 4)		Value
Confrontation frequency CI: Marginalized social	2.35 _a 40.82 _a	4.27 _b 67.01 _b	4.48 _b 76.00 _c	5.70 _c 87.18 _d	110.33 59.35	<0.001 <0.001
CI: Dissident social groups CI: Conservative social	24.12 _a 30.96 _a	44.22 _b 36.87 _a	43.50 _b 32.60 _a	57.31 _c 36.57 _a	44.42 1.94	<0.001 0.584
groups CI: Dangerous social groups	14.70 _a	36.10 _c	28.19 _b	31.69 _{b,c}	21.79	< 0.001

Note. Shared subscripts within a row indicate mean scores that do not differ significantly from each other (p < .05). Significant omnibus Wald χ^2 test results (p < .01) and the highest means are bolded for emphasis. CI = Confrontation intentions.

that the three "confronter" profiles—flexible, informative, and low stakes prodders—are selective about the types of prejudice that they intend to confront. Although the foundational results of Study 1 provide insights about these latent profiles, replication of the profile results found in Study 1 in other samples would thus provide evidence for the stability of the model results.

3. Study 2

The first aim of Study 2 was to identify latent PCS profiles of U.S. White adults. We selected this demographic for Study 2 as White people hold the greatest sociocultural and institutional power in the U.S. (Golash-Boza, 2016), and they may wield this power as prejudice confronters (Dickter et al., 2012; Rasinski & Czopp, 2010; Wedell et al., 2022). We examined differences across profiles in self-reported frequency of prejudice confrontations as well as confrontation and anti-racist behavior intentions. Further, to better understand the prejudice-related cognitive underpinnings of each profile, we compared profiles in their anticipated benefits of prejudice confrontations, concern about costs of prejudice confrontation, and lay theories of the malleability and origins of prejudice.

3.1. Method

3.1.1. Participants

Participants included White adults living in the U.S. who were recruited in Spring 2022 via Prolific to participate in an approximately 30-min online study for monetary compensation. As we aimed to recruit approximately 350 participants, to account for exclusions we recruited 400 participants. Fifty-three participants were excluded for not identifying as White in the survey, failing all three attention check questions, or indicating they did not consent for data inclusion in analyses, leaving an analytic sample of 347 participants ($M_{age} = 38.75$, SD = 14.88).

Participants primarily identified as cisgender women (n = 241), with the remainder identifying as cisgender men (n = 72), non-binary/genderqueer (n = 13), transgender men (n = 4), questioning or unsure (n = 4), or choosing a not listed option (n = 13). As in Study 1, the

n (%)

254 (73.2 %)

16 (4.6 %)

49 (14.1 %)

11 (3.2 %)

5 (1.4 %) 3 (0.9 %)

Table 6 Sample characteristics (Study 2).							
Demographics							
Sexual orientation							
Straight or heterosexual							
Gay or lesbian							
Bisexual							
Pansexual							
Oneer							

Questioning

Asexual	9 (2.6 %)
Socioeconomic status	
Poor or just barely making it	33 (9.5 %)
Working or labor class	118 (34.0 %)
Middle class	149 (42.9 %)
Upper middle class	44 (12.7 %)
Wealthy	3 (0.9 %)
Citizenship and visa status	
American-born citizen	344 (99.1 %)
Naturalized citizen	3 (0.9 %)

E. Wedell and K.E. Chaney

sample leaned liberal (M = 5.20, SD = 1.49). Table 6 presents additional demographics.

3.1.2. Procedure

After providing consent, participants responded to measures pertaining to personality, confrontation behaviors and lay theories, and sociopolitical attitudes. The order of presentation of these three clusters of measures was randomized, as was the presentation order of measures within the clusters. Lastly, participants reported demographics and were debriefed.

3.1.3. Materials

Table 7 presents bivariate correlations, internal consistency statistics, and descriptive statistics for all variables. Participants completed the same measures of PCS and confrontation frequency as in Study 1.

3.1.3.1. Confrontation and accomplice behavior intentions. Attitudes about prejudice confrontations and intentions to participate in antiracist actions were assessed with a seven-item measure (Wedell et al., 2022). Participants indicated agreement on a scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*) with items such as, "It is important to me that I stand up for racial equality," and "It is important to speak out after acts of racial discrimination."

3.1.3.2. Perceived benefits and concern about the costs to confronting. Perceived benefits and concern about costs to confronting prejudice were assessed with a 14-item measure (adapted from Good et al., 2012). Following the prompt, "When you confront someone for saying something prejudicial, to what extent..." participants responded to eight items assessing perceived benefits (e.g., Do you think that the person you confront would become less prejudiced?) and four items assessing concern about costs (e.g., Do you worry about how the person you confront would react [e.g., get angry or upset]) on a scale from 1 (*Not at all*) to 7 (*Extremely*).

3.1.3.3. Lay theories of prejudice. Six lay theories of prejudice were assessed with 18 items. For all items, participants indicated agreement on a 1 (*Strongly disagree*) to 7 (*Strongly agree*) scale. Participants responded to three items assessing the malleability of prejudice (e.g., "People are able to become less prejudiced if they try"; see also Carr et al., 2012). Additionally, participants indicated agreement with three items each to assess three lay theories of the origins of prejudice (see also Chaney et al., in press): the lay theory that prejudice is learned (e.g., "Those who are prejudiced learned their prejudical attitudes from others"), originates in ignorance (e.g., "Prejudice results from malice").

Table 7

Bivariate correlations among prejudice confrontation styles and outcome variables (Study 2).

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	М	SD
1. Educational PCS	0.92													3.28	1.09
2. Argumentative PCS	0.34	0.86												2.02	0.88
3. Help-Seeking PCS	0.52	0.20	0.84											3.14	0.94
4. Empathy PCS	0.63	0.30	0.55	<u>0</u> .93										3.09	1.12
5. Humor PCS	-0.00	0.27	0.07	-0.00	<u>0</u> .90									2.36	1.16
6. Confrontation frequency	0.71	0.38	0.34	0.52	0.04	-								3.74	1.72
7. Confrontation & accomplice behavior	0.70	0.29	0. 60	0.54	0.00	0.58	<u>0</u> .95							5.17	1.05
intentions															
8. Perceived benefits to confronting	0.56	0.34	0.46	0.41	0.06	0.46	0.48	0.90						3.29	1.17
9. Concern about costs to confronting	- 0 .02	0.13	0.19	0.04	0.19	-0.09	0.08	0.23	0.93					3.29	1.67
10. LTP: Malleability of prejudice	0.29	-0.12	0.13	0.16	- 0 .03	0.23	0.34	0.10	0.02	<u>0</u> .76				5.62	1.09
11. LTP origin: Learned	0.24	0.01	0.23	0.17	-0.05	0.25	0.40	0.18	0.04	0.39	<u>0</u> .93			5.55	1.05
12. LTP origin: Ignorance	0.37	0.02	0.24	0.30	0.00	0.28	0.48	0.24	-0.03	0.36	0.51	<u>0</u> .94		5.51	1.35
13. LTP origin: Malice	0.31	0.18	0.19	0.29	-0.02	0.25	0.41	0.19	0.00	0.13	0.38	0.36	<u>0</u> .91	4.54	1.31

Note. Significant correlations (p < .05) are bolded for emphasis. Cronbach's alphas are underlined and shown on the diagonals. PCS = prejudice confrontation style; LTP = lay theory of prejudice. General confrontation frequency was assessed with the item, "How often do you confront someone when they have said something prejudiced?"

