

Prejudice confrontation styles: A validated and reliable measure of how people confront prejudice

Group Processes & Intergroup Relations

1–20

© The Author(s) 2021

Article reuse guidelines:

sagepub.com/journals-permissions

DOI: 10.1177/13684302211005841

journals.sagepub.com/home/gpi

Kimberly E. Chaney¹ and Diana T. Sanchez²

Abstract

While research has demonstrated that confrontations of prejudice serve as effective prejudice reduction tools and as a coping mechanism for targets of prejudice, research has yet to identify a validated measurement of prejudice confrontation styles. The present research develops the Prejudice Confrontation Styles (PCS) Scale, which includes five styles of prejudice confrontation: Educational, Argumentative, Help-seeking, Empathy, and Humor. The factor structure of the PCS Scale is identified across two diverse samples employing exploratory (Study 1) and confirmatory (Study 2) factor analyses. Moreover, the PCS Scale demonstrates construct validity, predicting imagined confrontation styles two weeks later among women confronting prejudice, and prejudice confrontation styles moderated autonomy, rumination, and perceived effectiveness of prejudice confrontations (Study 3). Thus, the present research identifies and develops a tool to measure prejudice confrontation styles and demonstrates that prejudice confrontation styles are associated with divergent psychological health outcomes.

Keywords

confronting, coping, prejudice, scale development

Paper received 27 April 2020; revised version accepted 8 March 2021.

Prejudice confrontations are defined here as a verbal challenge directed at a person who has committed an act of blatant, subtle, or nonverbal bias (Chaney et al., 2015). Yet, how people confront prejudice, specifically their *prejudice confrontation styles* remains an understudied area of research. As prejudice confrontation styles may influence (1) whether confrontations reduce discriminatory responses (Czopp et al., 2006), (2) well-being after experiences of discrimination (Foster, 2015), and (3) how prejudice confrontations are evaluated

(Dickter et al., 2012), the present research sought to develop a validated and reliable measure of prejudice confrontation styles.

¹University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT, USA

²Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ, USA

Corresponding author:

Kimberly E. Chaney, Department of Psychological Sciences, University of Connecticut, 406 Babbidge Road, Storrs, CT, 06269, USA.

Email: kim.chaney@uconn.edu

Confronting Prejudice

Confronting prejudice and discrimination has been identified as an effective strategy to reduce the perpetrator's future behavior, including prejudice and stereotyping (Chaney & Sanchez, 2018; Chaney et al., in press; Czopp et al., 2006). White participants confronted for using negative stereotypes about Black Americans use fewer negative stereotypes about Black and Latinx Americans one week later compared to un-confronted White participants (Chaney & Sanchez, 2018; Chaney et al., in press). Failing to confront discrimination may validate discriminatory social norms (Blanchard et al., 1994), making it difficult for observers to recognize situations as discriminatory (Czopp, 2011), while witnessing prejudice confrontations can empower people to confront similar experiences (Swim & Thomas, 2006). Thus, prejudice confrontations serve as an effective strategy in egalitarian norm promotion by reducing stereotype use among perpetrators and empowering others to confront prejudice.

Despite such benefits, confrontations also engender interpersonal costs, and when perceived costs outweigh perceived benefits, individuals are unlikely to confront (Good et al., 2012; Kaiser & Miller, 2004; Swim & Hyers, 1999). Stigmatized group members who confront discrimination are often evaluated more negatively than those who do not confront discrimination (Alt et al., 2019; Czopp & Monteith, 2003; Czopp et al., 2006; Kaiser & Miller, 2004; Rasinski & Czopp, 2010) and concerns about being negatively evaluated for confronting prejudice can ultimately reduce the frequency of prejudice confrontations (Alt et al., 2019; Ashburn-Nardo et al., 2014; Good et al., 2012). Yet, we propose that the perceived (and likely actual) costs and benefits of confronting prejudice are likely moderated by prejudice confrontation styles.

Prejudice Confrontations as Coping

In addition to mitigating prejudice, it has been argued that confronting prejudice benefits confronters by serving as a strategy to cope with discrimination (Chaney et al., 2015), which is related

to health outcomes such as life satisfaction and autonomy (Foster, 2013; Sanchez et al., 2016). For example, women who confronted a sexist article via a tweet reported less negative affect compared to women who did not tweet about the article (Foster, 2015). Additionally, frequent prejudice confrontations are associated with less anger and regret, and greater feelings of empowerment, autonomy, and closure (Gervais et al., 2010; Haslett & Lipman, 1997; Hyers, 2007; Sanchez et al., 2016). Lastly, individuals are more likely to ruminate, defined as obsessive, negative thoughts about an event (see Thomsen, 2006), about experiences of discrimination if they do not confront compared to when they do (Hyers, 2007; Shelton et al., 2006), and rumination can impede cognitive performance (Richards & Gross, 2000) and have negative health outcomes (Roger & Najaran, 1998; Thomsen, 2006). Thus, researchers argue that confronting prejudice can promote psychological well-being for the confronter (e.g., Chaney et al., 2015; Foster, 2013). Yet, prejudice confrontation styles may moderate these effects, such that certain prejudice confrontation styles may be associated with greater autonomy and rumination, while others may be associated with *less* autonomy and rumination.

Prejudice Confrontation Styles

Little research has systematically examined *how* people confront prejudices. Among the few studies examining prejudice confrontation styles, research has demonstrated that both high threat (i.e., "you seem like some kind of racist to me") and low threat (i.e., "it would be good to think about Blacks in other ways that are a little more fair") confrontations from confederate confronters reduce perpetrators' use of Black stereotypes (Czopp et al., 2006). Perceptions of confronters employing high vs low threat confrontation styles have found that assertive (high threat) confrontations led to more negative evaluations by third-party observers compared to un-assertive (low threat) confrontations (Dickter et al., 2012). Other research has compared nonaggressive, verbal confrontations (e.g., "I told him that, as a woman, I thought that what he said was wrong")

and aggressive confrontations (e.g., “I vociferously told him that, as a woman, I thought that what he said was wrong. . . Then, I slapped his face”), and found that men and women evaluated nonaggressive confrontations more favorably than aggressive styles (Becker & Barreto, 2014). Moreover, women who are more concerned about being respected than liked confront sexism more assertively (Mallett & Melchiori, 2014), and women who reported a more negative reaction to a racist comment, indicated confronting the perpetrator with a stronger verbal reaction, both based on 1–7 Likert scales completed by independent coders of the confrontations (Dickter & Newton, 2013).

Some research has coded prejudice confrontation styles into three categories: angry, educational, or indirect (including both nonverbal and humor) confrontations and found that women who confronted sexism online with anger compared to indirect or educational styles, reported greater life satisfaction over a 28-day period (Foster, 2013). When humor has been examined as a prejudice confrontation style (not just as one of many indirect styles) in response to sexist humor, research found that people who confronted sexism with humor were rated as more likeable but less effective compared to a more serious confrontation (Woodzicka et al., 2020). Other research has noted more specific prejudice confrontation styles, including using humor or trying to educate the perpetrator, but analyzed the data based on broader categories of assertive (argumentative, educational, and nonverbal responses) and unassertive (humor and doing nothing; Hyers, 2007).

Such research ignores a broader variety of prejudice confrontation styles found in early research that coded prejudice confrontation styles in greater detail. The earliest research on prejudice confrontations included nine prejudice confrontation styles, ranging from “mere-negotiation” arguments (bare statement of disagreement) to the “individual differences” argument (don’t generalize from one person to a whole group; Citron et al., 1950). In a modern adaptation of Citron et al. (1950), a role-playing exercise identified four common styles, including questioning, arousing

cognitive dissonance, explaining how the perpetrator made you feel, and approaching with respect rather than self-righteousness (Plous, 2000). Swim and Hyers (1999) identified six sexism confrontation styles women used, including direct (saying a remark was sexist), humor or sarcasm, questioning the confederate, giving a task-related response that contradicted a perpetrator, surprised exclamations, and grumbling noises in response to a confederate making sexist statements. Despite demonstrations of a rich array of prejudice confrontation styles and divergent outcomes for confronters and perpetrators based on styles, there has not yet been a systematic examination of prejudice confrontation styles.

