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Children's environments are becoming increasingly ethnically diverse due to school bussing, social integration, and population shifts in urban areas (Educational Research Service, 1995; Gardner, 1996a; Simon, 1995). In the next century, ethnic minority persons in major urban centers will equal or outnumber their European American counterparts (Gardner, 1996a, 1996b). Also, the diversity of ethnic groups within ethnic minority communities will likely increase. Thus, one will probably find increasing numbers of ethnic minorities in European American communities as well as increased ethnic diversity among people of color in ethnic minority communities.

Increased Opportunities for Discrimination

In these increasingly diverse multiethnic settings (i.e., neighborhoods, the workplace, schools, etc.), racial and ethnic minorities are often targets of discrimination in many ways (Erkut, 1990; Feagin, 1991; Feagin & Sikes, 1994; Wakefield, 1998b; Wakefield & Hudley, 1997; Zubrinsky & Bobo, 1995). Racial discrimination is defined as “the active or behavioral expression of racism, and is aimed at denying members of certain racial groups equal access to scarce and valued resources” (Cashmore, 1996). This definition can easily be applied to discrimination of the basis of ethnicity as well.

Shopping areas and restaurants. One facet of ethnic minority individuals' lives where they often confront discrimination as a result of increasing diversity is in shopping areas they frequent (Grayson, 1995; Wakefield, 1998). In fact, Grayson (1995) and Wakefield (1998) found that ethnic minority individuals perceived discrimination to be most pervasive in stores, shopping malls, and businesses they visit. A national television magazine recently depicted how
African American shoppers are followed around by store security guards and treated like potential thieves more often than European American shoppers (Dateline, 1998). Wakefield (1998) found that nearly 95% of the African American and Latina/o students had been either followed around or accused of shoplifting by security guards or store employees while shopping at stores. Being followed around by security guards is one common form of discriminatory treatment; however, discriminatory treatment also commonly manifests itself in other ways. Black college students were turned away from an International House of Pancakes restaurant by employees who stated that the restaurant was closed, and then proceeded to allow a group of White students to enter. Furthermore, on many occasions, Denny’s restaurants have required Black patrons to pre-pay for their orders and have subjected them to extraordinary long waits not imposed on White customers (Los Angeles Times, 1993a, 1993b). In each of these situations, this discrimination was likely a result of non-ethnic minority members imposing negative stereotypes on ethnic minority customers.

School settings. Another venue where ethnic and racial discrimination often manifests itself is within schools. Most educators and researchers in multiethnic middle schools and senior high schools are familiar with the derogatory racial remarks often exchanged between students of different ethnic and racial groups during the lunch hour, at school sporting events, sometimes in the classroom. Recently, European American students from one high school yelled a racial epithets at a African American students from another high school while at a basketball game at the school gymnasium (Sports Illustrated, 1998). At yet another high school, the yearbook contained derogatory language regarding African Americans was found in the school’s yearbook (Facts on File, 1995). Moreover, these incidents are often serious situations where ethnic
minority individuals' safety is threatened. At a multiethnic Southern California high school, an African American student found a drawing on her desk depicting a Black individual being lynched (Santa Barbara News-Press, 1997a, 1997b).

**Aversive Effects Resulting from Responses to Discrimination**

Opportunities for discrimination between members of different ethnic and racial groups will likely increase. Many psychological and physical outcomes appear to hinge on the psychological effects of racial discrimination and how individuals cope with discrimination (Krieger, 1990; Phinney & Chavira, 1995). Some research suggests that one's response to discrimination has a direct impact on one's physical health condition. Krieger (1990) found that African Americans who responded to discrimination by “holding in their frustration” and “keeping quiet” were over four times more likely to suffer from hypertension than individuals who took action against the discriminatory treatment.

When ethnic minority children are confronted with racial discrimination, their responses may lead to different outcomes. For example, a student who is racially discriminated against by his teacher and responds by calling his teacher “a racist” in class is likely to experience a different reality from if s/he were to report the incident to the school principal. Similarly, a child who is racially discriminated against by a local convenience store clerk by ignoring the discrimination will experience a different reality from if s/he were to report the incident to his/her parents. Phinney & Chavira (1995) found that experiences of discrimination often lead individuals to low levels of self-esteem. However, adolescents who tend to use proactive coping styles tend to have high levels of self-esteem (Phinney & Chavira, 1995). Adolescents who use aggressive coping styles tend to have low levels of self-esteem (Phinney & Chavira, 1995).
Responding to Racial Discrimination

People’s responses to discrimination have implications on their psychological and physical well-being. A variety of typologies that define responses to acts of discrimination have been developed (Feagin, 1991; Feagin & Sikes, 1994; Parrillo, 1985; Phinney & Chavira, 1995). These typologies provide researchers ways to separate and categorize people’s behavior in responding to racial discrimination.

