

**African American College Students' Experiences
With Everyday Racism: Characteristics of and
Responses to These Incidents**

Janet K. Swim

Pennsylvania State University

Lauri L. Hyers

University of Tennessee Chattanooga

Laurie L. Cohen

Arizona State University

Davita C. Fitzgerald

Pennsylvania State University

Wayne H. Bylsma

American College of Physicians–American Society of Internal Medicine

African American college students reported their experiences with everyday forms of racism at a predominantly European American university using a daily diary format. Their reported incidents represented verbal expressions of prejudice, bad service, staring or glaring, and difficulties in interpersonal exchanges (e.g., rudeness or awkward and nervous behavior). Both women's and men's experiences with interpersonal forms of prejudice were common, often occurred with friends and in intimate situations, and had significant emotional impact on them in terms of decreasing their comfort and increasing their feelings of threat during the interaction. Moreover, anger was the most frequently reported emotional reaction to these events. Participants were not passive targets, however, with many responding either directly or indirectly to the incidents. Findings from this study converged upon patterns of results found in in-depth interviews and surveys while also adding information to a growing body of literature on everyday experiences with racism.

Keywords: *racism; discrimination; diary methodology; college students; stigma*

JOURNAL OF BLACK PSYCHOLOGY, Vol. 29 No. 1, February 2003 38-67

DOI: 10.1177/0095798402239228

© 2003 The Association of Black Psychologists

Over the past few decades, there has been much discussion about the changing nature of racism (Devine, Plant, & Blair, 2001). Researchers have discussed the hidden nature of racism where, for instance, European Americans discriminate against African Americans only when an alternative attribution for their behavior is plausible or when they will not be held accountable for their behavior (e.g., Crosby, Bromley, & Saxe, 1980). Moreover, contemporary research emphasizes covert racism, racial attitude ambivalence, and unconscious forms of racism (see Devine et al., 2001, for a current review). One unifying feature of this research is that it has examined beliefs and behaviors of European Americans in order to understand the characteristics and pervasiveness of racism. However, a growing alternative approach to understanding current forms of racism is to focus on the recipients of this racism by obtaining their descriptions of their experiences with racism (Swim, Cohen, & Hyers, 1998). First, by focusing on targets' experiences, one can better understand the range of concrete manifestations of "experienced" prejudice through perpetrators' behavioral expressions of racism that may be relatively easy to observe (e.g., Crosby et al., 1980; Dovidio, Brigham, Johnson, & Gaertner, 1996). Second, by exploring the experiences of targets of prejudice, research can better reveal the extent to which members of stigmatized groups must deal with prejudice and discrimination (Swim, Hyers, Cohen, & Ferguson, 2001). Third, asking targets to describe their experiences is more empowering than asking perpetrators to speak for targets' experiences (Oyserman & Swim, 2001). Finally, targets can be characterized as the true "experts" on prejudice (Swim et al., 1998). This approach of focusing on African American's self-ports guides this study in an exploration of the lived experience of racism.

Although a number of examples of writings on racism from the targets' perspective can be found in popular literature (e.g., Griffin's 1960 *Black Like Me* or Morrison's 1970 *The Bluest Eye*), academic research has been slow to include this perspective. A few groundbreaking exceptions are Essed's (1991) in-depth interviews with people of African descent living in the Netherlands and Feagin and Sike's (1994) in-depth interviews of middle-class African Americans. These studies have been followed by concerted efforts to examine the issues they raised, as illustrated by specific journal issues devoted to these topics (e.g., Crocker, 1999; Oyserman & Swim, 2001;

AUTHORS' NOTE: *The work described in this article was supported by a grant to the first author from the Society for the Psychological Studies of Social Issues. We would like to thank Carolann Conforti, Catherine Crawford, Andrea Jones, Jenn Kelius, Deborah Miller, Mara Morganstein, and Kathy O'Brien for their assistance in data collection and coding. Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Janet K. Swim, Psychology Department, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA, 16802. E-mail may be sent to jks4@psu.edu.*

Robinson & Ginter, 1999). This work reveals the breadth of racist experiences, the thought processes people report when attempting to determine whether an experience is racist, and a complex decision-making process about whether and how to respond to the incidents. Instead of associating the term *racism* with specific extreme incidents, such as hate crimes, racial slurs, or job discrimination, racism in these interviews is revealed to be a part of everyday life. Moreover, these everyday events have been described by some as forms of microaggressions (Pierce, 1974; 1995; Solorzano, Ceja, & Yosso, 2000). "Everyday racism" can include mundane hassles that could be forgotten by the day's end as well as overt, severe actions that could be recalled months later. These daily experiences have been termed *everyday racism*, characterized by routine encounters with another's prejudice (negative affect and beliefs based upon racial group membership) and discriminatory behavior (differential treatment based upon racial group membership) that pervade people's daily social interactions (Essed, 1991; Feagin & Sikes, 1994; Swim et al., 1998).

Consistent with the concept of everyday racism representing frequent and reoccurring incidents, surveys indicate that African Americans are familiar with encounters with prejudice and discrimination generally and in specific domains. A small number of psychological survey studies have examined the frequency of African Americans' experiences with racism through retrospective self-report methods. For instance, using survey methodology, D'Augelli and Hershberger (1993) asked African American students to estimate the general frequency with which they had encountered verbal prejudice and to indicate if they had ever experienced relatively blatant forms of prejudice (threats, violence, or property damage). They found that 89% of their participants reported having heard disparaging comments about African Americans "occasionally" to "frequently." In addition, they found that 59% reported being personally, verbally insulted and that 36% reported experiencing incidents involving threats or violence while at college. Using a similar retrospective approach, Landrine and Klonoff (1996) developed a scale to measure African Americans' lifetime and recent (in the past year) encounters with a variety of racist incidents. Instead of drawing distinctions between incidents based upon the type (e.g., verbal, violent, etc.), their survey differentiated various incidents based upon the perpetrator (e.g., discrimination from teachers, employers, strangers, etc.). They measured the percentage of time respondents experienced racism from these perpetrators, from "1% to 10% of the time" to "more than 70% of the time." They found that 98.1% had experienced some type of racism (at least 1% of the time) in the past year and that 100% of their sample had experienced some type of racism in their lifetime, the most common type coming from strangers. The authors also found

that 70% of those who experienced prejudice reported feeling extremely angry and that more than 30% of participants reported taking some action in response to racist incidents.

Sociological measures have also explored the frequency and nature of racism in the lives of African Americans. Again using retrospective self-report methods, sociologists have assessed the frequency of racism using Likert-type scales ranging from *never* to *always* (e.g., Williams, 1997); dichotomous (yes/no) indicators of having "been treated badly because [of race] in the past month" (Jackson et al., 1996); or domain-specific estimates of the percentage of time respondents experience prejudice (Fix & Struyk, 1993; Massey, Gross, & Shibuya, 1994). Findings from these studies indicate that African Americans experience racism *sometimes*, responding slightly under 2.5 on a scale where 1 = *never* and 5 = *always* (Shulz, Williams, et al., 2000; and Shulz, Israel, et al., 2000); about 20% of the time when applying for jobs (Fix & Struyk, 1993); and about 60% of the time when applying for housing (Massey et al., 1994).

THE PRESENT STUDY

Our research further elaborates on these qualitative and quantitative assessments of everyday racism by using a daily diary methodology that combines both qualitative and quantitative elements. Moreover, this methodology corrects for some limitations of the past research, most of which relies on the participants' ability to recall experiences over the past year or even over their lifetimes. To capture less salient, more mundane or patterned experiences with everyday racism, a daily diary procedure may be more appropriate. In addition, most of the research methodologies produce frequency indicators that are nonspecific, making it very difficult to translate their indicators of "sometimes" or "always" or "1 to 10 % of the time" into lived experience. These scales can be problematic in terms of variations in subjective interpretations of the meaning of the scale points (Schwarz, 1999). Also, different labels for scale points communicate different possibilities to respondents, and respondents' frequency estimates can be altered by changing the response options given (Schwarz, 1999). In contrast, the daily diary method enables participants to report everyday experiences as soon after they occur as possible, better capturing some of the more subtle, sometimes ambiguous, and often forgotten experiences of racism that may be quickly brushed off as a function of everyday living and survival. In addition, this method provides a more interpretable indicator of the frequency of

experiences with everyday racism by using an event sampling procedure. With this procedure, participants record events each day when they occur, resulting in the ability to count the frequency with which they occur to individuals over a specific time period.