3.2. Results

3.2.1. Profile solutions

Following the data analysis plan in Study 1, a four-profile solution was again identified as the best-fitting model (see Table 8 for fit statistics). BIC decreased from the one- through four-profile solutions and increased slightly for the five-profile solution. Although AIC and adjusted BIC were lower for the five-profile solution compared to the four-profile solution, the fifth profile in the five-profile solution comprised three participants, which is substantially below the recommended minimum profile size for model interpretation (e.g., $n \ge 30$; Sinha et al., 2021). Although VLMR and LMR were nonsignificant for the four-profile model, BLRT indicated that the four-profile model was superior to the three-profile model. Moreover, the four-profile model solution broadly replicated the results from Study 1. Therefore, we again retained and interpreted the four-profile model.

Profile 1 (8.1 % of the sample) scored low on all five PCS and were thus deemed the "non-confronters" as in Study 1 (see Fig. 2 for Study 2 profile results in bar chart format; see Supplemental Fig. 2 for these results in line chart format). We considered the largest profile, Profile 3 (44.1 %), to replicate the pattern of "low stakes prodders" because they moderately endorsed educational, help-seeking, empathy, and humor PCS; however, they also scored low on argumentative PCS, indicating that the White adult "low stakes prodders" in Study 2 take "lower stakes"

Table 8

Fit statistics for prejudice confrontation style latent profile analyses with 1–5 profiles for Study 2.

Fit statistics	Number of profiles											
	1	2	3	4	5							
AIC	5049.33	4717.56	4642.274	4601.38	4588.47							
BIC	5087.82	4779.15	4726.96	4709.16	4719.35							
Adjusted BIC	5056.10	4728.39	4657.17	4620.33	4611.49							
Entropy	-	0.87	0.76	0.74	0.78							
VLMR	-	< 0.001	0.001	0.077	0.108							
BLRT	-	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001							
LMR	-	< 0.001	0.001	0.082	0.114							
Smallest n	347	72	52	51	3							

Note. AIC = Akaike information criterion; BIC = Bayesian information criterion; VLMR = Vuong-Lo-Mendell-Rubin log likelihood ratio test *p*-value; BLRT = bootstrap likelihood ratio test *p*-value; LMR = Lo-Mendell-Rubin adjusted likelihood ratio test *p*-value. Fit statistics for the selected profile solution are bolded for emphasis.



■ Educational 🗳 Argumentative 🔳 Help-Seeking 🚍 Empathy 🗆 Humor

Fig. 2. Latent Profile Solution (Study 2). Note. Estimated mean scores of prejudice confrontation style latent profiles with profile counts and percentages based on most likely latent profile membership for a four-profile solution for Study 2.

than the same profile in the Study 1 racially diverse undergraduate sample. As Profile 4 (25.6 %) scored high in educational, help-seeking, and empathy PCS and low in argumentative and humor PCS, this profile mirrored Study 1's "informative" confronters. Lastly, Profile 2 (15.6 %) reported the highest level of argumentative PCS in addition to high educational, help-seeking, and empathy PCS levels. Profile 2 also reported the highest level of humor PCS compared to the other three styles. Because this profile reported relatively high levels of all PCS, we determined that this profile parallels the "flexible confronters" identified in Study 1. Considering that the Study 2 "flexible confronters" reported higher levels of humor PCS compared to the other profiles, they appear to be even more "flexible" about their style of confronting prejudice than the same profile identified in Study 1.

3.2.2. Equality of means

Omnibus Wald χ^2 tests indicated that PCS latent profiles were associated with significant differences in confrontation frequency, confrontation and accomplice behavior intentions, perceived benefits to confronting, and several lay theories of prejudice (See Table 9).

3.2.2.1. Confrontation frequency. Flexible confronters reported confronting prejudice significantly more frequently compared to low stakes prodders, Wald $\chi^2 = 56.74$, p < .001, and non-confronters, Wald $\chi^2 = 168.87$, p < .001. Informative confronters also reported confronting prejudice significantly more frequently than low stakes prodders, Wald $\chi^2 = 32.76$, p < .001, and non-confronters, Wald $\chi^2 = 149.07$, p < .001. Moreover, low stakes prodders reported confronting prejudice significantly more frequently than non-confronters, Wald $\chi^2 = 50.92$, p < .001.

The difference in confrontation frequency between flexible confronters and informative confronters was nonsignificant, Wald $\chi^2 = 3.68$, p = .055.

3.2.2.2. Confrontation and accomplice behavior intentions. Informative confronters reported higher confrontation and accomplice behavior intentions than low stakes prodders, Wald $\chi^2 = 52.26$, p < .001, and nonconfronters, Wald $\chi^2 = 151.03$, p < .001. Similarly, flexible confronters reported higher intentions to confront prejudice and engage in antiracist behaviors than low stakes prodders, Wald $\chi^2 = 40.50$, p < .001, and nonconfronters, Wald $\chi^2 = 130.18$, p < .001. Low stakes prodders also reported higher confrontation and accomplice behavior intentions than non-confronters, Wald $\chi^2 = 49.42$, p < .001. Flexible confronters and informative confronters did not differ significantly in confrontation and accomplice behavior intentions, Wald $\chi^2 = 0.13$, p = .720.

3.2.2.3. Perceived benefits and concern about the costs to confronting. Flexible confronters reported that they perceived greater benefits to confronting prejudice than did low stakes prodders, Wald $\chi^2 = 17.22$, p < .001, and non-confronters, Wald $\chi^2 = 78.60$, p < .001. Likewise, informative confronters perceived significantly greater benefits to confronting than low stakes prodders, Wald $\chi^2 = 21.31$, p < .001, and non-confronters, Wald $\chi^2 = 21.31$, p < .001, and non-confronters, Wald $\chi^2 = 110.38$, p < .001. Finally, low stakes prodders perceived significantly greater benefits to confronters, Wald $\chi^2 = 42.76$, p < .001. The difference in perceived benefits to confronting between flexible confronters and informative confronters was not significant, Wald $\chi^2 = 0.13$, p = .717.