Phinney & Chavira (1995) found that ethnic minority adolescents tended to use active, passive, or aggressive coping strategies when confronted with racial discrimination. An active response is one in which the adolescent challenges the act of discrimination in a non-hostile manner, while an aggressive response is one in which the adolescent responds in a hostile or aggressive manner and may physically threaten the perpetrator of the discrimination. A passive response is characterized by the adolescent ignoring the act of discrimination.

Wakefield (1997) used Feagin’s (1991) typology to measure African American male adolescents’ responses to racial discrimination. He discovered that withdrawal and resigned acceptance response were inter-correlated (r = .79) and so were collapsed into a single passive response type category. This finding concurred with Phinney & Chavira’s (1995) findings that ethnic minority adolescents tend to use active, passive, or aggressive coping strategies when confronted with discrimination. One limitation, however, of Phinney & Chavira’s (1995) typology is that it may not adequately represent minor subtypes of the response types due to the broadness of the categories. For example, a child who ignores a discriminatory act but continues his/her interaction with the perpetrator may be a qualitatively different response from a child who physically removes himself from the situation.
Factors Influencing Responses to Discrimination

The physical and mental well-being of our young people is of utmost importance and often plays a crucial role in healthy development. One way to better understand the psychological development of ethnic minority children and how multiethnic integrated settings influence their development is to understand how children respond to situations of racial discrimination. It is likely that situational factors, causal attributions, and ethnic identity influence people's responses to discrimination.

Presence of others. Situational variables may influence how children deal with racial discrimination. One type of situational influence well documented in the social psychology and sociology literature is the presence of others on behavior (Goffman, 1954; Fiske & Taylor, 1991; Shoda, Mischel, & Wright, 1993; Zajonc, 1968). Researchers have found that the mere presence of someone often influences behavior. Furthermore, the sex of the person present also influences behavior (Mori, Chaiken, & Pliner, 1987; Pliner & Chaiken, 1990). The influence of peers may also be a powerful determinant of behavior since during adolescence, peer acceptance is often of paramount importance (Asher, Parker, & Walker, 1998; Swanson, Spencer, & Petersen, 1998).

Self presentation is defined as the use of behavior to communicate information about oneself to others. It is aimed at establishing, maintaining, or refining an image of the individual in the minds of others (Goffman, 1959; Jones & Wortman, 1973; Schlenker, 1980). The general premise of self presentation and impression management theories is that people attempt to present themselves as favorably as they can. Baumeister (1982) discusses that there are two main reasons for engaging in self presentation: pleasing the audience, and constructing one's general public self.
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Goffman (1954), Jones & Wortman (1973), Juvonen & Murdock (1995) and Schlenker (1980) found that most people want to have others to think highly of them--a need that inevitably influences behavior when others are present. Juvonen & Murdock (1995) found that often middle school students want peers to think that they do not study hard. This finding illustrates that middle school students are likely influenced by how they are evaluated by their peers because high academic achievement is often not respected among peer groups. Juvonen (1996) found that adolescents are invested in issues of self presentation to facilitate peer approval and acceptance.

One factor that may influence self presentational strategies is the type of relationship between an individual and the person present. Individuals who are in the presence of a romantic or cross-sex partner may use different self presentational strategies present from an individual with a non-romantic partner or same-sex partner. Dolgin & Minowa (1997) and Leary, Nezlek, Downs, Radford-Davenport, et al. (1994) found that adolescents' self presentational motives were lower in same-sex interactions than that of cross-sex interactions. Male adolescents were more concerned with how they were perceived by females than males; similarly, females were more concerned with how they were perceived by males than females. Mori, Chaiken, & Pliner (1987), and Pliner & Chaiken (1990) found that males and females eating behavior was dependent on the sex of the person eating with them. Males and females ate less when in the company of a member of the opposite sex. These studies supports the notion that individuals may behave differently when in the presence of males and females as a function of self presentation.
Similarly, one might expect that adolescents confronted with discrimination respond differently based on whether someone is with them at the time. This may be particularly true of adolescents since they are highly invested in being accepted in peer groups (Asher, Parker, & Walker, 1998; Juvonen, 1996; Swanson, Spencer, & Petersen, 1998). For example, a high school student accompanied by a date might respond differently to racial discrimination than if s/he were alone during the act of discrimination.