Current Research

Because research has identified divergent outcomes based on styles of confronting prejudice, including how confrontations are perceived by evaluators (Dickter et al., 2012), how confrontations allow individuals to cope with discrimination (Foster, 2013), and how confrontations can reduce prejudice in perpetrators (Czopp et al., 2006), the present research sought to identify and validate a measure of prejudice confrontation styles.

Across three studies ($N_{\text{analytic}} = 1,076$) examining the factor structure, reliability, and validity of the Prejudice Confrontation Style (PCS) Scale, we identify five styles (Studies 1 & 2). The PCS Scale predicts the styles used by women confronting scenarios of sexism (Study 3). The present research highlights the divergent effects of prejudice confrontation styles on autonomy, rumination, and perceived confrontation effectiveness (Study 3), and develops a validated, reliable PCS Scale that can be employed to examine experienced or observed discrimination for members of dominant and stigmatized groups.¹

Study 1

Study 1 examined the initial factor analysis of the PCS Scale and evaluated the reliability of identified subscales. To develop an inclusive scale of prejudice confrontation styles, the scale was

developed to examine how individuals confront experienced *or* witnessed discrimination.

Participants

Study 1 included 388 participants (231 women, 59.5%; 157 men, 40.5%). The sample ($M_{\text{age}} = 19.29$, $SD = 2.48$, range: 18–45 years) was racially diverse. Participants identified as Asian/Asian American (37.7%), White/Caucasian (31.4%), Hispanic/Latinx (9.5%), Black/African American (9.8%), Middle Eastern/North African (5.7%), multiracial (5.2%), “other” (0.5%), and two did not indicate a racial identity (0.3%). Participants were US undergraduates recruited from a large university subject pool. As reported results did not significantly change when excluding participants who indicated they never confronted prejudice on the measure of confrontation frequency ($n = 29$, see below), these participants were retained.

Procedure

In an online questionnaire, participants completed the items developed for the PCS Scale (development described below) based on how they respond when they witness *or* experience discrimination, followed by measures of how frequently they experience or witness discrimination and how frequently they confront discrimination directed at themselves or others. After completing demographic questions, participants were debriefed.

Materials

PCS Scale Development. To develop items for the PCS Scale we first examined the literature on prejudice confrontations that had previously coded or manipulated confrontation styles. This literature, discussed in the introduction, highlighted several styles: assertive (high threat), nonassertive (low threat), educational, humor, arouse cognitive dissonance, and empathy. Next, we examined the literature on coping with stressful events, and coping with discrimination, and identified the

COPE Scale (Carver et al., 1989), and the Coping with Discrimination (CWD) Scale (Wei et al., 2010). We selected three subscales of the COPE Scale (Humor, Instrumental Social Support, and Restraint) and two subscales of the CWD (Education, Resistance) that reflected styles identified in the prejudice confrontation literature. Lastly, we examined the literature on confrontation styles (not prejudice confrontation styles) and identified the Intercultural Conflict Style (ICS) Inventory (Hammer, 2005), which identifies four conflict styles: direct, indirect, emotionally expressive, and emotionally restrained.

We identified 10 styles of interest: Help-seeking, Humor, Educational, Cognitive dissonance, Hostility, Empathy, Emotional restraint, Emotionally expressive, and Dominant (see Table 1) and developed 41 items for the PCS Scale.² Participants were prompted to “Rate the following statements based on how true they are of you. When I witness or experience discrimination. . .” followed by the 41 developed items in random order. Participants responded from 1 (not at all true of me) to 5 (very true of me).

Discrimination Experiences. Participants indicated how often during an average week they experience or witness various discrimination experiences on five items (Good et al., 2012), including “Hear a sexist, racist, or heterosexist joke” ($\alpha = .83$) on a scale from 0 (never) to 7 (every day of the week).

Confronting Frequency. Participants completed a five-item measure of confronting frequency (Good et al., 2012) on a scale from 1 (never) to 7 (every time), including items such as “I confront someone when they have said something sexist, racist, or heterosexist about me or someone else” ($\alpha = .92$).

Results

A principal axis factor (PAF) analysis was conducted on the 41 PCS items and a parallel analysis was used to determine the number of factors in the measure (Brown, 2006). Comparison of

Table 1. Initially developed Prejudice Confrontation Styles (PCS) subscales, items, and origin of development.

Developed PCS subscale	Number of items	Sample item	How developed	Citation
Help-seeking	5	"I take the issue to someone of authority when possible."	3 from COPE ISS subscale; 2 based on COPE ISS subscale	Carver et al., 1989
Humor	3	"I make a joke about it and hope they understand I disagree."	3 based on COPE Humor subscale	Carver et al., 1989
Education	5	"I try to inform them of the many negative effects of discrimination."	3 from CWD Education subscale, 2 based on CWD Education subscale	Wei et al., 2010
Cognitive dissonance	4	"I let them know I am surprised they hold such prejudiced beliefs."	4 based on cognitive dissonance style identified in confrontation exercise	Plous, 2000
Empathy	5	"I tell them their actions have really troubled me."	5 based on empathy style in confrontation exercise	Plous, 2000
Hostility	5	"I get straight to the point and tell them they are racist."	3 based on the CWD Resistance subscale; 2 based on confronting prejudice reduction research	Wei et al., 2010; Czopp et al., 2006
Emotional restraint	5	"I contain my emotions and remain collected."	5 based on the Emotional Expression subscale of ICS Inventory	Hammer, 2005
Emotionally expressive	5	"I passionately express to them my disagreements."	5 based on the Emotional Expression subscale of ICS Inventory	Hammer, 2005
Dominant	4	"I interrupt them."	4 based on dominant styles reportedly used by participants in past confrontation work	Hyers, 2007

Notes. ISS = Instrumental Social Support; CWD = Coping With Discrimination Scale; ICS = Intercultural Conflict Styles.

the parallel analysis indicated that six factors should be extracted, as the eigenvalue for the sixth factor (1.29) was equal to the averaged eigenvalue from the sixth factor of the 1,000 random data sets (1.29).

The six-factor solution was then explored with both oblique (Promax) and orthogonal (Varimax) rotations of the extracted factors. The oblique rotation was the easiest to interpret. Item selection was based on the following criteria: (1) a factor loading $> .45$, (2) cross-loadings on other factors of less than $.40$, and (3) factors could not have more than five items (Brown, 2006). Following these criteria, 25 of the original 41 items were retained. A second PAF exploratory factor analysis with a Promax rotation was conducted on the remaining 25 items. The six-factor solution accounted for 64.39% of the variance prior to rotation. However, one factor

included Emotional restraint items that did not ultimately reflect a confrontation style because the items only focused on a person's internal thoughts and reflections. This factor was dropped, resulting in a five-factor solution.³ The five-factor solution accounted for 60.96% of the variance prior to rotation (see Table 2). All items loaded on a factor $> .42$, and no items had cross-loadings $> .30$ on other factors, indicating simple structure (Thurstone, 1947).

Factor 1 was labeled Educational (five items, 12.02% of variance before rotation) and included efforts to educate a perpetrator about discrimination. Factor 2 was labeled Argumentative (five items, 27.69% of variance before rotation) and included argumentatively confronting a perpetrator. Factor 3 was labeled Help-seeking (five items, 9.98% of variance

Table 2. Items, factor loading, communality estimates, means, and *SDs* for the PCS Scale, Study 1.