A nonsignificant omnibus Wald test indicated that profiles did not

Table 9

Mean comparisons a	cross latent i	profiles on	confrontation	frequency.	beliefs about	confrontation.	and lav	theories of	prejudice for Stu	dv 2.
				- 1		,			F J · · · · · · · ·	· .

Outcome variables	Prejudice confrontatio	Wald χ^2	р-			
	Non-confronters (Profile 1)	Low stakes prodders (Profile 3)	Informative confronters (Profile 4)	Flexible confronters (Profile 2)	-	Value
Confrontation frequency	1.81 _a	3.17 _b	4.71 _c	5.38 _c	299.44	< 0.001
Confrontation and accomplice behavior intentions	3.01 _a	4.91 _b	6.21 _c	6.14 _c	199.81	<0.001
Perceived benefits to confronting	1.99 _a	3.09 _b	3.91 _c	4.00 _c	147.50	< 0.001
Concern about costs to confronting	3.13 _{a,b}	3.13 _a	3.26 _{a,b}	3.84 _b	4.45	0.217
LTP: Malleability of prejudice	5.28 _a	5.42 _a	6.17 _b	5.55 _a	25.45	< 0.001
LTP origin: Learned	5.17 _a	5.46 _{a,b}	5.80 _b	5.75 _b	10.81	0.013
LTP origin: Ignorance	4.70 _a	5.30 _b	6.30 _c	5.59 _b	44.01	< 0.001
LTP origin: Malice	3.73 _a	4.47 _b	4.75 _{b,c}	5.14 _c	23.90	< 0.001

Note. Shared subscripts within a row indicate mean scores that do not differ significantly from each other (p < .05). Significant omnibus Wald χ^2 test results (p < .05) and the highest means are bolded for emphasis. LTP = lay theory of prejudice.

demonstrate significant mean differences in perceived costs to confronting prejudice.

3.2.2.4. Lay theories of prejudice. For all lay theories of prejudice, omnibus tests revealed significant differences across profiles. Informative confronters endorsed a belief that prejudice is more malleable than flexible confronters, Wald $\chi^2 = 6.26$, p = .012, low stakes prodders, Wald $\chi^2 = 17.93$, p < .001, and non-confronters, Wald $\chi^2 = 19.05$, p < .001. The remaining pairwise comparisons were nonsignificant: flexible confronters did not differ significantly from low stakes prodders, Wald $\chi^2 = 0.32$, p = .574, or non-confronters, Wald $\chi^2 = 1.14$, p = .285, nor was the difference significant between low stakes prodders and non-confronters, Wald $\chi^2 = 0.50$, p = .480.

As for lay theories of the origins of prejudice, flexible, Wald $\chi^2 = 6.02$, p = .014, and informative confronters, Wald $\chi^2 = 7.74$, p = .005, both reported greater belief that prejudice is learned compared to non-confronters and did not significantly differ from each other, Wald $\chi^2 = 0.07$, p = .785. Additionally, low stakes prodders did not differ significantly from flexible, Wald $\chi^2 = 2.60$, p = .107, informative, Wald $\chi^2 = 3.72$, p = .054, or non-confronters, Wald $\chi^2 = 1.713$, p = .191.

Next, informative confronters endorsed a belief that prejudice originates in ignorance significantly more so than flexible confronters, Wald $\chi^2 = 6.34$, p = .012, low stakes prodders, Wald $\chi^2 = 26.36$, p < .001, and non-confronters, Wald $\chi^2 = 31.67$, p < .001. Flexible confronters, Wald $\chi^2 = 4.32$, p = .008, and low stakes prodders' endorsement, Wald $\chi^2 = 4.32$, p = .038, were significantly greater than non-confronters. Flexible confronters and low stakes prodders did not significantly differ, Wald $\chi^2 = 1.23$, p = .267.

Finally, flexible confronters endorsed a significantly stronger belief that prejudice originates in malice relative to low stakes prodders, Wald $\chi^2 = 6.87$, p = .009, and non-confronters, Wald $\chi^2 = 20.22$, p < .001. Informative, Wald $\chi^2 = 13.86$, p < .001, and low stakes prodders, Wald $\chi^2 = 8.04$, p = .005, also endorsed this belief more than non-confronters. No significant differences emerged between informative and flexible confronters, Wald $\chi^2 = 1.81$, p = .179, nor informative and low stakes prodders, Wald $\chi^2 = 1.74$, p = .188.

3.3. Discussion

In Study 2, PCS latent profile results broadly replicated the solution identified in Study 1. Study 2 revealed a comparable set of four profiles as in Study 1. Moreover, Study 2 results illuminated several beliefs that further differentiated the four profiles. Whereas no significant differences emerged for perceived prejudice confrontation costs across the PCS latent profiles, flexible and informative confronters perceived greater benefits to confronting compared to low stakes prodders, all of which in turn perceived greater benefits than non-confronters. In other words, low concern about costs may not be sufficient to encourage people to confront (Ashburn-Nardo et al., 2008).

Several differences in endorsement of lay theories of prejudice across profiles emerged. Informative confronters more strongly endorsed the beliefs that prejudice is rooted in ignorance and that prejudice is malleable compared to all other profiles. People who believe that prejudice is malleable are more likely to confront prejudice, and they may do so by addressing perceived ignorance (Rattan & Dweck, 2010). Also notable is the difference between flexible confronters and both low stakes prodders and non-confronters in the belief that prejudice originates in malice. As higher endorsement of argumentative PCS is the distinguishing feature of the flexible confronter profile, this may suggest that perceiving malice as a cause of prejudice begets an argumentative response from confronters.

4. Study 3

While Study 2 focused on potential high-status, White American

confronters of prejudice, Study 3 recruited U.S. Black adults because systemic racism in the U.S. has disproportionately targets Black people (Coates, 2014; Golash-Boza, 2016). Apart from the demographic restrictions in recruitment, the procedure and materials of Study 3 were identical to those of Study 2.

4.1. Method

4.1.1. Participants

Participants included Black adults living in the United States who were recruited during Spring 2022 via Prolific to participate in an approximately 30-min online study for monetary compensation. As we aimed to obtain an analytic sample of approximately 350 participants, we recruited 403 participants to account for exclusions. After accounting for exclusions (parallel to Study 2; n = 51), we obtained an analytic sample of 352 participants ($M_{age} = 36.11$, SD = 13.40).