**Ethnic identity development.** Characteristics within an individual often affect behavior as well. One such variable is an individual’s level of identity formation. During adolescence children are beginning to confront issues of identity formation (Erikson, 1968). For ethnic minority children, one facet of their identity development is confronting the meaning and significance of their ethnic group membership (Phinney, 1989, 1990, 1992). Children likely develop their ethnic identity through socialization by their parents, and through children’s individual exploration of their ethnic heritage and experiences of members of their ethnic group (i.e., relatives experiences with racial injustice, learning about the Civil Rights’ Movement) (Phinney & Chavira, 1995; Wakefield, 1997). The ethnic identity formation literature suggests a developmental model in which individuals progress through three stages: (a) individuals who have not yet thought about the meaning and significance of their ethnic group membership, (b) individuals who are in the process of exploring the meaning and significance of their ethnic group membership, and (c) individuals who have successfully grappled with the meaning and significance of their ethnic group membership and have a firm sense of what meaning it holds for them (Phinney, 1992).
In general, an achieved identity across multiple facets (i.e., religious identity, occupational identity, gender identity, etc.) of an individual is associated with a host of positive psychological outcomes. Achieved identity adolescents tend to have high levels of self-assurance, self-certainty, and a sense of mastery (Adams, Gullotta, & Montemayor, 1992; Marcia, Waterman, Matteson, Archer, & Orlofsky, 1994). For ethnic minority individuals, ethnic identity also appears to have direct implications for the mental health and psychological adjustment of ethnic minority adolescents. Adolescents who have fully examined their ethnic identity are often less defensive and more confident about the role of their ethnic group membership in their lives (Phinney, 1989; Phinney & Rosenthal, 1992). Achieved ethnic identity status individuals are more likely to have positive inter-group relations with members from different ethnic groups (Phinney & Kohatsu, 1997) and more positive in-group & out-group attitudes (Phinney, Ferguson, & Tate, 1997). They also are more likely to have a positive self-concept and the absence of psychological distress (Helms, 1990; Phinney, 1990). Furthermore, achieved ethnic identity status individuals have consistently been found to have high levels of self-esteem (Phinney, DuPont, Espinosa, Revill, Sanders, 1994). In contrast, unexamined ethnic identity status individuals tend to have low self-esteem, poor self-image, low self-concept scores, and negative in-group & out-group attitudes (Phinney & Kohatsu, 1997).

Some research has also found patterns in how ethnic minority adolescents deal with discrimination. Achieved ethnic identity status individuals are less likely to respond passively in situations of racial discrimination; also, findings appears to suggest that they are more likely to actively confront discrimination (Phinney & Chavira, 1995; Wakefield, 1997; Wakefield, 1998; Wakefield & Hudley, 1997).
An individual with an unexamined ethnic identity is likely to internalize the values and attitudes of the dominant culture regardless of whether s/he has “explored” his/her own ethnic group. Such an individual may also have little understanding of issues related to his/her ethnicity (Phinney & Chavira, 1995; Wakefield, 1997). In contrast, individuals in ethnic identity search are often immersed within their ethnic group’s cultural practices and most importantly are exploring the meaning of their ethnic group membership in relation to the dominant culture. Marcia’s (1980) model refers to this as moratorium. Individuals with an achieved ethnic identity, however, have a clear idea of the meaning of their ethnic group membership and the role it plays in their lives.

Responses to racial and ethnic discrimination are likely moderated by an individual’s ethnic identity level. In fact, Wakefield (1997) and Wakefield & Hudley (1997) found that African American males who had not yet thought about the meaning and significance of their ethnic group membership were less likely to endorse passive responses to acts of racial discrimination. Conversely, it also appears that individuals who have processed the meaning and significance of their ethnic group membership are more likely to endorse active responses challenging acts of racial discrimination (Wakefield, 1997; Wakefield & Hudley, 1997). However, limited research has been conducted in this area. As a result it is not clear what other factors may mediate or moderate individuals’ responses to discrimination.