Another advantage of the daily diary procedure is its ability to reveal detailed information on an incident-by-incident basis. This has the potential to provide detailed information about the characterization of the incidents in terms of the nature of the incidents, variations in the context, and perpetrator characteristics. Moreover, a participant's immediate emotional and behavior responses can also be assessed. The immediate reporting of emotional responses can be more accurate than those recalled later (Reiss & Wheeler, 1991). As others have noted, emotions such as anger, feeling threatened, and anxiety are important components of a person's experiences with racism (e.g. Collins, 1997; Cose, 1993; Feagin & Sikes, 1994; Grier & Cobbs, 1968; Landrine & Klonoff, 1996). Additionally, it is important to assess behavioral responses to everyday racism (or at least the consideration of such a response) because it seems to be integral to the experience of everyday prejudice (Feagin, 1991; Feagin & Sikes, 1994; Hyers, 2002; LaLonde, & Cameron, 1994; Landrine & Klonoff, 1996; Swim et al., 1998) and can be part of coping responses to such events (Clark, Anderson, Clark, & Williams, 1999; Miller & Kaiser, 2001; Miller & Major, 2000; Utsey, Ponterotto, Reynolds, & Cancelli, 2000). Past research indicates that there are many possible behavioral responses to prejudice, including violence, verbal confrontation, complaints to officials, and the seeking of social support, and that the type of response may depend on the type of incident (Clark et al., 1999; D'Augelli & Hershberger, 1993; Feagin, 1991; Feagin & Sikes, 1994; Hyers, 2002; Lykes, 1983; Miller & Kaiser, 2001; Swim et al., 1998; Swim & Hyers, 1999; Utsey et al., 2000). Combining an open-ended, qualitative diary format with an extensive guided-survey instrument allows participants to consistently and richly describe each incident and allows researchers to test for patterns and relationships across different incidents.

Finally, we suspected that a variety of individual differences might affect the experience of everyday prejudice, an element that has been given inadequate attention in above-mentioned studies. We were interested in whether there would be individual differences in the number and types of incidents reported, types of emotional responses, and whether the incident led to confrontation. A potentially important variable for understanding perceptions of and reactions to prejudice is racial identity. Those who are not strongly ethnically identified may experience racism differently than do those who are strongly ethnically identified. Gender is another important individual difference variable to consider. Men may experience incidents differently from

women. For instance, according to social dominance theory, African American males are more likely to be a target of hostility and discrimination than African American females because African American males are more of a threat to a dominant groups' higher status (Sidanius & Veniegas, 2000). Gender may also affect responses to incidents. For example, because assertive confrontation can be perceived as a more masculine, aggressive behavior, men may be more likely to confront prejudice than women (Eagly & Steffen, 1986). On the other hand, women may be more likely to seek social support than men, as has been found in research dealing with other forms of stressors (Barbee et al., 1993).

To summarize, we first assessed the frequency of everyday racist incidents, providing an indicator of incidents per week experienced by African American students attending a predominantly White/European American public university. We explored three aspects of the experience of encountering everyday incidents: (a) characterization of the incidents, (b) participants' emotional responses, and (c) participants' behavioral responses. We also explored (but made no a priori predictions about) the interrelationships among these aspects of participants' experiences. In addition, we tested whether stronger racial identity would relate to reporting more incidents and to assertively responding to the incidents; whether men would be more likely than women to experience blatant incidents due to gendered racism (Sidanius & Veniegas, 2000) and also more likely to respond assertively to them due to gender differences in assertiveness norms (Eagly & Steffen, 1986); and whether women would be more likely than men to engage in support-seeking and discussing experiences with everyday prejudice due to gender differences in using this method of coping with stressors (Barbee et al, 1993).

METHOD

PARTICIPANTS

Participants were 24 African American men and 27 African American women who were sophomores, juniors, and seniors recruited from the entire campus of a predominantly European American university in the Northeast. The study took place near the end of the spring semester, after the university's spring break and before final exams. African American 1st-year students were excluded from the sample because many were involved in another research project at the university and would not have been likely to want to also participate in this time-consuming diary-keeping study. To recruit

participants, we first sent letters to a sample of 163 African American students. This sample was obtained by choosing every other student from a list of all African American sophomore, junior, and senior students on campus. After mailing the letters, we then called participants to see if they were interested in participating in the study. We sent letters to a much larger pool of names than we had planned to include in the study because we had anticipated a response rate of about 30% based upon past experience with research recruitment on this campus. However, we obtained a higher number of interested responses than anticipated. Thus, many of the 163 who did not volunteer did not refuse to participate; they simply were not contacted. Specifically, we randomly selected from the 163-person volunteer list a recruited subset of 70 people who agreed to come to an orientation session. The final sample size ($N = 51$) was smaller because some students did not arrive at the orientation meeting and others did not complete the daily diary forms for every day of the 2-week study. Of the 51, one did not complete post measures.

Participants' average age was 20; 32% of the participants reported they were enrolled in the college of agricultural science, science, or engineering; 51% were in education, liberal arts, arts and architecture, or human development; and 16% were in business administration. Two incentives encouraged participation: Each of the participants was paid \$20, and each had the opportunity to win one of two \$100 lotteries.

MEASURES¹

Preditory Measures

First, participants rated the extent to which 24 emotions (e.g., shock, feeling threatened, feeling safe) were representative of their emotions during a typical interaction with European Americans. The participants used a scale ranging from 1 = *very unrepresentative* to 7 = *very representative*. We had anticipated, based upon past research (Essed, 1991; Feagin & Sikes, 1994), that most perpetrators would be European American, which is why this measure asked about interactions with European Americans. This item served as a baseline measure to compare with ratings of the same emotions assessed in the diaries (see below for the list of emotions and the subscales developed). Second, participants completed Luhtanen and Crocker's (1992) Collective Self-Esteem Scale (CSE). In our analyses, we only used the Identity subscale ($\alpha = .76$), which assesses the importance of group membership to one's self-concept. An example item from this scale is "The social group I belong

to is an important reflection of who I am.” Participants were instructed to think about the social group as being African Americans.

Daily Diaries

Participants were given a notebook with several daily diary forms inside. They completed these forms for 2 weeks. On these forms, they were asked to provide information about race-related incidents they experienced. We used this broader reference to “race-related events” rather than other terms such as “events due to prejudice,” “discriminatory events,” or “racist incidents.” We anticipated that these alternative terms might discourage participants from reporting events that they believed were more ambiguous, and we wanted to be able to include these types of events in our reports of the frequency of everyday racism. Latter ratings allowed us to distinguish between those events that the participants were relatively certain were due to prejudice versus those that were more ambiguous. Apart from the frequency estimates, however, only incidents that participants rated as at least possibly indicative of prejudice were included in analyses. Each day, participants were required to complete at least one form. If one or more incidents had occurred, they were asked to fill out a form for each incident. If no incidents had occurred, they were instructed to check off a space at the top of the form indicating that no relevant incidents occurred for that day.