22 items	Factor loading						<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
	1	2	3	4	5	<i>h</i> ²		
Educational								
I let them know I am surprised they hold such prejudiced beliefs	.65	.03	-.09	.12	.13	.51	2.97	1.18
I educate them about the negative impact of discrimination	.73	.01	.03	-.01	-.19	.56	2.83	1.22
I help them be better able to spot discrimination	.77	.04	.06	-.04	.09	.66	2.72	1.12
I teach them the various ways discrimination is still prominent in our society	.76	.03	.06	-.12	.01	.55	2.71	1.21
I show them why what they said was discriminatory	.63	-.14	.05	.16	.07	.52	3.14	1.20
Argumentative								
I express my feelings, even if it means shouting	-.04	.65	.01	.14	.02	.50	2.35	1.12
I make sure I have the last word	-.11	.56	.07	.09	.14	.39	2.59	1.20
I argue with the person and tell them they are ignorant	.20	.63	-.10	.08	-.07	.54	2.52	1.19
I talk louder than them so I can't be interrupted	-.01	.88	-.01	-.06	-.02	.72	2.12	1.13
I dominate the discussion and don't let them get a word in	-.11	.74	.07	-.11	.01	.50	1.91	0.98
Help-seeking								
I try to get advice from someone before confronting them	.01	-.06	.58	.03	.13	.37	2.70	1.15
I talk to someone who could do something concrete about the problem	.02	.04	.71	.05	-.05	.57	2.71	1.18
I ask people who have had similar experiences what they did	.03	-.04	.71	-.02	.05	.52	2.82	1.20
I take the issue to someone of authority when possible	.02	.12	.62	.04	-.05	.47	2.41	1.18
I speak to friends and family about how to handle situations like these	.03	-.02	.76	-.08	-.07	.53	2.85	1.34
Empathy								
I let them know they have hurt me	.04	.05	-.07	.65	-.06	.44	2.98	1.16
I make sure they know I am saddened by what they said	-.08	-.06	.07	.88	.06	.70	2.92	1.13
I express the pain they have caused me	-.07	.14	.06	.64	.01	.50	2.54	1.06
I tell them I am upset by what they said	.21	-.05	-.06	.69	-.07	.63	3.14	1.11
Humor								
I make a joke about it and hope they understand I disagree	.02	-.06	.06	.06	.73	.52	2.66	1.26
I make fun of the absurdity of the situation	.07	.15	.01	-.08	.64	.50	2.59	1.25
I kid around about their ignorance	-.03	-.01	-.07	-.03	.85	.71	2.58	1.23

Notes. PCS = Prejudice Confrontation Styles.

Bold text indicates item loaded on factor.

before rotation) and included going to people in positions of power or asking others how to confront discrimination. Factor 4 was labeled Empathy (four items, 6.40% of variance before rotation) and included informing the perpetrator how their act of discrimination has hurtful. Factor 5 was labeled Humor (three items, 4.87% of variance before rotation) and included trying to make a joke out of the situation.

PAF exploratory factor analyses with a Promax rotation on these 22 items with a five-factor solution was then conducted separately for (1) women, (2) men, (3) racial minorities, and (4) White participants to determine whether the factor structure remained consistent across key demographic groups. For each subsample, the same five factors were identified. All items loaded on a single factor, .42–.53 (no items cross-loading

Table 3. Correlations between identified PCS subscales, means, and standard deviations, Study 1.

	1	2	3	4	5
1. Educational	–				
2. Argumentative	.40**	–			
3. Help-seeking	.51**	.28**	–		
4. Empathy	.56**	.43**	.39**	–	
5. Humor	.12*	.27**	.15**	.03	–
<i>M</i>	2.89	2.30	2.70	2.90	2.61
<i>SD</i>	0.95	0.87	0.92	0.90	1.04

Note. PCS = Prejudice Confrontation Styles.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

> .38), for women, men, racial minorities, and Whites. All subscales had adequate reliabilities (α s: .79–.85). Correlations and descriptive statistics are presented in Table 3.⁴

Discussion

Study 1 identified 22 items on five factors: Educational, Argumentative, Help-seeking, Humor, and Empathy. The factor structure and reliabilities of the subscales remained consistent across the four demographic groups of interest, demonstrating the broad utility of the PCS Scale to examine prejudice confrontation styles.

Study 2

Study 2 sought to (1) conduct a confirmatory factor analysis, (2) demonstrate the test-retest reliability of the PCS Scale at two time-points one week apart, and (3) test the validity of the PCS Scale by examining whether the PCS Scale would account for additional variance beyond that of validated measures of coping with discrimination and conflict styles when predicting participants' autonomy and life satisfaction.

Participants

In all, 399 undergraduates participated in the study in exchange for partial course credit. Critically, 104 (26.07%) participants did not

complete Time 2 (T2), while 19 were excluded for completing T2 outside of the 72-hour window (7–10 days after Time 1),⁵ resulting in an analytic sample of 276 participants (198 women, 71.70%; 78 men, 28.30%). This T2 sample's ($M_{\text{age}} = 18.84$, $SD = 1.46$, range: 18–30 years) racial demographics (49.70% Asian/Asian American, 26.8% White/Caucasian, 7.20% Hispanic/Latinx, 6.20% multiracial, 5.40% Middle Eastern/North African, 4.00% Black/African American, 0.80% “other”) mirrored the larger sample.

Procedure

Time 1 (T1) was identified as an in-lab, 20-minute session and T2 was a 10-minute online survey received via email one week after T1. Participants received partial course credit for completing T1, and additional course credit for completing T2 within 72 hours of receiving the survey link. During T1, participants in the lab completed the 22-item PCS Scale, followed by ICS Inventory and CWD Scale items (below), and measures of discrimination experiences and confrontation frequency (Study 1). Lastly, participants completed measures of autonomy, life satisfaction, and demographic questions. One week later ($M = 7.26$ days, $SD = 0.61$), participants received an email with the survey link and instructions for T2, which included only the PCS Scale and a debriefing.

Materials

During T1, participants completed the 22 items of the PCS Scale, as well as the measures of confrontation frequency ($\alpha = .94$) and discrimination experiences ($\alpha = .82$) from Study 1. Participants also completed the 20-item measure of the ICS during T1 (below).⁶

ICS Inventory. A 20-item measure of the ICS Inventory (Hammer, 2005) was completed on a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree). Participants were promoted with, “In general, when resolving conflict with another party, my preferred approach is. . .” and then completed the direct (e.g., “I verbally confront people

when we have an opinion difference"; $\alpha = .87$), indirect (e.g., "I express complaints indirectly"; $\alpha = .67$), emotional expressive (e.g., "I do not try to control my emotions"; $\alpha = .87$), and emotional restraint (e.g., "I maintain my emotional calm") subscales ($\alpha = .91$).

Coping with Discrimination Subscales. Participants were prompted with "Please respond to the following items as honestly as possible to reflect how much each strategy best describes the ways you cope with discrimination." Participants then completed the five-item education/advocacy subscale of the CWD measure (e.g., "I try to stop discrimination at the societal level"; $\alpha = .89$), and the five-item CWD resistance subscale (e.g., "I get into an argument with the person"; $\alpha = .76$) on a scale from 1 (never like me) to 6 (always like me).

Autonomy. As a measure of autonomy, participants responded to the statements "I have a say in what happens and I can voice my own opinion," and "I feel free to be who I am" on a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) and these were significantly positively correlated, $r(275) = 0.65, p < .001$ (based on Sanchez et al., 2016).

Life Satisfaction. A five-item measure of life satisfaction (based on Van Praag et al., 2003) was completed by participants at T1 ($\alpha = .86$). Participants indicated "how satisfied are you in the following domains," including "life as a whole," "social life," and "work life," on a scale from 1 (very slightly or not at all) to 7 (very satisfied).

Results

A confirmatory factor analyses were conducted on T1 PCS Scale responses using a maximum-likelihood estimation in MPlus (Muthen & Muthen, 1998). Employing three levels of fit indices (Hu & Bentler, 1999), the root-mean-square error of approximation (RMSEA; values $< .08$ indicate acceptable model fit), comparative fit index (CFI; values $> .90$ indicate acceptable model fit), and standardized root-mean-square residual (SRMR; values $< .08$ indicate acceptable model fit), we examined the five-factor model identified in Study

1. The five-factor model had adequate fit, $X^2(199) = 567.69, p < .001$, RMSEA = 0.07, 90% CI [0.06, 0.08], CFI = 0.89, SRMR = 0.06.

To examine test-retest reliability, paired sample *t*-tests were conducted for participants' responses to each of the five PCS subscales at T1 and T2. Analyses revealed no significant difference between T1 and T2 on PCS Empathy, $t(275) = 0.91, p = .36$, 95% CI [-0.13, 0.05], PCS Educational, $t(275) = 0.92, p = .36$, 95% CI [-0.12, 0.05], PCS Argumentative, $t(275) = 1.71, p = .09$, 95% CI [-0.01, 0.16], PCS Humor, $t(275) = 1.23, p = .22$, 95% CI [-0.04, 0.17], and a marginally significant difference between T1 and T2 on PCS Help-seeking, $t(275) = 1.95, p = .052$, 95% CI [-0.19, 0.01]. The 95% CI of the mean difference of all subscales included 0 and all subscales were significantly, highly correlated from T1 to T2 (see Table 4). The internal reliability of the PCS subscales was also consistent across T1 (α s: .75-.82) and T2 (α s: .64-.89). Reliabilities were consistent across men, women, racial minorities, and Whites at T1 and T2 (see Table 4 of online supplemental material).