The Present Study

In sum, people of color frequently are targets of discrimination. An overwhelming percentage of ethnic minority adolescents (98%) (Wakefield, 1997) express that they or their friends are likely to experience or have already experienced racial discrimination (Gary, 1995;
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Feagin & Sikes, 1994; Landrine & Klonoff, 1996; Mena, Padilla & Maldonado, 1987; Pincus, 1996; Wakefield & Hudley, 1997; Wolfe & Spencer, 1996). Furthermore, African Americans tend to experience the highest rates of racial discrimination across ethnic groups (Mont-Reynaud, 1990; Phinney & Chavira, 1995). Understanding the behaviors of targets of discrimination will be beneficial in helping young people deal with discriminatory treatment. This is especially important since developmental psychologists have not yet clearly specified the precise mechanism involved in coping strategies and responses to discrimination used by ethnic minority adolescents.

The objective of the present study is to investigate ethnic minority adolescents’ responses to acts of racial discrimination as a function of ethnic identity status, audience presence, and attributions of personal control.

Ethnic identity. During adolescence, individuals are grappling with the significance and meaning of ethnic group membership in their lives. Previous research suggests that unexamined ethnic identity status individuals are more likely to endorse passive responses when confronted with racial discrimination than exploration or achieved status individuals. Achieved ethnic identity individuals are more likely to endorse active responses than exploration or unexamined status individuals (Phinney & Chavira, 1995; Wakefield, 1997; Wakefield & Hudley, 1997). Therefore, this study will confirm these findings by hypothesizing that individuals with an unexamined ethnic identity--those who have not yet explored the meaning and significance of their ethnic group membership--will be more likely to endorse passive responses to acts of discrimination than individuals engaged in ethnic identity exploration or individuals who have an unexamined ethnic identity. Individuals with an achieved ethnic identity--those who have
adequately explored the meaning and significance of their ethnic group membership--will be more likely endorse active responses to acts of discrimination than individuals engaged in ethnic identity exploration or individuals who have an unexamined ethnic identity.

Audience presence. It is clear that the presence of others often influences behavior or performance on a task (Goffman, 1959; Zajonc, 1968). Much research has clearly found that individuals are often ultra-conscious of their behavior in the presence of others due to issues of self-presentation. As a result, it is likely that adolescents accompanied by someone during an act of racial discrimination will respond differently than if he is alone. This study hypothesizes that individuals who are unaccompanied during an act of discrimination will respond differently from individuals who are accompanied by someone (either a same-sex friend or a cross-sex friend).

Social psychology literature also suggests that individuals’ behavior differs as a function of the gender of the person they are with. For example, men and women’s eating behavior is often affected by the gender of an accompanying person (Mori, Chaiken, & Pliner, 1987; Pliner & Chaiken, 1990) which is a likely a result of self-presentational motives operating in cross-sex interactions (Dolgin & Minowa, 1997; Leary, Nezlek, Downs, Radford-Davenport, et al., 1994). Therefore, this study also hypothesizes that adolescents who are with a cross-sex friend (romantic friend) will respond to racial discrimination differently from adolescents with a non-romantic friend (best friend). No specific directional hypotheses are presented, as this study is the first exploration of audience effects in individuals’ responses to racial discrimination.
METHOD

Participants & Setting

Relatively little research has investigated people's responses to racial discrimination (Feagin, 1991; Parrillo, 1985; Phinney & Chavira, 1995; Wakefield, 1997). Behavioral responses often differ as a function of gender (Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974; Mendoza, 1981; Patterson & McCubbin, 1987; Schonert-Reichl & Muller, 1996). Researchers have consistently found that male and female adolescents use different coping strategies (Broderick, 1998; Copeland & Hess, 1995; Frydenberg & Lewis, 1993; Mendoza, 1981; Patterson & McCubbin, 1987; Schonert-Reichl & Muller, 1996). As a result, one might expect that adolescents' responses to discrimination differ as a function of gender. Since research in this area is relatively limited, and exploratory in nature, these introductory studies will examine responses to racial discrimination separately by gender. The present study will focus entirely on male responses to racial discrimination.

Two hundred male African American students (N = 200) in ninth through twelfth grades enrolled in an urban multiethnic high school in Southern California were recruited to participate in this study. All participants were fluent in English.