The analytic sample primarily consisted of cisgender women (n = 199), with the remainder identifying as cisgender men (n = 72), nonbinary/genderqueer (n = 13), transgender men (n = 2), those who were questioning or unsure (n = 2), or who chose an unlisted option (n = 12). On a scale from 1 (*Strongly conservative*) to 7 (*Strongly liberal*), the sample leaned somewhat liberal (M = 5.11, SD = 1.66). Table 10 presents additional demographics.

4.1.2. Procedure and materials

Table 11 presents bivariate correlations, and internal consistency statistics, and descriptive statistics for PCS and auxiliary variables.

4.2. Results

4.2.1. Profile solutions

We settled on the three-profile solution as the best-fitting model for Study 3 (see Table 12 for fit statistics). BIC, AIC, and adjusted BIC decreased as the number of profiles increased, and the BLRT was significant for four- through five-model solutions. However, VLMR and LMR were significant for the three-profile solution but nonsignificant for the four- and five-profile solutions. Moreover, the smallest profiles in the four- and five-profile solutions made up <5 % of the sample. Thus, we determined that the three-profile solution provided the best fit to the data.

As in Studies 1 and 2, profile 1 (18.2 %) scored low in all PCS and thus comprised the "non-confronters" (see Fig. 3 for Study 3 profile results in bar chart format; see Supplemental Fig. 3 for the profile results in line chart format). The most populous profile, profile 3 (47.2 %), scored

Table 10	
Sample characteristics (Study	3).

Demographics	n (%)
Sexual orientation	
Straight or heterosexual	284 (80.9 %)
Gay or lesbian	18 (5.1 %)
Bisexual	39 (11.1 %)
Queer	2 (0.6 %)
Questioning	2 (0.6 %)
Asexual	4 (1.1 %)
Socioeconomic status	
Poor or just barely making it	49 (13.9 %)
Working or labor class	142 (40.3 %)
Middle class	130 (36.9 %)
Upper middle class	29 (8.2 %)
Wealthy	2 (0.6 %)
Citizenship and visa status	
American-born citizen	340 (96.6 %)
Naturalized citizen	8 (2.3)
Immigrant with visa	4 (1.1 %)

Bivariate correlations among prejudice confrontation styles and outcome variables (Study 3).

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	М	SD
1. Educational PCS	<u>0</u> .92													3.32	1.15
2. Argumentative PCS	0.49	<u>0</u> .90												2.26	1.06
3. Help-Seeking PCS	0.53	0.23	0.84											3.22	1.01
4. Empathy PCS	0.67	0.45	0.49	0.94										3.11	1.27
5. Humor PCS	0.06	0.26	0.13	-0.00	<u>0</u> .87									2.17	1.14
6. Confrontation frequency	0.57	0.42	0.28	0.50	-0.06	-								3.85	1.83
7. Confrontation & accomplice	0.64	0.35	0.40	0.52	-0.05	0.57	<u>0</u> .91							5.46	1.24
behavior intentions															
8. Perceived benefits to confronting	0.52	0.35	0.35	0.43	0.11	0.41	0.45	0.88						3.57	1.18
9. Concern about costs to confronting	-0.06	0.02	0.14	0.03	0.17	-0.16	-0.08	0.18	0.91					2.76	1.60
10. LTP: Malleability of prejudice	0.18	-0.15	0.18	0.12	-0.03	0.14	0.24	0.11	-0.13	0.80				5.47	1.16
11. LTP origin: Learned	0.16	0.04	0.12	0.11	-0.02	0.15	0.25	0.01	0.01	0.24	<u>0</u> .88			5.78	1.03
12. LTP origin: Ignorance	0.24	0.04	0.16	0.22	-0.04	0.17	0.25	0.17	-0.09	0.23	0.38	0.90		5.72	1.31
13. LTP origin: Malice	0.22	0.15	0.21	0.21	-0.05	0.19	0.30	0.13	0.00	0.11	0.28	0.30	<u>0</u> .88	5.33	1.23

Note. Significant correlations (p < .05) are bolded for emphasis. Cronbach's alphas are underlined and shown on the diagonals. PCS = prejudice confrontation style; LTP = lay theory of prejudice. General confrontation frequency was assessed with the item, "How often do you confront someone when they have said something prejudiced?"

Table 12

Fit statistics for prejudice confrontation style latent profile analyses with 1–5 profiles for Study 3.

Fit statistics	Number of profiles							
	1	2	3	4	5			
AIC	5418.82	5060.70	4923.29	4893.83	4867.36			
BIC	5457.46	5122.51	5008.29	5002.01	4998.72			
Adjusted BIC	5425.73	5071.76	4938.49	4913.18	4890.86			
Entropy	-	0.87	0.82	0.86	0.83			
VLMR	-	< 0.001	< 0.001	0.257	0.219			
BLRT	-	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001			
LMR	-	< 0.001	< 0.001	0.265	0.226			
Smallest n	352	78	64	16	17			

Note. AIC = Akaike information criterion; BIC = Bayesian information criterion; VLMR = Vuong-Lo-Mendell-Rubin log likelihood ratio test *p*-value; BLRT = bootstrap likelihood ratio test *p*-value; LMR = Lo-Mendell-Rubin adjusted likelihood ratio test *p*-value. Fit statistics for the selected profile solution are bolded for emphasis.

slightly higher in educational and help-seeking PCS and lower in argumentative, empathy, and humor PCS. Based on the rationale we followed in Studies 1 and 2, we designated this profile as "low stakes prodders." Lastly, profile 2 (34.7 %) scored high in educational, help-seeking, and empathy PCS, moderately in argumentative PCS, and low in humor PCS. Therefore, this profile represented an "informative confronters" profile analogous to Studies 1 and 2. As such, Study 3 profiles

largely mirrored the profiles in Studies 1 and 2 with one exception: the finding that a flexible confronters profile was not present in Study 3. Whereas the greater use of argumentative PCS was a fixture of the flexible confronters in Study 1 (U.S. undergraduate students) and 2 (U.S. White adults), argumentative PCS was less common overall in the Study 3 U.S. Black adult sample.

4.2.1.1. Equality of means. PCS latent profiles were associated with significant differences in confrontation frequency, confrontation and accomplice behavior intentions, perceived benefits and concern about costs to confronting, and several lay theories of prejudice (See Table 13).

4.2.1.2. Confrontation frequency. Informative confronters reported confronting prejudice significantly more than low stakes prodders, Wald $\chi^2 = 76.51$, p < .001, and non-confronters, Wald $\chi^2 = 160.620$, p < .001. Low stakes prodders reported confronting prejudice significant more than non-confronters, Wald $\chi^2 = 23.29$, p < .001.

4.2.1.3. Confrontation and accomplice behavior intentions. Informative confronters reported significantly higher intentions to confront prejudice and engage in antiracist behaviors than low stakes prodders, Wald $\chi^2 = 64.61$, p < .001, and non-confronters, Wald $\chi^2 = 129.79$, p < .001. Low stakes prodders reported significantly greater confrontation and accomplice behavior intentions than non-confronters, Wald $\chi^2 = 37.40$, p < .001.