The diary form included several sections. To begin, participants responded to an open-ended question asking them to describe the incident. They were given several lines to describe the incident in their own words, then went on to further describe the incident through a series of questions that followed. First, participants indicated whether the behavior could be characterized as an overt behavior, nonverbal behavior, direct comment, comment that implied prejudice, or joke by circling all that applied. Second, the participants indicated whether the behavior was directed at themselves, another person(s) in their racial group, their entire racial group, or members of other groups. Only incidents described as directed at African Americans were included in the analyses. Third, participants then indicated the location where the incident occurred by checking one of the following settings: academic, sports, retail, employment, social-general, or social-intimate. For analyses, the first four were combined to form a category representing “public or institutional settings,” and the last two settings were combined into a category representing “private or noninstitutional settings.”

Next, participants responded to questions about the person(s) responsible for the incident, filling out one form for each person responsible. If they

indicated that more than one person was responsible for the incident, they were asked to use the first form for the person they perceived to be the most responsible for the incident. Because only 12% reported incidents involving more than one responsible person, we conducted analyses using the first person listed (i.e., the person participants perceived as most responsible for the incident). Next, participants indicated the perpetrator's gender and race in two closed-ended questions and their relationship to this individual by checking off 1 of 11 categories that best described their relationship with the perpetrator. These relationship categories were combined to form four primary categories: peers (classmate, friend, acquaintance, or roommate), intimate relations (girlfriend/boyfriend or family member), nonstudent adults (faculty member or teaching assistant, university staff member, businessperson, or community resident), and strangers. This is consistent with the research by Landrine and Klonoff (1996), which revealed strangers to be the most common perpetrators, friends the least frequent perpetrators, and various other acquaintances falling somewhere in between the two in their frequency of responsibility for everyday racism.

Next, participants rated their certainty that the behavior reflected or reinforced prejudice. They were asked to use their own definition of what constituted prejudice. We did not use the term *discrimination* because we thought prejudice might be considered a more inclusive term and might better represent the concept of everyday racism. Some might think of discrimination as specifically referring to behaviors or to legally prosecutable events and might exclude, for example, verbal expressions of prejudice. In retrospect, we could also have asked participants to use the term *racism*. However, we suspect that, in the common vernacular, the terms might be used quite similarly (e.g., Swim et al., 2001). Historically, the term *prejudice* has included both attitudes and behaviors. Similarly, *individual racism* (as opposed to, for instance, institutional racism) has often been defined in terms of prejudiced attitudes and discriminatory behavior (Jones, 1997). Thus, students rated the incident as (1) simply a discussion of prejudice, (2) definitely not prejudice, (3) probably not prejudice but could be interpreted that way, (4) probably prejudice but not definitely prejudice, (5) definitely prejudice, and (6) uncertain. If participants gave one of the last four ratings, they were to continue to the next section in the diary form.

In that section, participants were instructed to rate the extent to which the person responsible for the incident was aware that his or her behavior could be thought of as prejudicial and the likelihood that the person intended to behave in a prejudiced manner. Participants made these ratings on 7-point scales with higher numbers indicating more perceived awareness and intention.

The remaining questions assessed participants' emotional and behavioral responses to the incidents. First, they described in their own words how they felt during the incident. Then, they rated the extent to which the same 24 emotions used in the prediary measures were representative of their emotions during the incident using a scale ranging from 1 = *very unrepresentative* to 7 = *very representative*. Next, participants were asked to describe, in an open-ended format, how they responded to the incident in terms of their nonverbal, verbal, or physical reactions. Finally, the students were asked to rate how they felt after the incident, again providing ratings for the 24 emotions used in the prediary measures.

Factor Analyses of Emotions Scale

Separate exploratory factor analyses using principal components with oblique rotation were conducted on the rating of the emotions included on the prediary measures and in the same set of emotions that participants reported feeling during and after the incidents. Scree plots revealed three factors across these factor analyses. Seven emotions did not consistently load on the same factors (anxious, confused, effective, frustrated, offended, upset, and useful). Analyses conducted after deleting these emotions resulted in the emergence of the same three factors. The first factor measured comfort (self-confident, self-assured, secure, competent, safe, comfortable, content, and calm). The second factor measured surprise (shock, surprise, and startled). The third factor measured threat (inadequate, intimidated, helpless, worthlessness, threatened, and self-conscious). Scales computed from the comfort, surprise, and threat factors for each analysis yielded Cronbach's alphas of .93, .93, and .86, respectively.

Postdiary Measures

Approximately 1 to 2 weeks after participants turned in their final diaries, they were asked to complete a series of postdiary measures. Because responses to the incidents could occur at a later time than immediately after the incident, the postdiary measures requested information about who the students had talked to about the incidents that they had rated as prejudiced (incidents rated 3 to 6 on the prejudiced ratings in the daily diaries). They were asked if they had talked to a variety of specific people (police officers, affirmative action officials, friends, family, university faculty, and other) and, if so, how helpful these people had been.

The postdiary measures were also used to assess the representativeness of the findings. Participants were asked to indicate whether they experienced any race-related incidents that they did not report. They were asked to indicate the number of experiences that they did not report, the number of these that were prejudicial, and to provide a reason for why they did not report them. Participants were told that they would not be penalized if they had not recorded all incidents and that this question was used to assess the accuracy of our estimates of the frequency of everyday racist incidents.

Participants were also asked to indicate whether participating in the study increased, decreased, or did not affect their likelihood of identifying an incident as race related and their likelihood of labeling an incident as reflecting prejudice. In addition participants indicated how typical the 2 weeks that they kept the diary had been in terms of the number of race-related incidents they usually encountered and the nature of the incidents they typically experienced (1 = *not very typical* to 7 = *very typical*). In general, they reported that their experiences were fairly typical for both the number ($M = 4.74$) and the type ($M = 5.00$) of incidents. Finally, they were asked the average amount of time ($M = 16$ min) per day they spent on the diary forms and the greatest amount of time they spent on any one diary form ($M = 25$ min).

PROCEDURE

Participants were told that the study was designed to examine prejudice from the target's perspective and that their role would be as a participant-observer. They were instructed to record all their encounters with race-related incidents, defined as incidents in which they believed that they (or the individual to whom the prejudice was directed) would have been treated differently if they had been of a different race. They were also told to include incidents directed at themselves personally, at others, or at their group in general but to exclude prejudice observed in the media in order to limit the scope of the study to interpersonal encounters. However, they were told that they could include comments made by others regarding something observed in the media.

Participants were told that we were interested in both blatant and subtle forms of prejudice, and they were encouraged to record incidents even if they were uncertain that the incidents reflected prejudice against their racial group. They were given a few examples of blatant and subtle incidents that some might encounter (e.g., people expressing various stereotypes about their group). Participants were instructed to complete their forms soon after each incident occurred in order to maximize the accuracy of their recall. If no incidents occurred on a particular day, they were to note this on a form for that

day. They turned in their forms four times during the study to increase the likelihood that they would complete forms on a daily basis. They were paid \$5 each time they turned in their forms. A week or two after completing the study, students returned to complete the postmeasures and for a debriefing session.

An effort was made to make the participants feel comfortable and safe about participating in the study. For instance, an African American student who participated in a pilot study was introduced to the students to share her experiences with the study. She also addressed student questions during the prediary meeting. Furthermore, an ethnically diverse group of research assistants helped with the data collection. The assistants were assigned a "case-load" of about 10 participants. These assistants had regular contact with the research assistants to make sure they did not have any questions, concerns, or problems with the study. In addition, participants were assured that their data would remain completely confidential and anonymous. Finally, we held a group debriefing at the postdiary meeting, within which the research staff observed any signs of distress as participants discussed some of their experiences and shared their ideas and concerns about the study. The debriefing session had a positive tone to it, as students validated each other's experiences and heard others talk about familiar situations.