The student body of the school is composed of 47% African American students, 53% Latina/o students, and the remaining 0.5% spread evenly across American Indian, Asian American, Pacific Islander and White ethnic groups; 74% of the student body receives free or reduced priced meals (California Department of Education, 1997).
Instruments

**Discrimination Response Index II (DRI-II).** The Discrimination Response Index (Wakefield, 1997) was revised and designed for this study to measure three response types to acts of discrimination (passive, active, and hostile) in one particular situation (at a shopping mall) with three audience conditions (when the target is alone, with his best friend, and with a romantic friend). The instrument consists of three hypothetical scenarios of acts of racial discrimination against African Americans who are shopping at stores inside a shopping mall. The scenarios illustrate African American young men as targets of discrimination while shopping at a store in a mall. In each story, a security guard accuses a young African American male of stealing something. The scenarios are accompanied by 5 x 7 color photographs of African American and European American males illustrating the actors in each of the stories. These photographs were shown to participants as they read the stories. Targets of discrimination were always portrayed by male African American adolescents; perpetrators of discrimination were always portrayed by male European Americans. Scenarios vary by who is accompanying the target of discrimination. The target is either (a) alone, (b) with his best friend, or (c) with a romantic friend. These audience conditions were equally interchanged between the three scenarios in order to avoid a scenario effect. The participants rate “how likely” they would react with each of the three response types (passive, active, and hostile) in each of the three scenarios on a scale of 1-8. One represents a highly unlikely behavioral response while 8 represents a highly likely behavioral response.

Two types of scores were derived from this instrument: (a) overall response type scores (each response type summed across scenarios), and (b) passive, active, and hostile scores for each
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scenario. Each participant will receive twelve scores. The overall response type scores (three scores) will represent each response type summed across all three scenarios (one for passive responses, one for active responses, one for hostile responses). The remaining nine scores will represent the individual item responses (response type x audience present).

Overall response type scores represent an individual’s likelihood to engage in Phinney & Chavira's (1995), Wakefield’s (1997) and Wakefield & Hudley’s (1997) responses to racial discrimination (passive, active, and hostile) across multiple situations. These scores determine an individual’s preferred response to discrimination.

Individual item scores rate specific response types as a function of who is present in the scenario (whether he is alone, with his best friend, or with a romantic friend). These scores allow one to investigate whether the likelihood of response varies as a function of the audience present.

Pilot testing of this instrument with African American, Latina/o, and Asian American high school and college students revealed that the hypothetical scenarios had high ecological validity as realistic situations of racial discrimination. Wakefield, Hudley, & Delgadillo (1999) found that African American and Latina/o high school and university students described each scenario as an act of racial discrimination. Ninety-one percent of the participating students also reported that this situation, or situations similar to these have occurred to them personally; 97% of the students reported that this situation, or situations similar to these have occurred to someone they personally know; and 99% of the students reported that they have heard of this situation, or situations similar to these happening to someone.

Ethnic identity status. Ethnic identity status was assessed using the 7-item ethnic identity achievement subscale of the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM) Phinney (1992). The
MEIM is a questionnaire which assesses an individual’s ethnic identity status by measuring his/her degree of agreement on questions concerning his/her ethnic group membership (Phinney, 1992). Items were rated on a four-point scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Ethnic identity status is based upon an individual’s exploration and commitment to one’s ethnic group (e.g., “I have spent time trying to find out more about my own ethnic group, such as its history, traditions, and customs” and “I have a clear sense of my own ethnic group and what it means to me”). Ratings were summed and divided by 7 to obtain a mean ethnic identity score. Scores range from 1 to 4. Low scores indicate that the individual has an unexamined ethnic identity (the individual has not yet contemplated the relevance of his/her ethnic group membership in life), while high scores indicate an achieved ethnic identity status identity (the individual has considered and is comfortable with the meaning of his/her ethnic group membership in life). Scores in the middle range tend to signify individuals who are in ethnic identity search (the individual is currently exploring the meaning of his ethnic group membership to his identity). Previous studies have demonstrated high reliability coefficients (Cronbach, 1951; Nunnally, 1978) for multiethnic samples of high school students $\alpha = .69$ (Phinney, 1992), $\alpha = .81$ (Phinney, Ferguson, & Tate, 1997), African American high school students $\alpha = .80$ (Phinney, Ferguson, & Tate, 1997), $\alpha = .77$ (Wakefield, 1997; Wakefield & Hudley, 1997), and multiethnic sample of university students $\alpha = .80$ (Phinney, 1992).