Fig. 3. Latent Profile Solution (Study 3). Note. Estimated mean scores of prejudice confrontation style latent profiles with profile counts and percentages based on most likely latent profile membership for a three-profile solution for Study 3.

Mean comparisons across latent profiles on confrontation frequency, beliefs about confrontation, and lay theories of prejudice for Study 3.

Outcome	Prejudice con	frontation sty	Wald	р-		
variables	Non- confronters (Profile 1)	Low stakes prodders (Profile 3)	Informative confronters (Profile 2)	χ ²	Value	
Confrontation frequency	2.25 _a	3.43 _b	5.30 _c	174.02	< 0.001	
Confrontation and accomplice behavior intentions	4.07 _a	5.36 _b	6.33 _c	164.16	<0.001	
Perceived benefits to confronting	2.42 _a	3.47 _b	4.33 _c	133.73	<0.001	
Concern about costs to confronting	2.33 _a	3.06 _b	2.57 _a	9.83	0.007	
LTP: Malleability of prejudice	5.30 _a	5.31 _a	5.79 _b	10.56	0.005	
LTP origin: Learned	5.63 _a	5.69 _a	5.96 _a	5.00	0.082	
LTP origin: Ignorance	5.28 _a	5.57 _a	6.15 _b	21.12	< 0.001	
LTP origin: Malice	4.95 _a	5.15 _a	5.81 _b	25.19	<0.001	

Note. Shared subscripts within a row indicate mean scores that do not differ significantly from each other (p < .05). Significant omnibus Wald χ^2 test results (p < .05) and the highest means are bolded for emphasis. LTP = lay theory of prejudice.

4.2.1.4. Benefits and costs to confronting. Informative confronters perceived significantly greater benefits to confronting than low stakes prodders, Wald $\chi^2 = 35.63$, p < .001, and non-confronters, Wald $\chi^2 = 133.15$, p < .001. Low stakes prodders perceived significantly greater benefits than non-confronters, Wald $\chi^2 = 42.06$, p < .001.

Low stakes prodders perceived significantly greater costs to confronting than informative, Wald $\chi^2 = 4.72$, p = .030, and nonconfronters, Wald $\chi^2 = 8.79$, p = .003, who did not significantly differ from each other, Wald $\chi^2 = 0.87$, p = .352.

4.2.1.5. Lay theories of prejudice. Informative confronters endorsed the belief that prejudice is malleable significantly more than low stakes prodders, Wald $\chi^2 = 8.72$, p = .003, and non-confronters, Wald $\chi^2 = 6.39$, p = .012 who did not significantly differ from each other, Wald $\chi^2 < 0.01$, p = .972.

Regarding lay theories of the origins of prejudice, the omnibus test indicated that there were no significant differences across profiles in terms of the belief that prejudice is learned. Note, however, that a belief that prejudice is learned was highly endorsed across profiles.

Informative confronters endorsed the belief that prejudice is rooted in ignorance significantly more strongly than did low stakes prodders, Wald $\chi^2 = 13.72$, p < .001, and non-confronters, Wald $\chi^2 = 12.52$, p < .001. Low stakes prodders and non-confronters did not significantly differ, Wald $\chi^2 = 1.23$, p = .268.

Informative confronters also endorsed the belief that prejudice is rooted in malice significantly more than low stakes prodders, Wald $\chi^2 = 16.80$, p < .001, and non-confronters, Wald $\chi^2 = 17.48$, p < .001 who did not significantly differ from each other, Wald $\chi^2 = 0.89$, p = .346.

4.3. Discussion

Study 3 replicated three of the profiles that emerged in Studies 1-2: informative confronters, low stakes prodders, and non-confronters.

There was, however, no evidence for a flexible confronter profile. In Study 3, the informative confronters displayed somewhat higher argumentative PCS levels compared to the low levels observed in the informative confronters in Studies 1–2. Whereas informative confronters in Studies 1–2 reported being markedly non-argumentative, this feature was not present among Study 3 informative confronters. Nonetheless, in a departure from Studies 1–2 findings, none of the three profiles identified in Study 3 actively endorsed usage of an argumentative PCS. Moreover, there were low overall mean levels of endorsed use of humor PCS across all three profiles in Study 3.

Like the Study 2 findings, informative confronters reported greater likelihood of confronting prejudice and greater anti-racism action intentions (Study 3) compared to low stakes prodders and nonconfronters, with the lowest rates occurring among non-confronters. This indicates that there may be similar behavioral differences between PCS profiles in Black and White adults alike.

Beliefs about prejudice confrontation benefits also mirrored Study 2 findings. Informative confronters perceived greater benefits to confronting compared to low stakes prodders, who, in turn, perceived greater benefits than non-confronters. Perceived costs of confronting represented a point of divergence from Study 2, however. In Study 3, the belief that confronting incurs costs was low among all profiles, with informative confronters and non-confronters reporting even lower costs than low stakes prodders. Although concern about costs of confronting were low across profiles among U.S. White adults (Study 2), profiles were not associated with significant differences in concern about costs in Study 2 as they were in Study 3. People who confront prejudice on their own behalf or on the behalf of their ingroup (i.e., targets of prejudice) tend to shoulder the burden of costs of confronting, whereas people who are not members of the social group targeted by an expression of prejudice or act of discrimination (i.e., non-targets; Dickter et al., 2012; Dickter & Newton, 2013) do not (Rasinski & Czopp, 2010). Therefore, it is noteworthy that Black informative confronters appear to be less concerned about the costs of confronting than low stakes prodders.

Lastly, informative confronters differed from non-confronters and low stakes prodders in more firmly endorsing the beliefs that prejudice is malleable and rooted in ignorance and malice. These findings largely replicate the distinctions between informative confronters and the other profiles that we found within the U.S. White adult sample in Study 2, and they may hint that informative confronters' beliefs shape how they decide to respond to prejudice. Compared to low stakes prodders and non-confronter counterparts, informative confronters in Study 3 appear to be optimistic that people's prejudices can be changed (Rattan & Dweck, 2010). They may attempt to curb perpetrators' ignorance and antipathy by appealing to empathy and teaching them about prejudice (Carter & Murphy, 2015).

5. General discussion

In the present study, we expanded upon prior individual differences approaches (e.g., Chaney & Sanchez, 2022; Dickter, 2012; Woodzicka & Good, 2021) to describe subgroups of individuals based on how they are likely to respond to prejudice and compared these subgroups in intentions to confront prejudice toward various social groups (Study 1), self-reported frequency of prejudice confrontations, confrontation and antiracist behavior intentions, perceived outcomes of prejudice confrontations, and lay theories of prejudice (Studies 2–3).