PCS Scale Incremental Validity

Autonomy. To examine incremental validity, a hierarchical linear regression was conducted. Dichotomous participant race and gender outcomes were entered in Step 1, confronting frequency and discrimination experiences were entered in Step 2, the four ICS subscales and two CWD subscales were entered in Step 3, and the five PCS subscales (averaged across T1 and T2) in Step 4. The outcome of interest was autonomy. While Step 1, $R^2\Delta = 0.06, p = .001$, Step 2, $R^2\Delta = 0.13, p = .001$, and Step 3, $R^2\Delta = 0.05, p = .005$, resulted in a significant change, Step 4 also resulted in a significant change, $R^2\Delta = 0.03, p = .016$, indicating the PCS accounted for an additional 3% of variance. The four-step model was significant, $F(15, 383) = 7.73, p < .001$. Steps 1-4 are presented in Table 5. In Step 4, PCS Help-seeking was significantly associated with greater autonomy, as was lower ICS Indirectness, greater ICS Directness, greater confrontation frequency, lower discrimination experiences, and being White or male.

Table 4. Means, standard deviations, and T1–T2 correlations, Study 2.

	Educational	Argumentative	Help-seeking	Empathy	Humor
T1 <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	2.98 (0.90)	2.39 (0.84)	2.91 (0.88)	2.93 (0.89)	2.60 (1.03)
T2 <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	3.02 (0.96)	2.31 (0.87)	3.00 (0.98)	2.97 (0.90)	2.54 (1.07)
T1–T2 <i>r</i>	.70***	.64***	.63***	.65***	.66***

****p* < .001.

Table 5. Hierarchical linear regressions on autonomy and life satisfaction, Study 2.

	Autonomy			Life satisfaction		
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>
Step 1						
Participant gender	0.15	0.05	.003	0.28	0.07	< .001
Participant race	0.18	0.05	.001	0.13	0.07	.08
Step 2						
Participant gender	0.18	0.05	< .001	0.30	0.07	< .001
Participant race	0.18	0.05	.001	0.13	0.07	.07
Discrimination experience	–0.16	0.04	< .001	–0.22	0.05	< .001
Confrontation frequency	0.17	0.03	< .001	0.17	0.04	< .001
Step 3						
Participant gender	0.18	0.05	< .001	0.30	0.07	< .001
Participant race	0.18	0.05	.001	0.14	0.07	.05
Discrimination experience	–0.15	0.04	< .001	–0.21	0.05	< .001
Confrontation frequency	0.11	0.03	.001	0.17	0.05	< .001
ICS Direct	0.18	0.06	.002	0.16	0.08	.046
ICS Indirect	–0.09	0.06	.14	–0.20	0.09	.028
ICS Emotionally expressive	0.01	0.06	.95	–0.08	0.08	.35
ICS Emotion restraint	0.02	0.06	.65	0.05	0.08	.56
CWD Education/Advocacy	0.11	0.04	.02	0.11	0.06	.08
CWD Resistance	–0.09	0.06	.14	–0.26	0.19	.003
Step 4						
Participant gender	0.21	0.05	< .001	0.37	0.07	< .001
Participant race	0.17	0.05	.001	0.14	0.07	.06
Discrimination experience	–0.14	0.04	< .001	–0.18	0.05	.001
Confrontation frequency	0.13	0.03	.001	0.16	0.05	.001
ICS Direct	0.19	0.06	.001	0.18	0.08	.03
ICS Indirect	–0.13	0.06	.048	–0.23	0.09	.01
ICS Emotionally expressive	0.01	0.06	.91	–0.10	0.08	.22
ICS Emotion restraint	0.14	0.06	.79	0.04	0.08	.65
CWD Education/Advocacy	0.04	0.06	.45	–0.02	0.08	.75
CWD Resistance	–0.06	0.06	.33	–0.22	0.09	.01
<i>PCS Help-seeking</i>	0.16	0.07	.01	0.34	0.09	< .001
<i>PCS Argumentative</i>	–0.13	0.08	.10	–0.01	0.11	.93
<i>PCS Educational</i>	–0.01	0.09	.96	–0.02	0.12	.87
<i>PCS Empathy</i>	0.10	0.08	.21	0.10	0.11	.39
<i>PCS Humor</i>	0.06	0.05	.26	–0.10	0.07	.15

Note. PCS = Prejudice Confrontation Styles; ICS = Intercultural Conflict Styles; CWD = Coping With Discrimination Scale. Unstandardized coefficients reported.

Life Satisfaction. An identical four-step hierarchical linear regression with life satisfaction as the outcome was conducted. While Step 1, $R^2\Delta = 0.05$, $p = .001$, Step 2, $R^2\Delta = 0.05$, $p = .001$, and Step 3, $R^2\Delta = 0.07$, $p = .001$, resulted in a significant change, Step 4 also resulted in a significant change, $R^2\Delta = 0.04$, $p = .002$, indicating the PCS Scale accounted for an additional 4% of variance. The full model was significant, $F(15, 383) = 6.50$, $p < .001$ (Table 5). In Step 4, PCS Help-seeking was associated with significantly greater life satisfaction, as was less ICS Indirect, greater ICS Direct, greater CWD resistance, more frequent confrontations, less frequent discrimination experiences, and being a man.⁷

Discussion

Study 2 demonstrated the reliability of the PCS subscales over one week. The PCS Scale accounted for additional variance in assessment of participants' autonomy and life satisfaction beyond the CWD and ICS subscales, demonstrating incremental validity. Supporting our proposal that confronting discrimination serves as a coping strategy, confrontation frequency significantly predicted autonomy and life satisfaction, as did PCS Help-seeking. While confronting prejudice, broadly defined, may serve as a coping strategy, the present results suggest that some prejudice confrontation styles may have negative effects on autonomy and life satisfaction, demonstrating divergent effects of prejudice confrontation styles on well-being. Lastly, many of the PCS Scale items note a "them," (e.g., "I help them be better able to spot discrimination"), but the prompt asked participants about when they witness or experience discrimination. We sought to correct this moving forward by giving participants a specific perpetrator and instance of discrimination.

Study 3

Study 3 examined the construct validity of the PCS Scale by having participants complete the PCS Scale at T1 and confront three acts

of prejudice two weeks later. The focus of the present study was to examine whether the PCS Scale predicted women's prejudice confrontation styles in response to imagined experiences of sexism given the negative effects of sexism on women's cognitive performance (Croizet et al., 2004), sense of belonging (Rubin et al., 2019), and health (Salomon et al., 2015). Unlike Studies 1 and 2 which recruited participants regardless of social identities, Study 3 focused on women confronting sexism. This decision was made in part to simplify the design and provide experiences of discrimination based on participants' social identity (here, as women experiencing sexism). While Studies 1 and 2 indicated no effect of social identities on the PCS Scale, discrimination experiences differentially predict targets' and nontarget observers' autonomy and rumination, for example (Hill & Hoggard, 2018; Sanchez et al., 2016). We also contend that confrontations of targeted versus observed prejudice would similarly differently affect these outcomes.

Additionally, Study 3 examined women's reported autonomy and rumination after these confrontation scenarios to demonstrate the divergent effects of prejudice confrontation styles. Further, we examined anticipated effectiveness of women's responses to sexism at reducing the perpetrator's future acts of discrimination as individuals' lay beliefs about the effectiveness of certain prejudice confrontation styles may influence the frequency with which they confront prejudice, and the prejudice confrontation styles they employ. Past research has suggested that individuals consider the anticipated effectiveness of a confrontation at reducing future bias when deciding whether to confront discrimination (Good et al., 2012), indicating the perceived effectiveness of various prejudice confrontation styles may be important in determining the likelihood that individuals employ such a style.