Procedure

In order to recruit participants, a general announcement was made via the school public address system describing the research project. In addition, under the advisement and supervision of school site staff, the researcher recruited students from their non-academic classes
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Groups of 5-7 students for whom consent was received were seen during two 20-minute sessions apart from their regular classroom. Students completed the Discrimination Response Index II (DRI-II) and the Multiethnic Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM) (Phinney, 1992). The Discrimination Response Index II was given at one session; the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (Phinney, 1992) was given at the other sitting. The ordering of the sessions was counterbalanced. Before completing the Discrimination Response Index, students were told, “You will be asked to read stories and answer questions of what you might do in situations that many students have said actually happened to them. There are no right or wrong answers. I am interested in hearing about your opinions and what you would do if you were in each of these situations. Please answer as honestly as you can and think about what you really would do. You don’t have to answer any question that you feel uncomfortable with. If you have any questions at any time, please raise your hand.”

During the administration of the Discrimination Response Index II, three hypothetical scenarios of acts of racial discrimination against African Americans while they are shopping at stores in a shopping mall were read aloud to participants. As the stories were being read, 5 x 7 photographs depicting the actors in each of the stories were shown to the students. The photographs were head-shots of the actors. The photographs were used so that the students can
recognize the race of the actors in the stories so they can identify the situations as racial discrimination. After reading to the stories and seeing the photographs, participants will circle how likely they would endorse passive, active, and hostile responses to each scenario. Participants will also have the opportunity to respond in a free-response format “why they believe each situation occurred.”

Immediately after completing the free response questions on why they believed each situation occurred. The principal investigator read the instructions of the instrument aloud and did a sample question of the measure with the participants.

Participants also completed the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM). Participants read along with the researcher as he read the instructions that are on the top of the measure. The instructions state that people in the United States use many different words to describe their ethnic and cultural background and that people differ on how important their ethnicity is them, how they feel about it, and how much their behavior is affected by it. The participants were told to read each statement on the measure and decide how much they agree with the statements.

After completing the measure(s) at the second sitting the principal investigator debriefed students on the purpose of the research study and answered questions participants had. After the debriefing session, the students returned to class.

RESULTS

The effects of audience and ethnic identity on individuals’ response styles (passive, active, and hostile) were examined using a repeated-measures design. For each behavioral response (passive, active, hostile), a 3 x 3 repeated-measures analysis of variance with ethnic
identity as the between-subjects grouping factors and audience present as the within-subject repeated factor was utilized. The dependent variable for each repeated-measures analysis of variance was the behavioral responses score (passive, active, hostile). A repeated-measures design was appropriate because each participant has each type of behavioral response score (passive, active, and hostile) in 3 audience conditions (alone, with a same-sex friend, with a cross-sex friend).

Ethnic identity status has three levels: unexamined, explored, and achieved. Ethnic identity status was converted into a discrete categorical variable with three levels representing Phinney’s (1992) paradigm of ethnic identity development. Past research suggests that ethnic identity status scores among high school participants across multiple grade levels are often normally distributed (Wakefield, 1997; Wakefield & Hudley, 1997). Our sample of students further substantiate these findings. In order to categorize participants at one of three ethnic identity statuses, we utilized Wakefield’s (1997) protocol for assigning ethnic identity status from Phinney’s (1992) continuous variable. Participants at or below the 25th percentile were coded as having an unexamined ethnic identity status. Participants within the 26th to 75th percentile were coded as being engaged in ethnic identity exploration while participants above the 75th percentile were coded as attaining an achieved ethnic identity.

The repeated-factor of audience presence has three levels: alone, with a same-sex friend, and with a cross-sex friend.

Analyses

In order to test the hypotheses (a) that unexamined ethnic identity status adolescents are more likely to endorse passive responses to acts of discrimination than exploration or
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unexamined status ethnic identity adolescents and (b) that achieved ethnic identity status adolescents are more likely to endorse active responses to acts of discrimination than exploration or unexamined status ethnic identity adolescents, the between-subjects factor of ethnic identity in each of the three repeated-measures analyses of variance (one for active, one for passive, one for hostile) were examined.

In order to test the hypotheses (a) that individuals who are unaccompanied during an act of discrimination will respond differently from individuals who are accompanied by someone (either a same-sex friend or a cross-sex friend) and (b) that adolescents who are with a cross-sex friend (romantic friend) will respond to racial discrimination differently from adolescents with a non-romantic friend (best friend), pairwise comparisons between levels of the repeated-factor (audience) were utilized to find where, if any, differences lie.