The present study demonstrates the interplay among PCS and the psychosocial differences between PCS profiles. Flexible confronters (Studies 1–2) reported higher levels of the five PCS relative to the other profiles. Flexible confronters indicated strong intentions to confront prejudice, particularly toward marginalized social groups (Study 1). The absence of a flexible confronter profile in Study 3 may indicate that groups that have different histories, positions in societal race relations, and racial socialization may display different PCS profiles. The roles of argumentativeness and humor in responding to prejudice may also vary

across racial lines. Flexible confronters (Studies 1–2) reported greater argumentative PCS than the other three profiles, and in Study 2 (U.S. White adults) flexible confronters reported the highest level of humor PCS compared to the other profiles. In Study 3 (U.S. Black adults), endorsed humor PCS was low for all profiles. For Black confronters, humor in prejudice confrontations may be reserved for Black audiences as subversive racial humor may be misinterpreted by those who harbor modern racist attitudes (Miller et al., 2019).

Flexible confronters (Studies 1–2) were the only profile that endorsed argumentative PCS. U.S. Black adults (Study 3) may generally confront in decidedly non-argumentative manners to preempt accusations that their confrontation communicated disproportionate anger or aggression. Black people in the U.S. are disproportionately subject to the societal stereotype of being angry (Motro et al., 2022) or aggressive (Zounlome et al., 2021). Non-Black confronters, especially White confronters, may thus be more likely to use an argumentative PCS without concern for confirming this stereotype. Moreover, non-target confronters may be perceived as especially respectable and persuasive when they confront more rather assertively (Dickter et al., 2012). Thus, the option to use a flexible confrontation style may be a privilege that is less accessible to Black people than White people and non-Black people of color.

Like flexible confronters, informative confronters (Studies 1-3) reported high educational, help-seeking, and empathy PCS levels. Although flexible confronters and informative confronters both appear willing to use educational and empathic appeals in confrontations and recruit help from confidants in the process, flexible confronters seem more inclined to incorporate argumentativeness and humor in their response to prejudice and discrimination. We also observed two primary ideological differences between these profiles, with informative confronters reporting stronger beliefs that prejudice is malleable and rooted in ignorance. Therefore, informative confronters may rely primarily on educational and empathy PCS from a belief that perpetrators are capable of changing their attitudes (Rattan & Dweck, 2010). Although flexible confronters are less likely to believe that prejudice is malleable and due to ignorance, they perceived confronting to be as beneficial as informative confronters. Rather than confronting to change others' views, flexible confronters may confront to pursue other benefits, such as garnering respect (Becker & Barreto, 2019). Despite these differences, both flexible and informative confronters reported strong intentions to confront prejudice toward marginalized groups. Moreover, they perceived greater benefits to confronting than low stakes prodders and non-confronters.

Low stakes prodders (Studies 1–3) generally reported moderate responses to all five PCS; however, they also reported lower-than-average intentions to confront prejudice toward marginalized social groups (Study 1). Moreover, low stakes prodders' perceptions of fewer potential benefits to confronting prejudice compared to informative confronters (and flexible confronters in Study 2), may indicate that they instead consider personal values and social norms that favor egalitarianism (Bamberg & Verkuyten, 2021) when they decide whether to confront.

Non-confronters (Studies 1–3) offer a point of comparison for the "confronter" profiles. Non-confrontations may represent the path of least resistance or a gesture to sustain the intergroup status quo. Although potential costs have widely been considered deterrents to confronting (Good et al., 2012; Rasinski & Czopp, 2010; Woodzicka & Good, 2021), we did not find evidence that non-confronters were especially concerned about costs. Non-confronters did, however, perceive the lowest benefits to confronting (Studies 2–3). In general, non-confronters differed from low stakes prodders in terms of lay theories of prejudice in Study 2; however, they were broadly like low stakes prodders in Study 3. Distinct underlying reasons not to confront prejudice may help to explain these differences in findings across studies. For instance, some people may choose not to confront because they agree with the perpetrator (Ashburn-Nardo et al., 2008). This possibility may disproportionately apply to non-targets, who are generally more

prejudiced than targeted individuals (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999).

5.1. Future directions

Future work may take several directions to build upon the findings of the present study. It is unclear whether the identified profiles tend to correspond to the use of multiple PCS within a single statement, conversation (see Chaney & Sanchez, 2022), or multiple occasions across the lifetime. This question may be tested empirically by coding actual confrontations for PCS across latent profile membership. Tools such as Linguistic Inquiry and Word Count (LIWC-22; Boyd et al., 2022) may be used to quantify the characteristics of actual confrontations, such as emotional tone, for analysis with the automatic BCH method as variables must be continuous for analysis using the automatic BCH method (Asparouhov & Muthén, 2014).

Although our inclusion of multiple samples was a strength, our samples were not comprehensive of the U.S. population. Our results clearly show that racial identity relates to profile membership. Future work should investigate profiles among additional groups, such as Asian, Latinx, and Indigenous people. Given these social groups' varied stereotypes and statuses within U.S. society (Zou & Cheryan, 2017), members of these groups may employ varied profiles. Relatedly, further investigation would help to understand which socialization factors may impact profile development across the lifespan. Examining profiles from a developmental perspective or using a longitudinal approach may afford numerous benefits, such as an initial demonstration of causal effects of lay theories and profiles. Indeed, work on children indicates they recognize inequality and may confront it at an early age (Scott et al., 2023).

5.2. Limitations

This study examined prejudice confrontations through a novel person-centered lens, replicated profiles across samples (which is relatively uncommon in LPA; see Hetelekides et al., 2023 as a notable exception), and examined a wide scope of auxiliary variables for profile comparison. Yet, the present research was based on self-reported perceptions, presenting several limitations. Accurately recalling and reporting prior behavior can be challenging (Schwarz & Oyserman, 2001). Participants' responses may be skewed by recent events in which they did (not) confront. Therefore, the profiles may only reflect participants' current perceptions of their typical behaviors. Another methodological limitation is that participants may have had different ideas about what behavior "counts" as exhibiting prejudice or a prejudice confrontation. Without definitions or examples, participants may have relied on different exemplars. Additionally, this study was crosssectional and limited to U.S. samples. We were not able to determine whether PCS profiles caused differences in perceived benefits to confronting, vice-versa, or whether a recursive process best describes the relationship. It is also unclear whether the profiles or associations that we observed with other variables are generalizable in other national contexts.