Participants

In all, 289 US undergraduate women were recruited to complete a two-part study in exchange for partial course credit, though

41 participants did not complete T2. While six additional participants completed T2 outside of the allowed 72-hour window after receiving the T2 survey, these participants are retained in the analysis as five completed T2 two days outside of the window and one completed T2 four days outside of the window.⁸ Thus, the T2 analytic sample was 248 participants ($M_{\text{age}} = 18.52$, $SD = 1.13$, range: 18–26 years), which largely matched the demographics of the T1 sample (46.1% Asian/Asian American, 22.6% White/Caucasian, 12.1% Hispanic/Latina, 7.7% multiracial, 5.2% Middle Eastern/North African, 4.8% Black/African American, 0.4% “other”).

Procedure

Participants who identified as women during a large prescreen survey were recruited for a two-part study that included a 20-minute T1 session in the lab, and a T2 20-minute session to be completed online two weeks after. Participants received partial course credit for completion of the T1 session in the lab, and additional partial course credit for completion of the T2 session online. During T1, participants completed the 22-item PCS Scale, a two-item autonomy measure, and demographic questions. Two weeks later, participants received T2 via email. Participants were asked to imagine themselves in various situations and how they would respond. Three scenarios of sexism, described below, were presented in random order and participants were simply asked, “What would you say or do? Please be specific.” After each scenario, participants completed measures of autonomy, rumination, and perceived effectiveness.

Materials

T1 PCS Scale. The prompt for the PCS Scale was adjusted to “When I witness or experience gender discrimination. . .,” an adjustment from the broader prompt employed in the previous studies to determine how well the PCS Scale would predict women’s confrontation styles when faced with sexism. The subscales of the

PCS Scale were again found to be reliable at T1, α s: .75–.86 ($M_{\text{Empathy}} = 3.01$, $SD = 0.99$; $M_{\text{Educational}} = 3.09$, $SD = 0.97$; $M_{\text{Argumentative}} = 2.41$, $SD = 0.86$; $M_{\text{Humor}} = 2.60$, $SD = 1.04$; $M_{\text{Help-seeking}} = 2.63$, $SD = 0.94$).

T1 Autonomy. As a measure of autonomy, participants responded to the statements “I have a say in what happens and I can voice my own opinion,” and “I feel free to be who I am” on a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree), $r(247) = .60$, $p < .001$ ($M = 3.93$, $SD = 0.95$).

T2 Sexism Scenarios. The sexism scenarios involved a confrontation of a friend, a classmate, and a person in authority. Friend scenario: “Imagine you are hanging out with friends, when one of them tells the below joke. Q: Why did the woman cross the road? A: Who cares? What the hell is she doing out of the kitchen?” (borrowed from Woodzicka et al., 2015). Classmate scenario: “Imagine you are working on a group project for a class and one of your classmates in the group tells you to, ‘Leave the work to the men, I don’t want you bringing down my grade.’” Authority scenario: “Imagine you are meeting with a school appointed academic advisor. When you tell him you are interested in majoring in either chemistry or biology, he says, ‘How about English or Psychology? Female students almost never do well in the hard sciences.’”

Two independent female coders blind to hypotheses coded each participant’s written responses. Coders were given descriptions of the five prejudice confrontation styles, defined by items from the respective PCS subscales and were instructed to code each response into 1–3 prejudice confrontation styles.⁹ We allowed for coding in up to three prejudice confrontation styles based on the significant correlations across subscales (Study 1) and past research that reported prejudice confrontations which transcend the five PCS subscales (e.g., Hyers, 2007). For example, one participant indicated their response to the friend scenario would be, “What the hell are you doing out of the kitchen?” which was coded as both humor and argumentative by two

independent coders. In the case of disagreement, a third independent female coder served as the tie-breaker (15%).

Autonomy. Immediately after entering their response to each scenario, participants were asked "Afterwards, how likely would you. . ." followed by the two items completed during T1 of the present study. The items were positively correlated in each scenario, $r(247) = .75-.83, ps < .001$.

Rumination. Participants were asked "Afterwards, how likely would you. . ." "Keep thinking about what your [friend/classmate/advisor] said," "Be unable to stop thinking about what your [friend/classmate/advisor] said," and "Replay the interaction with your [friend/classmate/advisor] over and over again in your head." Participants responded on a scale from 1 (not at all likely) to 5 (very likely). The scale was reliable across the three scenarios (α s: .88-.92; adapted from Nolen-Hoeksema, 1991).

Effectiveness. Participants were asked "Based on your response, how likely do you think it is. . ." "That your [friend/classmate/advisor] will make a joke [statement] like that again in the future," and "That your [friend/classmate/advisor] will think twice before making a joke [statement] like that in the future" (based on Good et al., 2012). Participants responded on a scale from 1 (not at all likely) to 5 (very likely). These two items were positively correlated in each scenario, $r(247) = .51-.53, ps < .001$.

Results

T2 Scenario Confrontations. All but one participant confronted in at least one of the scenarios. Twenty-four (9.70%) confronted in one scenario, 71 (28.60%) confronted in two of the scenarios, and 152 (61.30%) confronted in all three scenarios. However, in the friend scenario, 41 (16.50%) participant responses were not coded as verbal confrontations, e.g., "I'd laugh it off." In the classmate scenario, 30 (12.10%) participant responses were not coded as verbal

confrontations, e.g., "I would ignore him/her and continue completing my work." In the academic advisor scenario, 40 (16.10%) participant responses were not coded as verbal confrontations, e.g., "I would feel very offended, but I would not act upon my feelings."

Prejudice Confrontation Styles. In all, 116 responses received two styles during coding (46 friend scenario, 41 classmate scenario, 29 advisor scenario) and 11 responses received three styles (two friend scenario, four classmate scenario, five advisor scenario). Thus, across 247 participants who confronted at least once, a total of 771 styles were coded (257 in the friend scenario, 267 in the classmate scenario, 247 in the advisor scenario). The most common prejudice confrontation styles were Argumentative and Educational and the least common styles were Empathy and Humor. The Educational style was used more often in the friend and advisor scenarios than the classmate scenario, and Argumentative was used relatively equally across scenarios. Help-seeking included 22.85% of the prejudice confrontation styles in the classmate scenario and 22.67% of the prejudice confrontation styles in the advisor scenario but was never employed in the friend scenario. In contrast, participants were more likely to employ Empathy and Humor prejudice confrontation styles in the friend scenario compared to the classmate and advisor scenarios (see Table 6).

Predicting T2 Prejudice Confrontation Styles from the T1 PCS Scale. Coded responses were summed across each scenario, such that count scores ranging from 0 (in none of the scenarios) to 3 (in all the scenarios) were created for each prejudice confrontation style for each participant. Five Poisson loglinear regressions with robust estimators (Cameron & Trivedi, 1998) were computed with a PCS subscale predicting the corresponding count score (e.g., PCS Humor mean predicting use of humor in confrontations in three scenarios). Models indicated good fit, as Pearson X^2 s were not significant, the likelihood ratios (LRs) were significant, indicating that the PCS subscale

Table 6. Coded prejudice confrontation style frequency and percentage by scenario, Study 3.

Confrontation style	Friend scenario		Classmate scenario		Advisor scenario		Total	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Educational	77	29.96%	45	16.86%	75	30.04%	197	25.55%
Argumentative	114	44.36%	128	47.94%	104	42.11%	346	44.88%
Help-seeking	0	0.00%	61	22.85%	56	22.67%	117	15.18%
Empathy	31	12.06%	17	6.37%	8	3.24%	56	7.26%
Humor	35	13.26%	16	5.99%	4	1.62%	55	7.13%
Total	257	100.00%	267	100.00%	247	100.00%	771	100.00%

Table 7. Parameter estimates of PCS subscales predicting corresponding confrontations, Study 3.