**Passive Responses to Racial Discrimination**

For passive responses to racial discrimination, an audience X ethnic identity status interaction occurred \( F[4, 199] = 5.33, p < .001 \). Post-hoc analyses of the means revealed significant differences by ethnic identity status in the cross-sex audience condition and the alone audience condition. In the cross-sex situation (on a date), ethnic identity status has a reverse linear relationship with students' endorsement of a passive response. In the date situation, students who have explored the meaning and significance of their ethnic group membership \( M = 6.02 \) were less likely to endorse a passive response to discrimination compared to their counterparts who were in the process of exploring \( M = 4.17 \) or those who had not yet explored \( M = 3.21 \) the meaning and significance of their ethnic group membership (See Figure 1).
In the alone audience condition, a weaker inverse linear relationship occurred with students’ endorsement of passive responses and ethnic identity status. Again, achieved ethnic identity status individuals ($M = 5.86$) were less likely to endorse passive responses than their exploration status ($M = 4.64$) and unexamined status ($M = 3.96$) counterparts (See Figure 1).

**Hostile Responses to Racial Discrimination.**

A main effect of ethnic identity emerged for hostile responses ($F[2, 199] = 4.78$, $p < .001$). Across all audience conditions, students who had thoroughly explored the meaning and significance of their ethnic group membership (achieved ethnic identity status) were more likely to endorse hostile responses ($M = 4.09$) compared to their counterparts who were in the process of exploring (exploration ethnic identity status) ($M = 3.43$) or those who had not yet explored (unexamined ethnic identity status) ($M = 2.61$) the meaning and significance of their ethnic group membership (See Figure 2).

Due to the number of analyses performed, the Bonferroni Procedure was applied to the statistical tests in order to adjust the overall alpha level (e.g., Kirk, 1995; Pedhazur, 1982; Stevens, 1996).

**DISCUSSION**

Both hypotheses were partially supported. Our first hypothesis confirmed Wakefield & Hus-sex audience condition may be related to one’s perception of discrimination and issues of self-presentation and impression management. Wakefield (1997) found that the extent that adolescents have examined the meaning and significance of their ethnic group membership influences their responses to racial discrimination. For males accompanied by females, the extent they have explored the meaning and significance of their ethnic group membership may have influenced their understanding of the situation which, in turn may affect how much they
will tolerate racially discriminatory treatment. However, regardless of the audience present, adolescents who had explored the meaning and significance of their ethnic group membership were more likely to endorse hostile responses than adolescents who had not explored their ethnic group membership.

**Perceptions of Discrimination and Self-Presentation Strategies**

Baumeister (1982) asserts that one way individuals construct their identity is through others’ impressions. Most of the adolescent development literature supports this idea. One task during adolescence is forming one’s personal identity (Erikson, 1968). One way this process occurs is through adolescents’ membership in different peer groups and cliques. Through this process of joining different cliques and peer groups, individuals are likely confronted with other people’s perceptions of themselves. One facet of ethnic minority adolescents personal identity is their ethnic identity.

One explanation of the influence of ethnic identity on passive responses in the cross-sex audience condition may be related to one’s perception of discrimination and issues of self-presentation and impression management. Wakefield (1997) found that the extent that adolescents have examined the meaning and significance of their ethnic group membership influences their responses to racial discrimination. For males accompanied by females, the extent they have explored the meaning and significance of their ethnic group membership may be influenced their understanding of the situation which, in turn, may influence how likely they will passively accept discrimination. For example, an individual who has not yet explored his ethnic group membership may not perceive the situation as racial discrimination and thus be more likely to try and ignore the situation in order to make a favorable impression on the female he is with.
However, an individual who has explored and thoroughly understands the meaning of his ethnic group membership may perceive the situation clearly as an act of discrimination. One might speculate that this individual may believe that passively responding in this circumstance will result in the female he is with forming a negative impression of him since he is not standing up for himself by challenging the act of discrimination.

Males’ behavior is often influenced by the presence of females (Dolgin & Minowa, 1997). Dolgin & Minowa (1997) found that male adolescents were more concerned with how they were perceived by females than males. Mori, Chaiken, & Pliner (1987), and Pliner & Chaiken (1990) found that males and females eating behavior was dependent on the sex of the person eating with them. Males and females ate less when in the company of a member of the opposite sex. These studies supports the notion that individuals may behave differently when in the presence of males and females as a function of self presentation.