5.3. Conclusion

In sum, the present study identified four prejudice confrontation style profiles, including three profiles that spanned all samples (Studies 1–3) and a fourth that was present in a sample of racially diverse undergraduate (Study 1) and U.S. White adults (Study 2) but not a sample of U.S. Black adults (Study 3). Our findings demonstrate the prominent patterns of PCS among three key U.S. demographics of interest and illustrate the connections between PCS profiles and people's intended responses to expressions of prejudice and beliefs about the nature of prejudice.

CRediT authorship contribution statement

Emma Wedell: Writing – original draft, Validation, Formal analysis, Data curation, Conceptualization. **Kimberly E. Chaney:** Writing – review & editing, Visualization, Supervision.

Declaration of competing interest

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Data availability

All study materials are available on OSF

Acknowledgements

Funding for this research was provided by the Clara Mayo Grants and the Psychological Study of Social Issues. We are grateful for their financial support of this research. We are also grateful to Dr. Adrian J. Bravo for his guidance on conducting latent profile analysis in *Mplus*.

Appendix A. Supplementary data

Supplementary data to this article can be found online at https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2024.112904.

References

- Akaike, H. (1973). Information theory and an extension of the maximum likelihood principle. In B. N. Petrov, & F. Csaki (Eds.), *Proceedings of the second international* symposium on information theory (pp. 267–281). Akademiai Kiado.
- Asbrock, F., Sibley, C. G., & Duckitt, J. (2010). Right-wing authoritarianism and social dominance orientation and the dimensions of generalized prejudice: A longitudinal test. European Journal of Personality, 24(4), 324–340. https://doi.org/10.1002/ per.746
- Ashburn-Nardo, L., Morris, K. A., & Goodwin, S. A. (2008). The confronting prejudiced responses (CPR) model: Applying CPR in organizations. Academy of Management Learning & Education, 7(3), 332–342. https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2008.34251671
- Asparouhov, T., & Muthén, B. (2014). Auxiliary variables in mixture modeling: Using the BCH method in Mplus to estimate a distal outcome model and an arbitrary secondary model. Mplus web. Notes, No. 21 (statmodel.com).
- Bakk, Z., & Vermunt, J. K. (2016). Robustness of stepwise latent class modeling with continuous distal outcomes. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal, 23* (1), 20–31. https://doi.org/10.1080/10705511.2014.955104
- Bamberg, K., & Verkuyten, M. (2021). Internal and external motivation to respond without prejudice: A person-centered approach. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.2021.1917498
- Bartholomew, D. J., Knott, M., & Moustaki, I. (2011). Latent variable models and factor analysis: A unified approach (3rd ed.). Wiley.
- Becker, J. C., & Barreto, M. (2019). Personal, collective, and group-distancing motives under-lying confrontation of prejudice. In R. K. Mallett, & M. J. Monteith (Eds.), *Confronting prejudice and discrimination: The science of changing minds and behaviors* (pp. 141–158). Elsevier Academic Press. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-814715-3.00014-X.
- Bolck, A., Croon, M., & Hagenaars, J. (2004). Estimating latent structure models with catego- rical variables: One-step versus three-step estimators. *Political Analysis*, 12 (1), 3–27. https://doi.org/10.1093/pan/mph001
- Boyd, R. L., Ashokkumar, A., Seraj, S., & Pennebaker, J. W. (2022). The development and psychometric properties of LIWC-22.
- Brandt, M. J., & Crawford, J. T. (2016). Answering unresolved questions about the relationship between cognitive ability and prejudice. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 7(8), 884–892. https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550616660592
- Bravo, A. J., Wedell, E., Villarosa-Hurlocker, M. C., Looby, A., Dickter, C. L., & Schepis, T. S. (2021). Perceived racial/ethnic discrimination among young adult college students: Prevalence rates and associations with mental health. *Journal of American College Health*, 0(0), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1080/ 07448481 2021 1954012
- Brown, R. M., Craig, M. A., & Apfelbaum, E. P. (2021). European Americans' intentions to confront racial bias: Considering who, what (kind), and why. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 95, Article 104123. https://doi.org/10.1016/j. jesp.2021.104123
- Carr, P. B., Dweck, C. S., & Pauker, K. (2012). "Prejudiced" behavior without prejudice? Beliefs about the malleability of prejudice affect interracial interactions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 103(3), 452–471. https://doi.org/10.1037/ a0028849