	<i>B</i> (<i>SE</i>)	Wald	<i>p</i>
PCS Educational → Educational confrontations	0.24 (0.08)	9.79	.002
PCS Argumentative → Argument confrontations	0.12 (0.05)	6.16	.013
PCS Help-seeking → Help-seeking confrontations	0.29 (0.09)	10.20	.001
PCS Empathy → Empathy confrontations	0.36 (0.15)	5.94	.015
PCS Humor → Humor confrontations	0.24 (0.12)	3.88	.049

Note. PCS = Prejudice Confrontation Styles.

independent variable significantly improved the model over an intercept-only model, and the Deviance/*df* values were all near 1 indicating equidispersion and the appropriateness of a Poisson model (Coxe et al., 2009) for all models: Educational, $X^2(246) = 229.73, p = .73, LR(1) = 9.28, p = .002, Deviance/df = 1.06$; Argumentative $X^2(246) = 149.25, p = .99, LR(1) = 4.27, p = .039, Deviance/df = 0.82$; Help-seeking, $X^2(246) = 199.64, p = .99, LR(1) = 9.62, p = .002, Deviance/df = 0.88$; Empathy, $X^2(246) = 270.72, p = .14, LR(1) = 8.46, p = .004, Deviance/df = 0.76$; Humor, $X^2(246) = 253.79, p = .35, LR(1) = 5.10, p = .03, Deviance/df = 0.74$. All prejudice confrontation styles in the scenarios were significantly positively predicted by their corresponding PCS subscales (Table 7).

Post-Confrontation Effectiveness, Rumination, and Autonomy. Rumination and perceived effectiveness after each scenario were averaged. Linear regressions were conducted with participants' five prejudice confrontation style count scores (summed across the scenarios) entered as

predictors, and effectiveness and rumination were entered separately as outcome variables. The effectiveness linear regression equation was significant, $F(5, 242) = 5.95, p < .001, R^2 = 0.114$. Argumentative, Educational, and Empathy prejudice confrontation styles were associated with significantly greater perceived effectiveness. The rumination linear regression equation approached significance, $F(5, 242) = 2.13, p = .06, R^2 = 0.04$. Educational and Help-seeking prejudice confrontation styles were associated with significantly more rumination (see Table 8).

A hierarchical linear regression predicting autonomy (averaged across scenarios) was conducted with participants' T1 autonomy entered in Step 1 and the PCS count scores entered in Step 2. Step 1, $F(1, 246) = 17.05, p < .001, R^2 = 0.07$, and Step 2, $F(6, 241) = 4.51, p < .001, R^2 = 0.10$, were significant. Step 2 model coefficients revealed that T1 autonomy ($B = 0.24, SE = 0.06, p < .001$), Educational and Argumentative were associated with significantly greater autonomy. No other PCS subscales were significant predictors of post-scenario autonomy (see Table 8).

Table 8. Unstandardized regression coefficients and standard errors for prejudice confrontation styles on effectiveness, rumination, and autonomy, Study 3.

	Effectiveness		Rumination		Autonomy	
	<i>B</i> (<i>SE</i>)	<i>p</i>	<i>B</i> (<i>SE</i>)	<i>p</i>	<i>B</i> (<i>SE</i>)	<i>p</i>
Educational	0.31 (0.06)	< .001	0.20 (0.09)	.03	0.14 (0.07)	.04
Argumentative	0.20 (0.06)	.001	0.09 (0.08)	.28	0.16 (0.07)	.02
Help-seeking	0.05 (0.09)	.57	0.27 (0.12)	.02	-0.03 (0.10)	.80
Empathy	0.22 (0.10)	.03	0.07 (0.14)	.60	0.01 (0.12)	.91
Humor	0.02 (0.11)	.87	-0.05 (0.15)	.74	0.18 (0.13)	.15

Note. Results for autonomy are presented for Step 2 of the hierarchical linear regression.

Discussion

All subscales were significantly associated with how participants confronted in imagined scenarios. Argumentative and Educational styles were associated with greater autonomy, though Educational and Help-seeking prejudice confrontation styles were associated with more rumination. Moreover, Educational, Argumentative, and Empathy prejudice confrontation styles were associated with greater perceived effectiveness of the confrontation. Notably, women's prejudice confrontation styles changed across scenarios of sexism. Twelve participants employed four PCS styles across the three scenarios, 67 used three styles, 113 used two styles, and 55 used only one style, supporting the notion that people's PCS differs across scenarios. Given this diverse employment of prejudice confrontation styles, we would expect that styles and outcomes may similarly differ for target confronters of other biases (e.g., Black American confronting anti-Black racism), and encourage future research to explore this intergroup difference in prejudice confrontation styles based on type of discrimination and confronter identity.

Several PCS subscales were significantly, positively correlated (Study 1), and in Study 3 coders could code confrontations into three subscales of prejudice confrontation styles. While some prejudice confrontations can meld two styles into one, other responses indicated women would confront in two different ways.

For example, several participants in the classmate scenario indicated they would confront (Argumentative) and report (Help-seeking) the perpetrator. Thus, the PCS subscales can be utilized to identify nuanced, dynamic forms of prejudice confrontation styles and to capture multi-action confrontations.

General Discussion

Confronting prejudice can reduce future acts of stereotyping by perpetrators (e.g., Chaney & Sanchez, 2018) and has benefits for confronters (e.g., empowerment, autonomy; Gervais et al., 2010; Sanchez et al., 2016). Yet, confronting prejudice can come at a cost (negative evaluations; Dickter et al., 2012), and when costs are perceived to outweigh the benefits, individuals are unlikely to confront (Good et al., 2012). Styles of prejudice confrontation may significantly influence these outcomes. The PCS Scale is an important first step in identifying the range of prejudice confrontation styles, developing a validated measure of prejudice confrontation styles, and demonstrating divergent psychological outcomes of prejudice confrontation styles, thus filling a critical gap in the prejudice confrontation literature.

The present research identified the valid and reliable PCS Scale that includes five confrontation styles (Educational, Argumentative, Help-seeking, Humor, and Empathy), identified through exploratory (Study 1) and confirmatory

(Study 2) factor analyses and demonstrated convergent and incremental validity (Studies 2 and 3).¹⁰ Critically, the PCS Scale predicts the prejudice confrontation styles used by women confronting imagined scenarios of sexism (Study 3).

Emergent Prejudice Confrontation Styles

The PCS Scale identifies five prejudice confrontation styles, including some that have been largely overlooked in the prejudice confrontation literature (help-seeking, empathy) and others which have only been explored limitedly (educational, argumentative, humor). Educational prejudice confrontation styles have been identified in research on psychological health outcomes and were associated with lower life satisfaction over time than angry, argumentative confrontations (Foster, 2013). However, research on coping with stress and discrimination suggests that racial minorities who are highly identified with their racial identity are more prone to educational coping strategies (Miller & Kaiser, 2001; Wei et al., 2010). Moreover, past research has found that argumentative prejudice confrontation styles may result in greater backlash against the confronter (Dickter et al., 2012), but are just as effective at reducing a perpetrator's prejudice as emotionally restrained prejudice confrontation styles (Czopp et al., 2006).

Past research has categorized humor prejudice confrontations as nonconfrontations (Hyers, 2007) or indirect confrontations, and found that they were associated with lower life satisfaction compared to angry confrontations. Research on coping suggests that humor may be an important tool to alleviate stress (Overholser, 1992), though we propose it is likely not an effective tool at reducing prejudice as humor is unlikely to evoke strong negative self-directed affect for a perpetrator. Similarly, research has largely not examined help-seeking or empathy-driven prejudice confrontation styles, though instrumental and emotional social support have been identified as important coping strategies (Cohen & Wills, 1985). Help-seeking prejudice confrontation styles appear to move beyond the typical dyadic

interaction most often employed in the prejudice confrontation literature by taking into account the broader context in which acts of discrimination and confrontation occur, requiring one to consider other actors and an extended timeline (e.g., the time to identify and seek out help). In doing so, the identification of help-seeking as a prejudice confrontation style may motivate future research to consider the dynamic system of interpersonal interactions, including discrimination and confrontation interactions.

Psychological Health Outcomes by PCS

Past research has indicated that prejudice confrontations can serve as a coping strategy, such that confronting prejudice can mitigate rumination (Shelton et al., 2006) and is associated with greater autonomy (Sanchez et al., 2016). Yet, Study 3 findings indicate that while confronting prejudice is associated with less rumination and greater autonomy compared to not confronting, prejudice confrontation styles moderate these effects. Certain prejudice confrontation styles may be associated with *greater* rumination, while other styles may be associated with greater autonomy. Moreover, some prejudice confrontation styles may be associated with both positive and negative psychological health outcomes. While help-seeking prejudice confrontation styles were associated with significantly greater rumination after an imagined confrontation (Study 3), educational prejudice confrontation styles were associated with greater rumination *and* greater autonomy after an imagined confrontation (Study 3). While rumination is primarily associated with negative health outcomes (e.g., Hill & Hoggard, 2018) and autonomy with positive health outcomes, these findings require careful consideration of the potentially nuanced benefits of confronting on one's well-being.