CODING

Participants' open-ended descriptions of incidents that they labeled as definitely or probably reflecting prejudice (hereafter referred to as "racist incidents" for brevity) were read by three female graduate students (one African American and two European American) to identify themes or patterns in the incidents to create categories within which similar incidents could be grouped. Then, two African American undergraduate women coded the open-ended descriptions based upon the categories that the graduate students developed. In the style of the grounded theory method (Glaser & Strauss, 1967), we did not work from a priori categories in coding these racist incidents (e.g., using categories from other studies on everyday racism); instead, we looked for natural patterns or groupings from the data. We wanted to allow for the possibility that the types of incidents emerging using daily diary methods might present a different picture of everyday racism than in the retrospective accounts of previous research. Categories used to classify the incident types are described in the Results section. All kappas were above .60, with an average kappa across categories being .69.

Our initial coders also determined that participants seemed to indicate six different types of emotional responses to incidents. However, the interrater

reliability was low for five of the six categories because of the low frequency of participants mentioning any of these emotions. In contrast, the large majority reported being angry or upset, and there was adequate interrater reliability on this measure ($\kappa = .68$). Thus, results are reported only for this one emotion.

With regard to behavioral responses, we were interested in whether or not people decided to respond to incidents and, if they did respond, how direct their response was. As such, our two coders classified participants' descriptions of how they responded to each incident into one of three categories: direct, indirect, and no response. Categories used to classify the incident types and behavioral responses are described in the Results section (average κ across categories = .73).

RESULTS

In this article, we first explore the frequency and characteristics of everyday racism reported in the diaries. We then explore emotional and behavior responses to the incidents. Finally, we examine whether individual differences in racial identity and gender are associated with differences in experiences with the incidents and emotional and behavioral responses.

FREQUENCY OF EXPERIENCES

The first variable of interest from the diary-keeping portion of the study was the number of incidents reported by each participant. Over the course of their 2-week participation in the study, participants reported an average of 1.24 ($SD = 1.45$) incidents that they labeled probably or definitely prejudiced. This is about one incident every other week. Although about a third of the participants (35%, $n = 18$) did not report any incidents that they considered probably or definitely prejudiced, the majority of the participants (55%, $n = 28$) reported one or two incidents, and 10% ($n = 5$) reported experiencing from three to seven incidents that were probably or definitely prejudiced.

In addition to these incidents, participants reported an average of 0.51 ($SD = .64$) incidents over the 2-week course of the study that they thought were "probably not prejudice, but could be interpreted that way." Participants also reported an average of 0.14 ($SD = .53$) incidents that they labeled as "uncertain." If one considers both the probably and definitely racist incidents along with the more ambiguous incidents, then participants were likely to experi-

ence an average of about one incident per week ($M = 1.88$, $SD = 1.82$, incidents for 2 weeks).

One might wonder whether participating in the diary study increased the number of incidents reported by the participants. Consistent with the idea that participating in the study made participants more vigilant, 68% ($n = 34$) of participants reported that being in the study made them notice incidents more, and 48% ($n = 24$) of participants reported that being in the study made them more likely to label incidents as prejudicial. However, it should be noted that people's reports about the influence of participating in the study were actually unrelated to the actual number of incidents they reported. This lack of relationship could be due to low power, given the small sample size. Yet it may also be an example of people not being aware of factors that influence their perceptions (Nisbett & Wilson, 1977). Moreover, there is also evidence that participants experienced more incidents than those they reported. For instance, 20% of our sample indicated on the postdiary questionnaire that they did not report between one and four incidents that had occurred during the 2-week diary-keeping period. According to the participants, the most common reasons for not recording incidents were that they thought the incident did not fit the criteria to be included in their diaries (i.e., not relevant to the study), the details of the incident were forgotten, or they were too busy.

CHARACTERISTICS OF INCIDENTS: OPEN-ENDED RESPONSES

In addition to describing the nature of the incidents in terms of the categories that emerged in our grounded-theory coding procedure, we wanted to explore the frequencies of various types of incidents. We were interested in whether the relative occurrence of each was different from what has been reported in past literature. To assess the relative frequency of these four types of incidents, we calculated occurrence rates for each of these categories. Because participants reported different total numbers of racist incidents in their diaries (some as few as 1 and others as many as 7), calculating rates from all 96 incidents reported would overrepresent some participants' experiences. Therefore, to not overrepresent data from those participants who reported more than one racist incident, rates of each type of incident presented below are based upon randomly selecting one racist incident from each participant's diary.²

Four major categories of incidents emerged: (a) staring, (b) verbal expressions of prejudice, (c) bad service in public establishments, and (d) miscellaneous interpersonal offenses. Qualitative examples of each category are

described below for incidents labeled as definitely or probably prejudiced. The frequency of occurrence for each type of racist incident is also provided.

Staring. The most common type of incident, reported in 36% ($n = 12$) of the randomly selected racist incidents, was being stared at. Two specific types of staring behaviors were experienced. The most common type involved being stared at suspiciously. For example, in stores or on streets, participants were closely watched, with the implication that they were perceived as threatening or dangerous. The other type of staring experienced was more of a hostile glare from strangers. These types of stares were attributed to things such as being part of an interracial couple, being the only African American in a group, or to the perpetrator's racism and hatred for African Americans in general. For example, one student said that a man repeatedly stared at her and a European American friend after a physical education class "without blinking" and with a face that was "clenched and cold as ice."

Verbal expressions. Verbal expressions of prejudice occurred in 24% ($n = 8$) of incidents reported. There were three general subtypes of verbal expressions of prejudice. The first involved direct racial slurs. For example, one woman reported a particularly disturbing incident where a man at a party addressed her by a racist label and ordered her to perform a menial task. The second involved culturally or interpersonally insensitive comments, such as a European American person commenting that "some of my best friends are Black" in a situation where it was irrelevant or ingratiating. The third type included expressions of racial stereotypes or generalizations about African Americans' interests, skills, and culture.

Bad service. Bad service characterized 18% ($n = 6$) of the racist incidents. In these situations, participants received differential treatment by people in retail stores, restaurants, classrooms, or other public establishments. Most frequently, participants were customers and received differential treatment during a service transaction. A common occurrence was participants being served, seated, waited on, or assisted after European American customers received service, even if the African American participant had preceded them in line. Other specific examples included abrupt or rude handling of service transactions. Less frequently (likely due in part to the fact that our participants were full-time students and less likely to be fully employed at the time of the study), participants were employees in business situations who received rude treatment from their customers.

Miscellaneous interpersonal offenses. This fourth, catch-all category of various interpersonal incidents involved participants' experiencing rude or awkward encounters with European Americans. These interpersonal offenses occurred in 15% ($n = 5$) of the racist incidents. These included general rudeness, usually in social situations, awkward or nervous behavior on the part of European American individuals, European Americans mistaking a participant for another Black person (implying that the perpetrator may have perceived that "all Blacks look alike"), and avoidance by European Americans (e.g., on the street, in seating areas, etc.).

CHARACTERISTICS OF INCIDENTS: CLOSED-ENDED RESPONSES

In addition to asking participants to describe incidents in their own words, we also provided a series of closed-ended questions to obtain more specific information about the incident and their experience of it. This descriptive data is helpful for assessing possible consistencies across participants' experiences with everyday prejudice. Furthermore, as reported below, we used the closed-ended items to predict other aspects of the encounter (e.g., participants' emotional and behavioral responses to the incident). For the analyses presented below, we again used only the randomly selected incidents to not overrepresent participants who recorded a higher number of incidents. All data are presented in Table 1.

Nature of the incidents. Participants' characterizations of the incidents suggest that many of the incidents could be considered subtle. For instance, many incidents included components that were nonverbal, comments that only implied but did not directly state prejudice, or were "jokes." However, a number of incidents were also rated as being overt and direct comments. Participants' descriptions of the specific targets of the incidents revealed that a majority of the incidents were directed at the participants. Yet, at the same time, many of the incidents were also perceived to be directed at specific others or African Americans in general, suggesting that participants did not view personally directed versus group-directed prejudice to be mutually exclusive.