Goffman (1954), Jones & Wortman (1973), Juvonen & Murdock (1995), and Schlenker (1980) argued that people want others to think highly of them and will behave in ways consistent with this notion. As a result, one way that adolescent males can form positive relationships with their female peers is to have female peers think highly of them. This may be particularly true in males accompanied by females because self-presentational strategies may be salient and one might speculate that how male adolescents are perceived by their female peers since adolescence is a time when forming positive relationships with members of the opposite sex is a major task of their social development.
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Tolerance of Threats Toward Ethnic Group

Contrary to findings in previous studies (Wakefield, 1997), we found that adolescents who had thoroughly explored the meaning and significance of their ethnic group membership were more likely to endorse hostile responses to discrimination than their counterparts who had not explored or who were exploring the meaning and significance of their ethnic group membership.

One explanation for this finding may be related to issues of tolerance toward racial threats. Individuals who have thoroughly explored the meaning and significance of their ethnic group membership may be more aware of the exploitation and oppression that members of his ethnic group have faced. They also probably have thought about the implications of being an ethnic minority individual in a dominant culture. As a result, young males who have a firm understanding of the meaning and significance of their ethnic group membership may be less likely to tolerate threats toward their ethnic group compared to young males who are exploring or have not yet explored the meaning of their ethnic group membership.

Methodological Limitations and Future Research

Methodological and ethical issues in accessing these kinds of data are important to consider. Examining how young people deal with racial discrimination is a sensitive area, for good reason, since research carried out inappropriately may have negative impacts on the well-being of our young people.

Hypothetical scenarios of racial discrimination are efficient since they are able to capture a multitude of data across a variety of situations. Furthermore, since occurrences of racial discrimination are often hard to predict, hypothetical scenarios of discrimination are one way to
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simulate acts of racial discrimination. Hypothetical scenarios are also convenient since subjects can participate in the research activities in groups rather than one-at-a-time. Furthermore, hypothetical scenarios allow the researcher to better control extraneous variables since each participant will experience the same act of discrimination with the same variables present.

One limitation of a hypothetical scenario instrument is the difference between a reported belief and the actual behavior in which the individual would engage. An individual’s beliefs of what s/he would do may not be congruent with his/her actual behavior in a given situation. Hartshorne & May (1930) examined cheating behavior in two groups of individuals: those who defined themselves as honest and those who defined themselves as dishonest. Their findings revealed that individuals’ reported honesty and actual behavior when faced with an exam (whether or not they cheat on examinations) were not highly correlated. In this case, hypothetical scenarios may be tapping individuals’ beliefs of what they might do in a given situation rather than what they actually do in a situation. Kohlberg & Candee (1984) and Blasi (1980) found a relatively high correlation between moral beliefs and moral behavior in individuals at high stages of moral reasoning. Since there is little research in this area, regardless of the disparity between Blasi (1980), Hartshorne & May (1930) and Kohlberg & Candee’s (1984) findings, data understanding individuals’ beliefs of responses to discrimination may contribute to a clearer comprehension of the factors influencing individuals’ responses to racial discrimination.

Future studies should address school focused scenarios (e.g., students being discriminated against by teachers or administrators; discrimination by peers at school). Such scenarios may be useful since experiences with teachers, administrators, and peers has consistently shown a dramatic impact on the success of students. School focused scenarios may be useful since they
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may help gain further insight into successful peer and student-adult interactions at school. Future studies should also investigate the role of causal attributions on behavioral responses to discrimination. An individual who makes an believes he has control over being discriminated against ("I was walking around the store acting in a suspicious way") may likely respond differently from an individual who believes he has little or no control over being discriminated against ("That security guard stopped me because he thinks black folks steal.").

Investigating these factors will help educators, researchers, and practitioners better understand the experiences of ethnic minority children. Current and future generations of children will need to be prepared to interact with people from different racial and ethnic backgrounds. In regions such as California, young people are often already living in neighborhoods and attending schools composed of an ethnically diverse student body (Educational Research Service, 1995). In these types of integrated settings, children must learn proactive, beneficial methods of responding to discrimination.
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Figure 1.

Passive Responses to Perceived Discrimination by Audience Condition and Ethnic Identity Status
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Figure 2.

Hostile Responses to Perceived Discrimination by Audience Condition and Ethnic Identity Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audience Condition</th>
<th>Unexamined</th>
<th>Exploration</th>
<th>Achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alone</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Friend</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Date</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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