- Carter, E. R., & Murphy, M. C. (2015). Group-based differences in perceptions of racism: What counts, to whom, and why? Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 9(6), 269–280. https://doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12181
- Celeux, G., & Soromenho, G. (1996). An entropy criterion for assessing the number of clusters in a mixture model. *Journal of Classification*, 13(2), 195–212. https://doi. org/10.1007/BF01246098
- Chakrabarti, A., & Ghosh, J. K. (2011). AIC, BIC and recent advances in model selection. In P. S. Bandyopadhyay, & M. R. Forster (Eds.), Vol. 7. Philosophy of statistics (pp. 583–605). North-Holland. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-444-51862-0.50018-6.
- Chaney, K. E., Pham, M. D., & Cipollina, R. (2024). Black Americans suppress emotions when prejudice is believed to stem from shared ignorance. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 15. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1336552
- Chaney, K. E., & Sanchez, D. T. (2022). Prejudice confrontation styles: A validated and reliable measure of how people confront prejudice. *Group Processes*, 25(5), 1333–1352. https://doi.org/10.1177/13684302211005841
- Chaney, K. E., Sanchez, D. T., Alt, N. P., & Shih, M. J. (2020). The breadth of confrontations as a prejudice reduction strategy. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 12(3), 314–322. https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550620919318
- Chaney, K. E., & Wedell, E. (2022). How lay theories of prejudice shape prejudice confronta- tions: Examining beliefs about prejudice prevalence, origins, and controllability. Social and personality psychology. Compass, 16(4). https://doi.org/ 10.1111/spc3.12658
- Coates, T.-N. (2014, May 22). The case for reparations. The Atlantic. https://www.thea tlantic.com/magazine/archive/2014/06/the-case-for-reparations/361631/.
- Czopp, A. M., & Monteith, M. J. (2003). Confronting prejudice (literally): Reactions to confrontations of racial and gender bias. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29* (4), 532–544. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167202250923
- Czopp, A. M., Monteith, M. J., & Mark, A. Y. (2006). Standing up for a change: Reducing bias through interpersonal confrontation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 90(5), 784–803. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.90.5.784
- Dickter, C. L. (2012). Confronting hate: Heterosexuals' responses to anti-gay comments. Journal of Homosexuality, 59, 1113–1130. https://doi.org/10.1080/ 00918369.2012.712817
- Dickter, C. L., Kittel, J. A., & Gyurovski, I. I. (2012). Perceptions of non-target confronters in response to racist and heterosexist remarks. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 42(1), 112–119. https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.855
- Dickter, C. L., & Newton, V. A. (2013). To confront or not to confront: Non-targets' evaluations of and responses to racist comments. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 43, E262–E275. https://doi.org/10.1111/jasp.12022
- Dolezal, M. L., Decker, M., Higgins, M., & Littleton, H. (2023). Evaluation of the gender minority stress model in transgender and gender diverse college students. *Psychology* of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity. https://doi.org/10.1037/sgd0000669
- Duckitt, J., & Sibley, C. G. (2007). Right wing authoritarianism, social dominance orientation and the dimensions of generalized prejudice. *European Journal of Personality*, 21(2), 113–130. https://doi.org/10.1002/per.614
 Farber, R., Wedell, E., Herchenroeder, L., Dickter, C. L., Pearson, M. R., & Bravo, A. J.
- Farber, R., Wedell, E., Herchenroeder, L., Dickter, C. L., Pearson, M. R., & Bravo, A. J. (2021). Microaggressions and psychological health among college students: A moderated mediation model of rumination and social structure beliefs. *Journal of Racial and Ethnic Health Disparities*, 8(1), 245–255. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40615-020-000778-8
- Golash-Boza, T. (2016). A critical and comprehensive sociological theory of race and racism. Sociology of Race and Ethnicity, 2(2), 129–141. https://doi.org/10.1177/ 2332649216632242
- Good, J. J., Moss-Racusin, C. A., & Sanchez, D. T. (2012). When do we confront? Perceptions of costs and benefits predict confronting discrimination on behalf of the self and others. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 36(2), 210–226. https://doi.org/ 10.1177/0361684312440958
- Hetelekides, E., Joseph, V. W., Pearson, M. R., Bravo, A. J., Prince, M. A., Conner, B. T., ... Marijuana Outcomes Study Team. (2023). Early birds and night owls: Distinguishing profiles of cannabis use habits by use times with latent class analysis. *Cannabis (Albuquerque, N.M.)*, 6(1), 79–98. https://doi.org/10.26828/cannabis/ 2023.01.007
- Hodson, G., & Esses, V. M. (2005). Lay perceptions of ethnic prejudice: Causes, solutions, and individual differences. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 35, 329–344 (doi: 10. 1002/ejsp.251).
- Hooper, D. (2012). Exploratory factor analysis. In H. Chen (Ed.), Approaches to quantitative research – Theory and its practical application: A guide to dissertation students (p. 33). Oak Tree Press.
- Khubchandani, J., Biswas, N., Mustapha, T., Talbert, S., & Dharamsi, S. (2022). COVID-19 vaccination refusal among college students: Global trends and action priorities. *Brain, Behavior, and Immunity, 99*, 218–222. https://doi.org/10.1016/j. bbi.2021.10.006

Kline, R. B. (2016). Principles and practice of structural equation modeling (4th ed.). Guilford Press.

- Lee, E., Soto, J., Swim, J., & Bernstein, M. (2012). Bitter reproach or sweet revenge: Cultural differences in response to racism. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin, 38*, 920–932. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167212440292
- Mallett, R. K., & Wagner, D. E. (2011). The unexpectedly positive consequences of confronting sexism. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 47(1), 215–220. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp. 2010.10.001
- Miller, S. S., O'Dea, C. J., Lawless, T. J., & Saucier, D. A. (2019). Savage or satire: Individual differences in perceptions of disparaging and subversive racial humor. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 142, 28–41. https://doi.org/10.1016/j. paid.2019.01.029
- Monteith, M. J., Ashburn-Nardo, L., Voils, C. I., & Czopp, A. M. (2002). Putting the brakes on prejudice: On the development and operation of cues for control. *Journal*

E. Wedell and K.E. Chaney

of Personality and Social Psychology, 83(5), 1029-1050. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.83.5.1029

- Motro, D., Evans, J. B., Ellis, A. P. J., & Benson, L. I. (2022). Race and reactions to women's expressions of anger at work: Examining the effects of the "angry black woman" stereotype. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 107(1), 142–152. https://doi.org/ 10.1037/apl0000884. supp
- Rasinski, H. M., & Czopp, A. M. (2010). The effect of target status on witnesses' reactions to confrontations of bias. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 32(1), 8–16. https:// doi.org/10.1080/01973530903539754
- Rattan, A., & Dweck, C. S. (2010). Who confronts prejudice? The role of implicit theories in the motivation to confront prejudice. *Psychological Science*, 21(7), 952–959. https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797610374740
- Rattan, A., & Dweck, C. S. (2018). What happens after prejudice is confronted in the workplace? How mindsets affect minorities' and women's outlook on future social relations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 103(6), 676–687. https://doi.org/10.1037/ ap10000287
- Schwarz, G. (1978). Estimating the dimension of a model. The Annals of Statistics, 6(2), 461–464. https://doi.org/10.1214/aos/1176344136
- Schwarz, N., & Oyserman, D. (2001). Asking questions about behavior: Cognition, communi- cation, and questionnaire construction. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 22 (2), 127–160. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1098-2140(01)00133-3
- Scott, K. E., Henkel, M. A., Moens, O. M., Devine, P. G., & Shutts, K. (2023). Children's evaluations of and reactions to racial discrimination. *Developmental Psychology*, 59 (7), 1190–1202. https://doi.org/10.1037/dev0001542

- Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (1999). Social dominance: An intergroup theory of social hierarchy and oppression. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/ CB09781139175043
- Sinha, P., Calfee, C. S., & Delucchi, K. L. (2021). Practitioner's guide to latent class analysis: Methodological considerations and common pitfalls. *Critical Care Medicine*, 49(1), e63–e79. https://doi.org/10.1097/CCM.000000000004710
- Sommers, S. R., & Norton, M. I. (2006). Lay theories about white racists: What constitutes racism (and what doesn't). Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 9(1), 117–138. https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430206059881
- Wedell, E., Dickter, C. L., & Bravo, A. J. (2022). The effects of antiracism education on intended confrontation of institutional discrimination: A game theory approach. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 52(5), 376–390. https://doi.org/10.1111/ jasp.12865
- Woodzicka, J. A., & Good, J. J. (2021). Strategic confrontation: Examining the utility of low stakes prodding as a strategy for confronting sexism. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 161(3), 316–330. https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.2020.1829529
- Zou, L. X., & Cheryan, S. (2017). Two axes of subordination: A new model of racial position. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 112, 696–717. https://doi.org/ 10.1037/pspa0000080
- Zounlome, N. O. O., Wong, Y. J., Klann, E. M., & David, J. L. (2021). "I'm already seen as a sexual predator from saying hello": Black men's perception of sexual violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 36(19–20). https://doi.org/10.1177/ 088626051987 7942. NP10809–NP10830.