Context of incidents. About a third of the incidents occurred in public and/or institutional settings (i.e., academic, sports, or retail settings). An additional third were described as being in social-intimate settings; thus, even in private settings, our participants were not invulnerable to racism.

Perpetrators' characteristics. All but one of the perpetrators were European Americans (with the other being African American). There were no

TABLE 1
Characteristics of Incidents Labeled as Prejudicial

	n	Percentage
Nature of incident (could check more than one)		
Nonverbal	14	42
Comment that implied prejudice	8	24
Prejudicial joke	3	9
Overt	9	27
Direct comment	8	24
Target of incident (could check more than one)		
Participant	27	82
Another specific person or group of people	17	52
Their group in general	22	67
Location of incident		
Public / institutional	12	36
Private / noninstitutional	16	48
Other	4	12
Perpetrator of incident		
European American	32	97
Male	19	58
Relationship to perpetrator		
Complete stranger	19	58
Peer (e.g., classmate, friend, acquaintance)	8	24
Nonstudent adult (e.g., faculty, businessperson)	5	15
Intimate (e.g. girlfriend / boyfriend, family)	1	3

significant differences in the perpetrators' gender, who were just slightly more likely to be male than female. Strangers were the most common perpetrators, responsible for just more than half of the incidents. Acquaintances of the target, such as peers or nonstudent adults, were the next most frequent perpetrators. Intimate relations were the least frequent perpetrators.

Just because incidents were labeled as prejudicial did not necessarily mean that perpetrators were seen as intentionally malicious; instead, perpetrators were sometimes seen as acting out of ignorance or naiveté (Swim, Scott, Sechrist, Campbell, & Stangor, 2002). Therefore, we asked participants the extent to which perpetrators were *aware* that their behavior may have been seen as prejudicial and the extent to which perpetrators *intended* to be prejudicial. On average, participants viewed the perpetrators as fairly aware and intentional in their offensive behavior ($M = 4.97$, $SD = 1.78$, and $M = 4.94$, $SD = 1.68$, respectively, on 7-point scales, with 7 = *definitely aware* and *definitely intentional*).

TABLE 2
Emotional Responses to Incidents

	<i>Baseline</i>		<i>During</i>		<i>After</i>	
	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>
Comfortable	5.19 _a	0.97	3.91 _b	1.65	4.47 _b	1.80
Surprised	2.87	1.79	3.24	2.00	2.71	0.82
Threatened	2.26 _a	0.85	2.94 _b	1.62	2.67 _{ab}	1.50

NOTE: Ratings range from 1 to 7 with higher numbers indicating greater feelings of being comfortable, surprised, and threatened. Means in the same row that do not share subscripts differ at $p \leq .05$.

EMOTIONAL RESPONSES

On average, the incidents reported in the present study had significant emotional impact on participants, with the predominant emotional response being anger. In 58% ($n = 19$) of the incidents, respondents revealed in their open-ended descriptions that they felt angry and upset. However, as the means on the scales suggest (see Table 2), participants did not have extreme emotional responses in terms of lack of comfort or feeling threatened during the incidents.

Yet it is important to note that the participants' emotional responses did differ from what they considered to be their typical feelings during interactions with European Americans. We compared participants' emotion ratings generally (baseline) with their emotion ratings during a racist incident and immediately after it was over (both from diaries).³ We analyzed this with a 3 (baseline, during the incident, after the incident) \times 2 (gender of participant) mixed ANOVA. Gender was included in these analyses to account for possible differences in tendency to self-report different emotional responses, particularly in the baseline measures where factors such as gender stereotypes about emotions might influence self-reports (Shields, 2002). The only significant effect in these analyses was a main effect for time on feelings of comfort, $F(2, 50) = 5.39, p = .01$. Participants reported that they felt less comfortable during the incidents and after the incident than their baseline emotions in typical interactions with European Americans, $t(27) = 4.02, p < .001$, and $t(26) = 2.35, p = .03$, respectively (see Table 2). In comparison to baseline, participants were not differentially surprised or threatened during or after the incident. However, paired comparisons revealed that there was a trend indicating that participants felt more threatened during the incident than at baseline, $t(27) = 2.23, p = .03$. Thus, these results reveal that the incidents resulted

in decreased feelings of comfort and increased feelings of threat as compared to how they typically felt during interactions with European Americans.

We were interested in whether characteristics of the incidents (listed in Table 1) and ratings of perpetrators' intent and awareness were associated with particular types of emotional responses. We suspected that the overtness and setting of the incident and the perceptions of the perpetrators might relate to participants' emotional responses. Although ratings of overtness did not predict emotions, whether an incident involved a direct racist comment did predict emotion, with more direct incidents relating to more feelings of surprise, $r(31) = .38, p = .03$. Perhaps because racism in private settings is less expected (Feagin, 1991), feelings of comfort were related to incident settings; incidents occurring in private, noninstitutional locations were related to reduced comfort, $r(27) = -.37, p = .05$. With regard to characteristics of the perpetrator, the more the perpetrator was perceived to be intentionally prejudiced and aware the incident could be seen as prejudiced, the less comfortable participants felt during and after the incident, $r(28) = -.40, p = .03$, and $r(28) = -.49, p = .01$, respectively, and the more threatened participants felt during and after the incident, $r(28) = .35, p = .07$ and $r(28) = .33, p = .08$, respectively. It appears that perpetrators who were perceived to be more intentional had more impact on participants' emotional states, even after the incident had ended.

BEHAVIORAL RESPONSES

Inseparable from the experience of everyday prejudice is the response a target has to an incident, with behavioral confrontation being a response that participants at least consider (Feagin, 1991; Feagin & Sikes, 1994; Landrine & Klonoff, 1996). In our study, participants overall were more likely to respond in some manner, with 42% ($n = 14$) directly addressing the offense and 21% indirectly responding ($n = 7$); 33% made no response at all ($n = 11$).

We tested whether characteristics of the incident (characteristics listed in Table 1 and perpetrators' intent and awareness) were associated with the directness of the participants' responses. Because we anticipated gender effects in response style, we controlled for gender in these analyses. Two characteristics of the target of were associated with directness of responding. The more the incidents were personally directed at participants, the more likely they were to directly respond, $r(29) = .41, p = .01$, and the more the incident was described as being directed at another particular person, the less likely participants were to directly respond $r(29) = -.70, p < .001$. Whether the incident was perceived to be directed at their group in general was unrelated to participants' responses, $r(29) = -.04, p = .41$. These findings suggest

TABLE 3
Discussing Incident With Others

<i>Who Was Told</i>	n	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>Helpfulness of Those Told</i>	
			<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>
Friends	28	56	5.71	1.55
Family	6	12	5.67	0.82
Faculty	2	4	7.00	0.00
University official	1	2	6.00	0.00
Police	1	2	5.00	0.00
Other	6	12	5.33	1.51

NOTE: Helpfulness ratings range from 1 to 7 with higher numbers meaning more helpfulness.

that participants felt more compelled to respond when the incident had more personal implications. Perhaps because of the idiosyncratic nature of each incident, none of the other characteristics of the incidents, the perpetrators, or the location predicted responses.

We also tested for support seeking as a delayed behavioral response to racist incidents. We asked participants whether they had talked about any of the incidents to others (see Table 3). A large percentage of the participants reported doing this, with just more than half of the participants talking to friends and 12% talking to family members. One participant also reported an incident to the police. Based upon participants' ratings of how helpful it was to share incidents with another person, almost all participants felt that these discussions were helpful.

INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES

We were interested in how individual differences might relate to the experience of and response to everyday racism. First, we explored racial identification, predicting that those who were more racially identified would be more likely to notice and therefore report racist incidents. Racial identity, as measured by the Collective Self-Esteem Scale, was unrelated to the total number of racist incidents reported (incidents labeled as definitely or probably prejudiced). Although this lack of a relationship was surprising, we speculated that the more obvious nature of "probably" and "definitely" racist incidents might have overpowered any individual differences. Therefore, we explored whether individual differences in racial identity would be more strongly related to the number of ambiguous incidents reported. Those who were strongly African American-identified reported experiencing more ambiguous incidents $r(50) = .29, p = .04$. There were no effects of racial

TABLE 4
Behavior Responses to Incidents

<i>Response</i>	<i>Women</i>		<i>Men</i>	
	<i>n</i>	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
Direct comment to perpetrator, retaliatory comment or behavior directed at perpetrator through someone else	11	52	3	27
Comment to someone other than perpetrator, abruptly ending interaction, avoiding, ignoring, or boycotting perpetrator, nonverbal looks or gestures	6	28	1	9
No response or no information provided	4	19	7	64

identity on the characteristics of incidents, perhaps because perpetrators likely have more control over these aspects of everyday prejudice than would a target. However, we were surprised to find that racial identification related neither to emotional nor to behavioral responses to incidents reported.⁴

We had expected that men would experience more everyday incidents of prejudice due to the gendered nature of racism (Sidanius & Veniegas, 2000); however, we actually found a trend of women ($M = 1.59$, $SD = 1.47$) reporting more definitely or probably racist incidents, $M = .83$, $SD = 1.34$, $F(1, 49) = 3.67$, $p = .06$. There were no gender differences in types of experiences reported. Furthermore, using the randomly selected incidents, we found no relationship between participant gender and characteristics of events and between participant gender and emotional responses during or after the incident.

There were gender differences in behavioral responses. However, again, they were contrary to predictions (see Table 4). Using the randomly selected set of racist incidents, men were more likely than women to not respond to the incident ($Z = 2.57$, $p = .01$). Thus, although there were no gender differences in the tendency to give direct ($Z = 1.36$, $p = .17$) or indirect responses ($Z = 1.25$, $p = .21$), the gender differences on lack of responses indicates that, taken together, women (81%) were more likely than men (36%) to respond either directly or indirectly. This gender difference is not a function of differential types of incidents experienced by women and men, given the lack of gender differences documented in participants' descriptions of incident characteristics or their emotional responses to the incidents. It is possible that the larger social context contributes more to this than the characteristics of the immediate incident. Specifically, African American men may suffer greater

consequences in society than African American women may suffer if they assertively confront.

Gender also predicted the participants' social support seeking. Consistent with our predictions and past research that indicates women are more likely to seek social support than men (Barbee et al., 1993), women (68%) were more likely than men (32%) to report talking to friends about the incidents ($Z = 2.54, p = .01$). There were no gender differences in the likelihood of discussing the incidents with others, including family, acquaintances, and authorities.

DISCUSSION

FREQUENCY OF EXPERIENCES WITH EVERYDAY RACISM

Our study illustrates the value of examining the experiences of those who are the targets of prejudice—rather than the perpetrators—and the value of using a daily diary methodology to assess these experiences. For instance, our findings concur with characterizing African Americans experiences with racism as being a common and patterned. Moreover, our data provide a concrete estimate of the frequency with which these experiences occur. Whereas past survey research indicated that experiences with racism could be described as occurring “occasionally,” “frequently,” or “sometimes,” (D’Augelli & Hershberger, 1993; Shulz, Israel et al., 2000; Shulz, Williams, et al., 2000), this research illustrates that, for college students, the frequency of racism can be more concretely described as occurring about once every other week in the form of incidents that are probably or definitely prejudiced and once a week if more ambiguous incidents are counted. Moreover, whereas past survey research indicates that nearly 100% of participants indicate that they have experienced some form of racism (i.e., 1% to 10% of the time) in the past year (Landrine & Klonoff, 1996), this study illustrates that about two thirds of African American students will report at least one experience in a 2-week period.

Although our diary study does overcome limitations associated with use of survey methodology for assessing frequency of experiences with racism and provides more concrete descriptions of the commonness of these experiences, it should be kept in mind that there are limitations associated with the assessments obtained from diary studies. First, we do not know the extent to which participants overreported or underreported the number of incidents they encountered during the diary-keeping phase of the study. Participants

may have underreported because the diary keeping was somewhat labor intensive. On the other hand, experimenter demand may have made participants feel compelled to write about incidents (although we assured them that there would be no penalty if they did not experience anything to report).

Second, participating in the study could potentially alter attention to prejudice in one's environment, making participants attend to their social interactions with more scrutiny. Thus, the study in part reflects the types of experiences participants have when they are specifically asked to attend to them, a level of scrutiny that may surpass the level employed in everyday living by some people. The phenomenological experience of encountering everyday prejudice as revealed in the present study may be more representative of people who tend to generally be sensitive to racism (e.g., Pinel, 1999). Yet it should be kept in mind that, although on average participants did report that the study increased their awareness of racism, variations in this effect were unrelated to actual differences in the number of incidents participants reported in their diaries. Thus, rather than providing a *definitive* assessment of the frequency of everyday racism experienced by African American students, the results from the present study provide an *alternative* means of assessing this frequency, which has certain advantages over previous methods.

CHARACTERIZATION OF INCIDENTS

Some interesting comparisons can be made between the characterizations of prejudice that have focused on perpetrators and those found in past interview and survey studies. For instance, despite what might be expected in view of theories of the hidden nature of contemporary racism (Devine et al., 2001), overt verbal incidents of prejudice have been noted as very common (e.g., in D'Augeli & Hershberger, 1993), and we also found that to be the case here. Verbal expressions were the second most frequent type of incident reported in the diaries; a quarter of the incidents were described as overt, and a quarter of the incidents were described as direct comments. Also, from our participants' perspectives, like those reported in interviews, these events were often not particularly subtle, with most incidents being rated as definitely or probably prejudiced rather than uncertain and with perpetrators often being rated as being relatively aware of the prejudiced nature of their behaviors and intending to behave in a prejudicial manner. This is not to say that subtle or covert incidents did not emerge, given that many of the incidents were nonverbal or involved comments that only implied prejudice. Moreover, many of the behaviors described by participants—such as culturally or interpersonally insensitive comments, some incidents of bad service,

staring, or rude behavior—could conceivably be labeled by others as ambiguous or subtle. However, these findings indicate the continued presence of blatant forms of racism from our participants' perspectives. Also, in contrast to research that focuses on perpetrators' perspectives, typically by examining White people's evaluations and behaviors toward strangers (e.g., Poskocil, 1977), the diaries revealed that many incidents were not in public settings, occurring instead in intimate social gatherings.

It appears that the incidents reported in the diaries were not inconsistent with the nature of everyday prejudice reported in interview and survey research. However, some interesting differences emerged between our study and past retrospective studies. For example, unlike what is found in the more retrospective accounts of everyday prejudice (e.g., Feagin, 1992), it is notable that staring emerged as the most common type of incident. It is likely that the daily accounting for prejudice made this very short-term, perhaps otherwise quickly forgotten incident more salient. Because staring behaviors do not involve direct social interaction and are usually fleeting moments, they may be overlooked or at least underestimated by participants making retrospective accounts of everyday prejudice. They also may be more difficult to classify as being definitely race related, and if classified as race related, there may be uncertainty as to whether the behaviors are due to prejudice. Thus, in interviews, participants may select not to report such incidents, preferring instead to describe more obvious incidents of everyday racism.

It is also the case that retrospective accounts have given less attention to other relatively minor interpersonal offenses, such as interpersonal awkwardness, rudeness, or social faux pas. Moreover, whereas bad service has been one of the most common types of everyday prejudice reported in previous research (e.g., Feagin & Sikes, 1994; Landrine & Klonoff, 1996), bad service and interpersonal awkwardness occurred at about equal rates in the present study. Perhaps interpersonal offenses are less often recalled or reported because these types of incidents, like staring, may be scattered across contexts, making it harder for participants to recall. These types of incidents may also be characterized by relative uncertainty.