We note, however, that no association was found between autonomy and educational confrontation styles in Study 2. Similarly, help-seeking was associated with greater autonomy and life satisfaction in Study 2, and it was not related to autonomy, but was associated with greater

rumination in Study 3. As Study 2 assessed global autonomy while Study 3 assessed situational autonomy, these findings may not inherently be inconsistent, but these results should be interpreted cautiously until replicated and/or explored further. As individuals with greater autonomy may be more likely to employ different prejudice confrontation styles, we encourage future research to examine the associations between prejudice confrontation styles and autonomy in order to better understand how prejudice confrontation styles may be both a product, and an outcome, of autonomy. As Study 3 was only correlational, it will be important for future experimental research to discern the extent to which rumination and autonomy predict specific confrontation styles, and the extent to which rumination and autonomy are outcomes of employing specific prejudice confrontation styles. Indeed, we believe these findings demonstrate the importance of examining prejudice confrontation styles in detail, accounting for the numerous dimensions that have been identified as important factors in prejudice confrontations (e.g., target vs ally confronter, relationship with perpetrator, type of discrimination).

Lastly, argumentative, empathy, and educational prejudice confrontation styles were expected to be effective at reducing future acts of prejudice by the perpetrator (Study 3). These findings suggest women may endorse lay beliefs about the effectiveness of variant prejudice confrontation styles that may ultimately impact the frequency that they confront prejudice (Good et al., 2012), as well as provide insight into why they choose to confront sexism, if not to reduce future sexist expressions from the perpetrator. However, given the correlational nature of the present findings, it is also possible that lay beliefs about the effectiveness of confrontations predicts which styles individuals choose to use. We encourage future experimental work to examine such lay beliefs and evaluations of confrontations' effectiveness.

An important note, however, is this scale was validated and developed employing samples of American college undergraduates at a public

Northeastern University over five years (2015–2019). It will be an imperative step for the literature to expand research on prejudice confrontations to samples which may not be embedded in relatively egalitarian contexts, and among social groups for whom prejudice contributes to health disparities (e.g., Black Americans).

Uses of the PCS Scale

Research on prejudice confrontation styles will likely be generative and informative. Rates of anticipated confrontation are much higher than rates of actual confrontation (Hyers, 2007; Shelton & Stewart, 2004; Woodzicka & LaFrance, 2001), and we encourage future research to examine whether the PCS Scale predicts prejudice confrontation styles employed in experienced and witnessed discrimination. Given the disparity in imagined versus actual confrontation rates, it will be critical to identify what motivations and contexts predict which prejudice confrontation styles are evoked versus those anticipated. Specifically, future research should examine how backlash concerns (Good et al., 2012) and individuals' relation to the target of discrimination (e.g., self, friend) and the perpetrator of discrimination (Ashburn-Nardo et al., 2014) may evoke different anticipated and actual prejudice confrontation styles.

While research is still needed to identify the predictors of using the identified prejudice confrontation styles, the PCS Scale and identified prejudice confrontation styles will also be integral in better understanding reactions to prejudice confrontations. Research has suggested that hostile, argumentative confrontations result in more negative evaluations of the confronter by the perpetrator (Czopp et al., 2006), yet research has not yet examined perceptions of, for example, empathy-driven prejudice confrontation styles. Additionally, the various identified prejudice confrontation styles should be examined when considering the effectiveness of confrontations at reducing future acts of prejudice from the perpetrator and third-party observers, and cognitive and health outcome for confronters. For example, humorous confrontations are perceived as

less effective at reducing the perpetrator's future prejudiced behavior (Woodzicka et al., 2020) as they likely do not activate negative self-directed affect for the perpetrator, but research outside of the prejudice confrontation literature suggests that using humor is associated with more positive affect and protective cognitive appraisals in the face of stress (Folkman & Moskowitz, 2000; Martin et al., 1993). Yet, the present study found that humor prejudice confrontation styles were not associated with effectiveness, rumination, or autonomy (Study 3), raising an important question about the motivation for employing this prejudice confrontation style.

As such, research employing the PCS Scale and its identified subscales will provide greater understanding of the motives and predictors of prejudice confrontations, the effectiveness of prejudice confrontations at reducing prejudice, evaluations of dominant and stigmatized group members who confront prejudice, and the effect of prejudice confrontations on the health and well-being of confronters and stigmatized group members.

Conclusion

The present research identified and demonstrated the validity and reliability of the PCS Scale across social groups. The scale includes five prejudice confrontation styles: Educational, Argumentative, Help-seeking, Empathy, and Humor, and predicts women's confrontation styles of imagined sexism. The present work has identified and provided a measure of diverse prejudice confrontation styles, which moderate prejudice confrontations' perceived effectiveness at reducing prejudice, the psychological health outcomes for the confronter, and evaluations of the confronter by others. The PCS Scale will serve as an integral tool in advancing the prejudice confrontation literature, allowing for a validated and comprehensive measurement of prejudice confrontation styles.

Funding

The authors received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

ORCID iDs

Kimberly E. Chaney  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6450-9488>

Diana T. Sanchez  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8684-6183>

Supplemental material

Supplemental material for this article is available online.

Notes

1. All measures are reported. All data and materials are available at <https://osf.io/xe5hp/>
2. All 41 items presented in the online supplementary material.
3. See online supplementary materials for more details on the Emotional restraint subscale which was removed. Retaining it did not significantly change reported results.
4. Analyses examining social identity effects on prejudice confrontation styles are presented in the online supplementary materials for all studies.
5. These participants completed T2 18–35 days after T1.
6. Correlations between ICS, CWD, and PCS subscales are presented in Table 3 of the online supplementary material.
7. A fifth step with PCS subscale \times discrimination experience interaction terms does not significantly improve the model for autonomy, $R^2\Delta = 0.01$, $p = .43$, nor for life satisfaction, $R^2\Delta = 0.01$, $p = .80$. Similarly, a fifth step with PCS subscale \times confrontation frequency interaction terms does not significantly improve the model for autonomy, $R^2\Delta = 0.01$, $p = .65$, nor for life satisfaction, $R^2\Delta = 0.01$, $p = .73$. See online supplementary Table 6 for regression analyses reported without confrontation frequency and discrimination experiences.
8. Reported results do not significantly change when excluding these participants.
9. Sample confrontations by styles are shown in the online supplementary material.
10. See Study 4 in the online supplementary material for further examination of PCS Scale validity.

References

- Alt, N. P., Chaney, K. E., & Shih, M. (2019). "But that was meant to be a compliment!": Evaluative costs of confronting positive racial stereotypes. *Group*

- Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 22(5), 655–672. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430218756493>
- Ashburn-Nardo, L., Blanchard, J. C., Petersson, J., Morris, K. A., & Goodwin, S. A. (2014). Do you say something when it's your boss? The role of perpetrator power in prejudice confrontation. *Journal of Social Issues*, 70, 615–636. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/josi.12082>
- Becker, J. C., & Barreto, M. (2014). Ways to go: Men's and women's support for aggressive and nonaggressive confrontation of sexism as a function of gender identification. *Journal of Social Issues*, 70, 668–686. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12085>
- Blanchard, F. A., Crandall, C. S., Brigham, J. C., & Vaughn, L. A. (1994). Condemning and condoning racism: A social context approach to interracial settings. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79(6), 993–997. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.79.6.993>
- Brown, T. A. (2006). *Confirmatory factor analysis for applied research*. Guilford Press.
- Cameron, A. C., & Trivedi, P. K. (1998). *Regression analysis of count data*. Cambridge University Press.
- Carver, C. S., Scheier, M. F., & Weintraub, J. K. (1989). Assessing coping strategies: A theoretically based approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 56(2), 267–283. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.56.2.267>
- Chaney, K. E., & Sanchez, D. T. (2018). The endurance of interpersonal confrontations as a prejudice reduction strategy. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 44(3), 418–429. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167217741344>
- Chaney, K. E., Sanchez, D. T., Alt, N. P., & Shih, M. (in press). The breadth of interpersonal confrontations as a prejudice reduction strategy. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550620919318>
- Chaney, K. E., Young, D. M., & Sanchez, D. T. (2015). Confrontation's Health Outcomes and Promotion of Egalitarianism (C-HOPE) framework. *Translational Issues in Psychological Science*, 1(4), 363–371. <https://doi.org/10.1037/tps0000042>
- Citron, A. F., Chein, I., & Harding, J. (1950). Antiminority remarks: A problem for action research. *Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology*, 45, 99–126. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0061855>
- Cohen, S., & Wills, T. A. (1985). Stress, social support, and the buffering hypothesis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 98(2), 310–357. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.98.2.310>
- Coxe, S., West, S. G., & Aiken, L. S. (2009). The analysis of count data: A gentle introduction to Poisson regression and its alternatives. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 91(2), 121–136. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223890802634175>
- Croizet, J. C., Després, G., Gauzins, M. E., Huguet, P., Leyens, J. P., & Méot, A. (2004). Stereotype threat undermines intellectual performance by triggering a disruptive mental load. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 30(6), 721–731. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167204263961>
- Czopp, A. M. (2011). *The sexist sound of silence: Interpersonal consequences of failing to confront bias*. Poster presented at the 2011 Annual Conference of the Society for Personality and Social Psychology, San Antonio, TX.
- Czopp, A. M., & Monteith, M. J. (2003). Confronting prejudice (literally): Reactions to confrontations of racial and gender bias. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 29, 532–544. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0146167202250923>
- Czopp, A. M., Monteith, M. J., & Mark, A. Y. (2006). Standing up for a change: Reducing bias through interpersonal confrontation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 90, 784–803. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.90.5.784>
- 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, 112–119. <http://dx.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, 262–275. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jasp.12022>
- Folkman, S., & Moskowitz, J. T. (2000). Positive affect and the other side of coping. *American Psychologist*, 55(6), 647–654. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.6.647>
- Foster, M. D. (2013). Everyday confrontation of discrimination: The well-being costs and benefits to women over time. *International Journal of Psychological Studies*, 5, 135–154. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ijps.v5n3p135>
- Foster, M. D. (2015). Tweeting about sexism: The well-being benefits of a social media collective action. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 5, 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjso.12101>
- Gervais, S. J., Hillard, A. L., & Vescio, T. K. (2010). Confronting sexism: The role of relationship ori-

- entation and gender. *Sex Roles*, 63(7–8), 463–474. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11199-010-9838-7>
- 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, 210–226. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0361684312440958>
- Hammer, M. R. (2005). The intercultural conflict style inventory: A conceptual framework and measure of intercultural conflict resolution approaches. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 29(6), 675–695. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2005.08.010>
- Haslett, B. B., & Lipman, S. (1997). Micro inequalities: Up close and personal. In N.V. Benokraitis (Ed.), *Subtle sexism: Current practice and prospects for change* (pp. 34–53). Sage.
- Hill, L. K., & Hoggard, L. S. (2018). Active coping moderates associations among race-related stress, rumination, and depressive symptoms in emerging adult African American women. *Development and Psychopathology*, 30(5), 1817–1835.
- Hu, L. T., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 6, 1–55. [10.1080/10705519909540118](https://doi.org/10.1080/10705519909540118)
- Hyers, L. L. (2007). Resisting prejudice every day: Exploring women's assertive responses to anti-Black racism, anti-Semitism, heterosexism, and sexism. *Sex Roles*, 56(1–2), 1–12. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11199-006-9142-8>
- Kaiser, C. R., & Miller, C. T. (2004). A stress and coping perspective on confronting sexism. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 28, 168–178. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.2004.00133.x>
- Mallett, R. K., & Melchiori, K. J. (2014). Goal preference shapes confrontations of sexism. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin*, 40(5), 646–656. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0146167214521468>
- Martin, R. A., Kuiper, N. A., Olinger, L. J., & Dance, K. A. (1993). Humor, coping with stress, self-concept, and psychological well-being. *HUMOR*, 6(1), 89–104. <https://doi.org/10.1515/humr.1993.6.1.89>
- Miller, C. T., & Kaiser, C. R. (2001). A theoretical perspective on coping with stigma. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57(1), 73–92. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.00202>
- Muthen, L. K., & Muthen, B. O. (1998). *Mplus user's guide*. Muthen & Muthen.
- Nolen-Hoeksema, S. (1991). Responses to depression and their effects on the duration of depressive episodes. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 100(4), 569–582. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-843X.100.4.569>
- Overholser, J. C. (1992). Sense of humor when coping with life stress. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 13(7), 799–804. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869\(92\)90053-R](https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869(92)90053-R)
- Plous, S. (2000). Responding to overt displays of prejudice: A role-playing exercise. *Teaching of Psychology*, 27, 198–200. http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/S15328023TOP2703_07
- 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, 8–16. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01973530903539754>
- Richards, J. M., & Gross, J. J. (2000). Emotion regulation and memory: The cognitive costs of keeping one's cool. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79, 410–424. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.79.3.410>
- Roger, D., & Najarian, B. (1998). The relationship between emotional rumination and cortisol secretion under stress. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 24, 531–538. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869\(97\)00204-3](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869(97)00204-3)
- Rubin, M., Paolini, S., Subašić, E., & Giacomini, A. (2019). A confirmatory study of the relations between workplace sexism, sense of belonging, mental health, and job satisfaction among women in male-dominated industries. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 49(5), 267–282. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jasp.12577>
- Salomon, K., Burgess, K. D., & Bosson, J. K. (2015). Flash fire and slow burn: Women's cardiovascular reactivity and recovery following hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 144(2), 469–479. <https://doi.org/10.1037/xge0000061>
- Sanchez, D. T., Himmelstein, M. S., Young, D. M., Albuja, A. F., & Garcia, J. A. (2016). Confronting as autonomy promotion: Speaking up against discrimination and psychological well-being in racial minorities. *Journal of Health Psychology*, 21(9), 1999–2007. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1359105315569619>
- Shelton, J. N., Richeson, J. A., Salvatore, J., & Hill, D. M. (2006). Silence is not golden: The intrapersonal consequences of not confronting prejudice. In S. Levin & C. Van Laar (Eds.), *Stigma and group*

- inequality: Social psychological perspectives* (pp. 65–81). Erlbaum.
- Shelton, J. N., & Stewart, R. E. (2004). Confronting perpetrators of prejudice: The inhibitory effects of social costs. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 28, 215–223. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.2004.00138.x>
- Swim, J. K., & Hyers, L. L. (1999). Excuse me – What did you just say?! Women’s public and private responses to sexist remarks. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 35, 68–88. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/jesp.1998.1370>
- Swim, J. K., & Thomas, M. A. (2006). Responding to everyday discrimination: A synthesis of research on goal-directed, self-regulatory coping behaviors. In S. Levin & C. Van Laar (Eds.), *Stigma and group inequality: Social psychological perspectives* (pp. 119–140). Erlbaum.
- Thomsen, D. K. (2006). The association between rumination and negative affect: A review. *Cognition and Emotion*, 20, 1216–1235. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02699930500473533>
- Thurstone, L. L. (1947). *Multiple-factor analysis*. The University of Chicago Press.
- Van Praag, B. M., Frijters, P., & Ferrer-i-Carbonell, A. (2003). The anatomy of subjective well-being. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 51(1), 29–49. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-2681\(02\)00140-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-2681(02)00140-3)
- Wei, M., Alvarez, A. N., Ku, T.-Y., Russell, D. W., & Bonett, D. G. (2010). Development and validation of a Coping with Discrimination Scale: Factor structure, reliability, and validity. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 57(3), 328–344. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0019969>
- Woodzicka, J. A., & LaFrance, M. (2001). Real versus imagined gender harassment. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57(1), 15–30. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.00199>
- Woodzicka, J. A., Mallett, R. K., Hendricks, S., & Pruitt, A. V. (2015). It’s just a (sexist) joke: Comparing reactions to sexist versus racist communications. *Humor*, 28(2), 289–309. <https://doi.org/10.1515/humor-2015-0025>
- Woodzicka, J. A., Mallett, R. K., & Melchipro, K. J. (2020). Gender differences in using humor to respond to sexist jokes. *Humor*. <https://doi.org/10.1515/humor-2019-0018>.