When making comparisons across studies, however, the reader should keep in mind that our findings might be different from others because of characteristics of our sample, which may also preclude generalizing findings to a wider range of African Americans. Our sample represents a small group of African American students at a predominantly European American university located in a predominantly European American city where many residents have had little contact with African Americans. It is possible that differences in experiences with staring and interpersonal offenses may reflect the likelihood of experiencing these types of events while attending this

university and may generalize only to those of African American students at other predominantly European American universities. Yet some of the differences in types of events reported by our participants and events reported in retrospective studies are also found when comparing retrospective accounts by students and professors, so the differences can be attributable in part to differences in methodology rather than differences between academic and nonacademic settings (i.e., Feagin, 1992). Plus, characterizations of some of the incidents reported suggest that the findings may generalize to other African Americans who would encounter European Americans in similar public settings. For instance, the study participants' experiences were not limited to interactions with students on the campus but also included interactions in places such as restaurants, banks, record and clothing stores, and on city streets.

EMOTIONAL AND BEHAVIORAL RESPONSES

Another important similarity between our study and other studies is in the responses elicited from participants. In past research, anger has been the most common emotion in response to everyday racism (e.g., Landrine & Klonoff, 1996), and, as Feagin and Sikes (1994) note, "Most white Americans do not have any inkling of the rage over racism that is repressed by African-Americans. . . . The psychological costs to African-Americans of widespread prejudice and discrimination include this rage, as well as humiliation, frustration, resignation, and depression" (p. 293). Consistent with this conclusion, our results reveal that these incidents have an emotional toll on participants, with anger being the emotion noted most frequently, together with decreased comfort levels and increased feelings of being threatened. Although the data also indicate that participants generally recovered from the events, they continued to experience discomfort even after the incident had ended. Furthermore, it is possible that periodic stressors such as everyday prejudice may take a toll in ways other than those measured in this study (e.g., Allison, 1998; Landrine & Klonoff, 1996). It is also important to recognize that participants' emotional baselines, which were used in comparing emotions during incidents, may themselves have been adversely affected due to previous experience with everyday racism.

Nonetheless, the fact that more than half of the participants directly responded to incidents and that many sought social support from friends and family suggests these participants had effective coping responses and were better characterized as active copers than as passive victims of everyday prejudice.

Our findings suggest that one of the biggest costs of these incidents will likely be in terms of the quality of interpersonal relationships between African Americans and European Americans. For instance, comfort levels were especially likely to be lower when participants reported incidents in intimate social settings, where social relationships and networking are most likely to be developed. Thus, the perpetrators' behaviors in these relatively personal settings served to distance them from the African Americans.

INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES

In our examination of the role of individual differences in experiences with everyday racism, we did not find many effects of racial identity on reported experiences with racism. Future research might examine the extent to which other measures of identity or Black's racial attitudes and ideologies (e.g., Phinney, 1992; Sellers, Rowley, Chavous, Shelton, & Smith, 1997; Vandiver, Cross, Worrell, & Fhagen-Smith, in press) might predict self-reported experiences with everyday racism.

We did, however, find some interesting effects for gender. In contrast to previous claims that men experience more racism than do women, we found little difference between the number of experiences reported by women and men. If anything, there was a tendency for women to report more incidents than men. There were no gender differences in the characteristics of the incidents that women and men reported experiencing. It seems more likely that previous findings of gender differences in experiences with racism are a function of gender differences in the less frequent and perhaps more acute or violent forms of racism. In our sample, only one person reported an incident that our coders labeled as being violent. Although this does not explain the idea that women experience more everyday racism than men, it does suggest that the perception that men experience more prejudice than women may be based upon the types of incidents people consider when contemplating the frequency of women's and men's experiences with racism.

There were also gender differences in behavioral responses to the incidents. Women were more likely to talk about the incidents with friends and more likely to behaviorally respond to perpetrators. Talking with friends may reflect women's greater tendency to seek social support than do men (Barbee et al., 1993). This greater tendency to talk about interpersonal problems may be the reason women also seemed more likely to talk directly to perpetrators, in that many of the incidents reflected difficulties in interpersonal exchanges. Finally, it is possible that African American men resist directly responding to racism because the response might be seen as aggressive and their lack of

response is an attempt to not confirm the stereotype that African American men are aggressive.

CONCLUSIONS

This study reveals the richness of information that can be obtained from diary accounts of everyday experiences with racism. There is convergence between many of the types of incidents reported by our participants and those reported in studies using different methodology and samples (D'Augelli & Hershberger, 1993; Feagin & Sikes, 1994; Landrine & Klonoff, 1996). Yet other aspects reveal more precision and new insights into these experiences. We believe that the diary methodology should be seen as being complementary rather than competitive with other methodologies, converging upon different patterns of results and adding information to the others. We hope the present study will encourage others to consider this as a possible alternative method of answering important questions about African Americans' experiences with prejudice. For instance, future research could go into more detail about the incidents people report, providing a better understanding of what makes people more or less certain that incidents are racist or that perpetrators are prejudiced. Other research could lead to better understanding of the short-term and long-term emotional and interpersonal toll of these events (Clark et al., 1999; Ramseur, 1991). Diary studies could also help researchers better understand coping methods people select (e.g., Swim, Pearson, & Johnston, 2002), delineate general and racism-specific coping responses (Clark et al., 1999; Utsey et al., 2000), or understand people's motives in confronting racism (e.g., Hyers, 2002). Finally, diaries could also be used as a manipulation to test the effects of attending to events on targets' perceptions of prejudice or perpetrators.

NOTES

1. There were a few other exploratory measures in the prediary questionnaire, the diary itself, and the postdiary questionnaire that were included. Some of these measures were not directly related to the research questions in this study, others were responded to in a manner that indicated the questions were not clearly written, some had low internal reliability, and some were from nonvalidated scales. Thus, we do not present results from these measures. A complete set of materials, including the prediary questionnaire, the diary form, and the postdiary questionnaire is available from the first author.

2. The *ns* reported do not add up to 33, the number of participants who reported at least one event, because two randomly selected incidents were not descriptive enough for coding.

3. Because our baseline measure assessed feelings during interactions with European Americans, we excluded the one incident with an African American perpetrator from these analyses.

4. We had also included a preliminary version of Vandiver, Cross, Worrell, and Fhagen-Smith's (in press) racial identity scale in our study as an alternative way to examine racial identity. The internalization subscale was not reliable in our data set. Results with the pre-encounter and immersion subscales revealed no relationship with frequency of experiences reported. Racial identity did, however, reveal some interesting relationships with emotional responses. Greater endorsement of pre-encounter beliefs was associated with more surprise during the incident, and greater endorsement of immersion beliefs was associated with fewer feelings of being threatened by the incidents. We do not report results from the other scales because the scale we used was not the final version of this measure.

REFERENCES

- Allison, K.W. (1998). Stress and oppressed social category membership. In J. K. Swim & C. Stangor (Eds.), *Prejudice: The target's perspective* (pp. 149-171). New York: Academic Press.
- Barbee, A. P., Cunningham, M. R., Winstead, B. A., Derlega, V. J., Gulley, M.R., Yankeelov, P. A., et al. (1993). Effects of gender role expectations on the social support process. *Journal of Social Issues, 49*, 175-190.
- Clark, R., Anderson, N. B., Clark, V. R., & Williams, D. R. (1999). Racism as a stressor for African Americans: A biopsychosocial model. *American Psychologist, 54*, 805-816.
- Collins, S. M. (1997). *Black corporate executives: The making and breaking of a Black middle class*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Cose, E. (1993). *The rage of a privileged class*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Crocker, J. (1999). Introductory comments. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 35*, 1-3.
- Crosby, F., Bromley, S. & Saxe, L. (1980). Recent unobtrusive studies of Black and White discrimination and prejudice: A literature review. *Psychological Bulletin, 37*, 546-563.
- D'Augelli, A. R. & Hershberger, S. L. (1993). African American undergraduates on a predominantly White campus: Academic factors, social networks, and campus climate. *Journal of Negro Education, 62*, 67-81.
- Devine, P. G., Plant, E. A., & Blair, I. V. (2001). Classic and contemporary analyses of racial prejudice. In R. Brown & S. Gaertner (Eds.), *Blackwell Handbook of Social Psychology: Vol. 3 Intergroup Processes* (pp. 198-217). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Dovidio, J., Brigham, J. C., Johnson, B. T., & Gaertner, S. L. (1996). Stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination: Another look. In C. N. Macrae, C. Stangor, & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *Stereotypes and Stereotyping* (pp. 276-319). New York: Guilford.
- Eagly, A. H. & Steffen, V. J. (1986). Gender and aggressive behavior: A meta-analytic review of the social psychological literature. *Psychological Bulletin, 100*, 309-330.
- Essed, P. (1991). *Understanding everyday racism: An interdisciplinary theory*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Feagin, J. R. (1991). The continuing significance of race: AntiBlack discrimination in public places. *American Sociological Review, 56*, 101-116.

- Feagin, J. R. (1992). The continuing significance of racism: Discrimination against Black students in White colleges. *Journal of Black Studies, 22*, 546-578.
- Feagin, J. R. & Sikes, M. P. (1994). *Living with racism: The Black middle-class experience*. Boston: Beacon.
- Fix, M., & Struyk, R. (1993). *Clear and convincing evidence: Measurement of discrimination in America*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute Press.
- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Grier, W. H., & Cobbs, P. M. (1968). *Black rage*. New York: Basic Books.
- Griffin, J. H. (1960). *Black like me*. New York: Penguin.
- Hyers, L. (2002). *Interpersonal confrontation as a means to prejudice reduction: When oppressed group members challenge the prejudices of dominant group members*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Jackson, J. S., Brown, T. N., Williams, D. R., Torres, M., Sellers, S. L., & Brown, K. (1996). Racism and the physical and mental health status of African Americans: A thirteen year national panel study. *Ethnicity and Disease, 6*, 132-147.
- Jones, M. M. (1997). *Prejudice and racism* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- LaLonde, R. N., & Cameron, J. E. (1994). Behavioral responses to discrimination: A focus on action. In M. P. Zanna & J. M. Olson (Eds.), *The psychology of prejudice: The Ontario symposium*, (Vol. 7, pp. 257-288). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Landrine, H., & Klonoff, E. A. (1996). The schedule of racist incidents: A measure of racial discrimination and a study of its negative physical and mental health consequences. *Journal of Black Psychology, 22*, 144-168.
- Luhtanen, R., & Crocker, J. (1992). A collective self-esteem scale: Self-evaluation of one's social identity. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin, 18*, 302-318.
- Lykes, M. B. (1983). Discrimination and coping in the lives of Black women: Analyses of oral history data. *Journal of Social Issues, 39*, 79-100.
- Massey, D., Gross, A., & Shibuya, K. (1994). Migration, segregation and the geographic concentration of poverty. *American Sociology Review, 59*, 425-445.
- Miller, C. T., & Kaiser, C. R. (2001). Theoretical perspective on coping with stigma. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*, 73-92.
- Miller, C. T., & Major, B. (2000). Coping with stigma and prejudice. In T. F. Heatherton, R. E. Kleck, M. R. Hebl, & J. G. Hull (Eds.), *The social psychology of stigma* (pp. 243-272). New York: Guilford.
- Morrison, T. (1970). *The Bluest Eye*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Nisbett, R. E., & Wilson, T. D. (1977). Telling more than we can know: Verbal reports on mental processes. *Psychological Review, 84*, 231-259.
- Oyserman, D., & Swim, J. (2001). Stigma: An insider's view. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*, 1-14.
- Phinney, J. S. (1992) The multigroup ethnic identity measure: A new scale for use with diverse groups. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 7*, 156-176.
- Pierce, C. (1974). Psychiatric problems of the Black minority. In S. Arieti (Ed.), *American handbook of psychiatry* (pp. 512-523). New York: Basic Books.
- Pierce, C. (1995). Stress analogs of racism and sexism: Terrorism, torture, and disaster. In C. Willie, P. Rieker, B. Kramer, & B. Brown (Eds.), *Mental health, racism, and sexism* (pp. 277-293). Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Pinel, E. C. (1999). Stigma consciousness: The psychological legacy of social stereotypes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 76*, 114-128.
- Poskocil, A. (1977). Encounters between Blacks and White liberals: The collision of stereotypes. *Social Forces, 55*, 715-727.

- Ramseur, H. P. (1991). Psychologically healthy Black adults. In R. L. Jones (Ed.), *Black psychology* (pp. 353-378). Berkeley, CA: Cobb & Henry.
- Reiss, H. T., & Wheeler, L. (1991). Studying social interaction with the Rochester Interaction Record. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 24, 269-318.
- Robinson, T. L., & Ginter, E. J. (1999). Racism: Healing its effects [Special issue]. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 77(1).
- Schwarz, N. (1999). Self-reports: How the questions shape the answers. *American Psychologist*, 54, 93-105.
- Sellers, R. M., Rowley, S. A., Chavous, T. M., Shelton, J. N., & Smith, M. A. (1997). Multidimensional inventory of Black identity: Preliminary investigation of reliability and construct validity. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 73, 805-815.
- Shields, S. A. (2002). *Speaking from the heart: Gender and the social meaning of emotion*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Shulz, A., Israel, B., Williams, D., Parker, E., Becker, A., & James, J. (2000). Social inequalities, stressors, and self reported health status among African American and White women in the Detroit metropolitan area. *Social Science and Medicine*, 51, 1639-1653.
- Shulz, A., Williams, D., Israel, B., Becker, A., Parker, E., James, S. A., et al. (2000). Unfair treatment, neighborhood effects, and mental health in the Detroit metropolitan area. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 41, 314-332.
- Sidanius, J., & Veniegas, R. C. (2000). Gender and race discrimination: The interactive nature of disadvantage. In S. Oskamp (Ed.), *Reducing prejudice and discrimination: The Claremont Symposium on Applied Social Psychology* (pp. 47-69). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Solorzano, D., Ceja, M., & Yosso, T. (2000). Critical race theory, racial microaggressions, and campus racial climate: The experiences of African American college students. *Journal of Negro Education*, 69, 60-73.
- Swim, J. K., Cohen, L. L., & Hyers, L. L. (1998). Experiencing everyday prejudice and discrimination. In J. K. Swim & C. Stangor (Eds.), *Prejudice: The target's perspective* (pp. 38-61). New York: Academic Press.
- Swim, J. K., & Hyers, L. L. (1999). Excuse me—What did you say?! Women's public and private response to sexist remarks. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 35, 68-88.
- Swim, J. K., Hyers, L. L., Cohen, L. L., & Ferguson, M. J. (2001). Everyday sexism: Evidence for its incidence, nature, and psychological impact from three daily diary studies. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57, 31-53.
- Swim, J. K., Pearson, N. B., & Johnston, K. E. (2002). *Day to day experiences with heterosexism: Heterosexist hassles as daily stressors*. Manuscript in preparation.
- Swim, J. K., Scott, E. D., Sechrist, G., Cambell, B., & Stangor, C. (2002). *The role of intent and harm in perceptions of prejudice*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Utsey, S. O., Ponterotto, J. G., Reynolds, A. L., & Cancelli, A. A. (2000). Racial discrimination, coping, life satisfaction, and self-esteem among African Americans. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 78, 72-80.
- Vandiver, B. J., Cross, W. E., Jr., Worrell, F. C., & Fhagen-Smith, P. E. (in press). Validating the Cross Racial Identity Scale. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*.
- Williams, D. R. (1997). Race and health: Basic questions, emerging directions. *Annals of Epidemiology*, 7, 322-333.